

Country: POLAND

Partner organisation: NATIONAL BUREAU FOR DRUG PREVENTION

Course site(s): BYDGOSZCZ and BARTOSZYCE

Contact person: ANNA RADOMSKA
DAWID CHOJECKI

I. Basics

1. Are there any differences between the intended target groups for Fred goes net and what was actually achieved?

Below is a summary of the intended target groups as originally defined. Please delete the entries in the column "planned" and replace them with the correct information for your country in the new column "implemented".

Criterion	PLANNED (according to 2008 RAR)	IMPLEMENTED (Pilot phase 2009)	brief comment if necessary
Age	14 to 21-year-olds	13 – 23 year-old	
Access route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Police / judiciary system – School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Police / judiciary system – School – Children hospital – parents 	<p>The access routs were extended due to the fact that parents by themselves came with their children to the program and if the case was adequate for participating in "Fred goes net", then he or she was interviewed and if needed - referred to the program. Parents mostly learned about the project from the media.</p> <p>Hospital for children was included as a route of access to the project in Bydgoszcz. The problems about incidental intoxications and poisonings were reported earlier (before the implementation of Fred) to our expert who cooperates with this hospital. So, naturally hospital was included in the project and referred children after hospitalization due to drug or alcohol poisoning.</p>
manner of (first) coming to notice	It is possible to also include youths that have come to notice several times on account of their drug use	Only youths noticed for the first time were referred to the course	
Substances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Illegal drugs except heroin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Illegal (excluding heroin) – Alcohol 	<p>Some young people were "caught red handed" due to alcohol use and referred to the program. However, very often, after the interview it turned out that this young person had also experiments with illegal drugs. So, in this kind of cases the direct cause of referral to "Fred goes net" was alcohol but illegal drugs were also present in the lives of those young people. Even if a person had no experiments with illegal drugs but only with the legal ones – there was no obstacles to include such a person in the programs if other conditions of the participation were fulfilled.</p>
classification of drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user were the majority of the participants. But in Bartoszyce about 20% of participants were classified as "abusing"	

2. Meeting the main aims

2.1. Was it possible to implement FreD goes net in the pilot regions?

yes no

Comments:

The idea of FreD goes net was very well received in both cities. The Police, Municipal Police, juvenile court, schools, local authorities and also children hospital (in Bydgoszcz) were very interested in cooperation within the project. In both cities also local media played an important role. Moreover, the need to provide a project based on an early intervention addressed to young people not addicted to psychoactive substances was really visible.

2.2. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to improving access to drug-consuming adolescents and young adults?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Now more young people find out about the possibilities of receiving help from the Police and the court. Schools have more alternatives, sometimes it is their only option for young people who uses psychoactive substances. Thanks to FreD also the Children Hospital in Bydgoszcz has the possibility to proceed with children using drugs/alcohol. In Bartoszyce, thanks to FreD also the awareness of risky behaviors of youths has risen in particular institutions.

2.3. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to developing or improving cooperative relationships between the chosen settings (police, schools etc) and drug counselling organisations/institutions (course sites)?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Thanks to FreD , in Bydgoszcz the cooperation between the our prevention expert and the involved institution was improved. Our expert noticed better flow of information, the meetings of involved "components" is something new. It is also significant for the involved institutions to feel being important. In Bartoszyce the cooperation between the our prevention expert and such institutions like the Police, court, schools, social service was always very good, also before the implementation of the FreD goes net pilot phase.

Country report Poland

2.4. *If cooperation as set out in 2.3 was successfully established/developed, will it be sustainable and continue beyond the pilot phase?*

yes no

Reasons for this:

See point 2.3.

2.5. *Were there any specific conditions/changes (political, economic) in your country during the first two years of FreD goes net that affected the implementation of the project?*

yes no

If yes, what were they?

Nothing changed in Bydgoszcz

In Bartoszyce there were personal changes in the County Police Department but it had no influence on the program.

II. RAR

In the first project year all partners used the method of RAR to carry out a stocktake of the current situation and current needs. This consisted of three elements:

- Background research,
- Interviews with key persons
- Identifying „good practice projects“.

Results were documented in country reports.

1. Did you identify good practice projects in your country that met the agreed criteria?

yes no

2. Looking at it retrospectively after concluding the pilot phase: Was the method of RAR useful in identifying suitable settings for your site(s)?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Such cooperation partners as the Police, municipal guard, local authorities, department of education, schools, hospital and juvenile court were identified during RAR research and engaged in the implementation of FreD goes net.

3. Judging by the results it achieved, and based on your professional perspective, was the time spent on the RAR exercise justified?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Writing RAR was very useful to arrange the subjects especially the issue on law and the issue of school regulations regarding pupils using psychoactive substances.

4. Would you recommend this method of stocktaking to other early intervention projects?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Establishing RAR was very useful and arranging the knowledge. It gave also the opportunity to gain knowledge about different sources of information.

III. Cooperation

1. Implementation of FreD goes net requires **viable cooperative relationships between the participating institutions. What methods of establishing/maintaining these have proven successful in your pilot region?** (e.g. informal verbal agreements, formal written agreements, regular meetings, agreements at certain levels of hierarchy) Please describe these.

Formal written agreements with all engaged in project entities were the most successful way to maintain cooperation. But additionally, our experts had quite good cooperation, or even relationship with most of the "components" so in some cases the agreements were only a formality.

2. **What difficulties were encountered in developing and maintaining cooperative relationships?**

Please describe these.

At the beginning of the project there were personal changes in the management of the Police in Bydgoszcz and due to this fact there were some temporal complications and obstructions in cooperation and referring individuals to the project. The insufficient flow of information, and the miscomprehension of the idea of FreD goes net (i.e. the ambiguity of the participants criteria) were the serious obstacles in cooperation with the Police. Fortunately a specified trainings for the Police changed this situation. In the other hand the image of a drug user in the Police is usually an injecting drug user.

In Bartoszyce, one of the school which whom the agreement had been signed did not cooperate because its regulations states that a pupil who is noticed due to psychoactive substance use is relegated from this school.

3. **Did you enter into any written cooperation agreements?**

yes no

If yes: How many such agreements did you have and with which cooperation partners?

– Site 1: (Bydgoszcz)

2 agreements were signed in Bydgoszcz: with the Police and with the Department of Education. The agreement with the Department of Education enabled the cooperation with all schools in Bydgoszcz.

Site 2: (Bartoszyce)

12 agreements were signed in Bartoszyce: with the Police, with the court and with 10 schools

4. Was there a local steering group for implementing the FreD approach?

yes no

If yes, please list the members and rate the work of the steering group in implementing FreD goes net for each of the pilot sites.

Members of the steering group in Bydgoszcz:

1. *Social Affair Advisor of the Mayor of the Bydgoszcz City*
2. *head of the prevention section in the Police Headquarters in Bydgoszcz,*
3. *aspirant of the prevention section in the Police Headquarters in Bydgoszcz,*
4. *the assistance of the Education Department of Bydgoszcz Municipal Office,*
5. *head of the Municipal Police in the division on Districts in Bydgoszcz,*
6. *psychologist, Regional Child Hospital in Bydgoszcz,*
7. *assistant to the Director of the Emergency Clinic of the University Hospital responsible for supervising the poisoning ward in Toruń, Collegium Medicum in Bydgoszcz,*

Members of the steering group in Bartoszyce:

1. *Sub-inspector on Prevention and Health in the City Office of Bartoszyce*
2. *Specialist on Discipline, Personal Resources and Social Communication in the County Police Department in Bartoszyce*
3. *Specialist on Minors in the County Police Department in Bartoszyce*
4. *professional curator in Provincial Court in Bartoszyce*
5. *Head of the Probation Officers in the Provincial Court in Bartoszyce*
6. *school educator in the Middle School Complex NO 2 in Bartoszyce*
7. *school educator in secondary school NO 1 in Górow Ilawiecki and the proxy of the mayor on prevention and alcohol problems dissolving of mayor in Górow Ilawiecki*

Members of the steering group was also manager of the project, secretary and prevention experts.

During the meeting the following issues were discussed:

1. *Referral rules for the programme, according to the Agreements signed.*
2. *Forms of signing up for the programme as well as contacting and exchanging information about the enrolments.*
3. *Forms of contact were agreed: by the telephone, individual meetings, committee sessions,*
4. *Forms of permanent contact were agreed in order to provide information whether the person referred signed up for the programme, takes part in it and completed it.*

5. Please list those institutions/organisations/services that really did refer young persons to the courses.

Police / judicial system

Which institutions and divisions exactly were these? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? Why was cooperation successful in these specific cases?

The Police:

Juvenile Crime Division, the prevention section in the Police Headquarters in Bydgoszcz and Bartoszyce.

Workers of the prevention section in the Police were the contact person.

Judicial system:

Family probation officer in Bartoszyce

Head of the Probation Officers Team in Bartoszyce

Probation officers were the contact persons.

School

What types of school? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? What characterises the schools that were willing to cooperate/where cooperation was successful?

High schools (for 16-19 years old pupils) and secondary schools (for 13-16 years old pupils).

All kind of schools were involved in FreD goes net: technical, trade, grammar, public, private and social schools.

Schools have more alternatives, sometimes it is their only option for young people who uses psychoactive substances.

School educator or form tutors were the contact persons.

Also the Department of Education in the Office in Bydgoszcz was involved.

Other settings, specifically:

What divisions/ contact persons (function/position)?

Why was cooperation successful in these cases?

6. Chapter 4.4 of the manual gives recommendations for successfully establishing structures of cooperation. Did you find these tips helpful?

yes no

Comments:

Prevention expert in Bydgoszcz did not used them.

Prevention expert in Bartoszyce did used them.

7. Do you have any further suggestions or comments on the topic of “cooperation”?

No

IV. Access

1. The role of the respective legal provisions in facilitating access to FreD courses:

The manual presents an overview of the legal provisions that currently apply in each country. After completing the pilot phase, would you say these facilitate or obstruct access to drug-using youngsters?

Police context / judiciary system:

Current provisions facilitate access obstruct access

reasons for this:

Current legal acts facilitate the access to the program. One of the regulation (nr 72) of the Act of 29 July 2005 on counteracting drug addiction says that the criminal proceedings against an addicted person or a person using psychoactive substances who has been charged with committing the offence subject to a custodial sentence of up to 5 years may be suspended at the stage of prosecutor proceedings if the person participates in a prevention or treatment programme in a relevant health care centre or another entity in the health care sector. After initiating the proceedings, the prosecutor may, taking into consideration the results of treatment, file the court with the request for the conditional discontinuance of the proceedings.

In the case of minors, issues related to using psychoactive substances (alcohol and drugs) and punishable activities related to drugs are regulated by the Act of 26 October 1982 on proceedings in the case of minors, which points to the family court as the institution responsible for ruling. The family court having established demoralization or committing by a minor (13-18) a punishable offence may oblige the person to specific behaviour, including participating in appropriate socializing, therapeutic or training activities.

School context:

Current provisions facilitate access obstruct access

reasons for this:

School's response to problems of using psychoactive substances (alcohol, drugs) or committing crimes by pupils is based on the current educational law, especially the bequests of the regulation of the Minister of Education of 31 January 2004 on detailed forms of educational and prevention activities among children and youth endangered by addiction. The interpretation of the law for undertaking intervention by school in aforementioned cases is "Procedures of teachers course of action and cooperation between schools and police in situations endangering children and youth with demoralization and crime" – a module programme of "the National Programme for Preventing Social Maladjustment and Crime among Children and Youth" implemented in schools in Poland since 2004. The procedures specify in a detailed way all the successive steps that should be taken by the school in such cases as: student being endangered by demoralization (e.g. using psychoactive substances or possession of drugs).

Other (please state which):

Current provisions facilitate access obstruct access

reasons for this:

Both regulations (described above in the section: Police context / judiciary system) provide an opportunity to help the drug user, especially when dealing with an insignificant amount of drugs. The penitentiary procedures can be abandoned and instead of it the accused can receive an offer – an adequate form of assistance like participation in a programme for people endangered by addiction and/or experimenting with psychoactive substances implemented at an out-patient clinic. This is the ideal place for FreD goes net.

The bequests of the regulation of the Minister of Education of 31 January 2004 on detailed forms of educational and prevention activities among children and youth endangered by addiction (described above in the section: School context) also provide “space” for FreD goes net.

2. **Were there any differences between these legal provisions (and any other rules and agreements) ‘on paper’ and their implementation ‘in real life’?**

yes no

If yes: What were the differences?

Above mentioned acts of law refers to the situation when the court or the prosecutor is engaged in the criminal case. The place for FreD goes net is earlier, before it comes to this situation but the vision of the whole criminal proceedings or possible punishment is a strong motivation for potential participants of FreD goes net to think about this program. There was an obstacle in one school in Bartoszyce which do not give a chance to pupils caught red handed on consuming psychoactive substances and relegates them from school. In such a situation there is no motivation for individuals to participate in FreD goes net.

3. **Which flyer did you use for ‘your’ young persons?** Please enclose 5 copies.

yes no

Basically used the available flyer (the template) or developed our own flyer

4. Did you change any of the main messages of the template?

yes no

5. Can the universal flyer for young persons (the emplate) be included as a recommendation in the handbook or does it need to be changed in any way?

The message is good, the graphic layout is "catchy" so the flyer for young persons could be included as an recommendation in the handbook. Of course it should be adopted to the particular country situation during the translation.

6. What are typical situations for youngsters to come to the notice of a particular setting and be referred to FreD?

Typical situation of coming to the notice...

of the police /
judiciary system

The most typical situation was when a youngster was noticed by a police patrol (or police with municipal police) during consumption or possession of illegal psychoactive substances or during consuming alcohol in the forbidden places. Often other acts of demoralization were present at this time; generally: public nuisance. Apprehended persons were taken to the police station and there a talk with the specialist for prevention and pathology of minors took place. The specialist was trained in FreD goes net and provided to minors the information (leaflet) about the program. Also adolescents (over 18 years old) noticed with small amount of illegal psychoactive substances were receiving this information thanks to article 72 of the act of law on counteracting drug addiction (see point IV.1. of the template).

Also probation officers and juvenile court played an important role in the access of youngsters to the program. It happened, that within legal proceedings it came out that an offender noticed due to destroying public properties were under influence of psychoactive substances. Probation officers referred some minors to the program after finding out that they use psychoactive substances.

of school

Pupils were referred to program by school educator or form tutors if it came out that a pupil uses psychoactive substances. It was revealed in the occasion of resolving educational problems with pupils. There were also some cases when a pupil at school was noticed under influence of alcohol or illegal psychoactive substances. Some time a pupil was "caught" on dealing or possessing drugs. There were also some cases when a pupil him/herself reported about his/her problems with substances.

Parents got the information about the project during the meetings with teachers at schools.

Country report Poland

- of another setting
(please state which):
- a) children hospital,
 - b) parents
- a) After a child lands in the hospital due to a poisoning it is the best moment to propose him or her and their parents participation in FreD goes net. In case of underage person the participation in the program requires the parents' permission.
- b) Also parents were bringing their children to the place where FreD goes net took place. The reason for this was positive drug test result (after providing a drug test to their children) or finding some "drug paraphernalia". They knew about the program from local media or at the school meetings with teachers.

7. **What benefits** can young persons draw from taking part in a course that could motivate them enough to contact the course leader?

gains or benefits obtained from participation

Police / judiciary
system

The Police

Enclosed the information or the certificate to the files;
Wrote a positive opinion for the court;

Court:

Discontinued or suspended the criminal proceedings.

Probation Officer

Wrote a positive opinion;
Suspended the punishment.

School

Schools

Gave a second chance to the pupil and did not relegate from school
Did not reported the problem to the Police if it was the first time.

Other setting
(please state which):

Parents:

Were revealed,
Begun to have bigger confidence to their children,
Started cooperation with therapist,
Changed the point of view.

8. FreD goes net works to the principle that “coming to notice on account of legal or illegal drug use is followed by intervention.” For your chosen settings, please describe a **typical chain of events/the individual steps from first being noticed all the way to completing the intervention** (bullet points; if needed refer to the chart “Alex is caught...” from the ppt of the kick-off workshop – see attachments of the e-mail that was used to send out this questionnaire).

1. *a young person is noticed*
2. *he/she learns about the possibility of participating in “FreD goes net” from the institution*
3. *he/she makes a phone call (special telephone number) and makes an appointment for a meeting*
4. *he/she comes to the center for an intake interview*
5. *if he/she is qualified he/she is invited for attending a course*
6. *he/she participates in the course*
7. *if he/she completes the course he/she receives the certificate*

9. **Were the parents involved in referring the youngsters to FreD?**

yes no

If yes:

- How and in what form were they involved?

The parents found out from media about “FreD goes net”. The part of participants were referred to the intake interview by their parents. The 14-15 years old children came with their parents. There was a conversation with parents about family situation, child's problems etc. In the case of the underage persons there is an obligation of having permission of their parents to participate in the course.

- Would you recommend parental involvement to new FreD sites?

yes no

Reasons for this:

Motivating of the children to participate in the course by parents.

10. **Do you have any other comments on the topic of access? What measures do you find helpful in facilitating access to the intake interview and/or course?**

No.

V. Implementing the intervention (Intake and courses)

1. After the intake interview, what were typical reasons for you to find that FreD was unsuitable for the adolescent/young adult in question?

The typical reasons were as follows:

- age (too young for the program)
- drug dependence

2. On average, how many weeks were there between the intake interview and the beginning of the course?

3-4 weeks

3. Up to this point, at which sites did you carry out how many courses with how many participants?

Name of site 1: Bartoszyce
7 courses with 61 participants

Name of site 2: Bydgoszcz
10 courses with 78 participants

4. How many sessions did you divide the course into?

2 sessions 3 sessions 4 sessions

5. Did some of the sessions also take place at weekends?

yes no

6. How satisfied are you generally with the exercises that currently make up the course?

Please rank on a scale from 1 to 4
(1 = very satisfied, 4 = not at all satisfied)

1 and 1-2

7. **Please name (up to 3) exercises that have proven particularly effective:** The following should definitely remain in the manual (please give the exercise name and number):

Scaling, 1

The game: experimenting, harmful use and dependence

Quiz – Joint watches

Legal aspects

8. **Were there any exercises in the course that proved ineffective or too difficult to implement?**

yes no

If yes: please list a maximum of three together with the respective name and number.

In Bydgoszcz:

- 1. The letter about the future – it is difficult to do it at the end of the course because participants are tired. Only in 1 group in 10 it was done successfully.*
- 2. the game „Pick-up sticks ballet“– can be performed only in the bigger groups*

In Bartoszyce:

- 1. the test – more time was needed for the participants*
- 2. the chart – the majority of the participants did not want to discuss
The situation was depending on the group. For one group one exercise was easy to do, for the other one – not so easy.*

9. **Are there any other exercises you would like to be included in the manual?**

yes no

If yes: please write them out separately in the format of the manual and attach to this report.

10. **Was / is implementing the FreD courses something that enriches your work?**

Did you gain any particular insights? Did something unexpected happen?

Yes,

FreD goes net is the new challenge, new method of working. It facilitated cooperation with different institutions.

11. What are your experiences with respect to group composition?

(gender, age, different substances consumed, different patterns of consumption etc)

The composition of groups were as follow:

Age:

In Bydgoszcz:

Age of the participants

13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Course participants	2	3	15	15	25	16	2	1	1	0	1
---------------------	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---

The vast majority of the participants were between 15 and 18 years old (88% of all).

In Bartoszyce:

The vast majority of participants were 16-18 years old: 86,9 %

The youngest participant in both cities was 13 year old; the oldest: 23

Substances:

In Bydgoszcz:

37 % of participants were noticed due to alcohol

63 % of participants were noticed due to other illegal psychoactive substances (87% – cannabis, 10% – amphetamine, 3% - other ("smart drugs, codeine))

In Bartoszyce:

47.5% of participants were noticed due to alcohol

52.5% of participants were noticed due to other illegal psychoactive substances (78.1% – cannabis, 18.79% – amphetamine, 3.1% - other)

The composition of the group.

The main criteria of the participation:

- The term of the referral. The most important thing was to have short time between the referral and the beginning of the group.*
- Expert tried also to have co-educative groups.*

There was no big difference in the age of the participants

The kind of used substance was not the criterion of the group composition.

12. Do you have any further comments/ideas/recommendations on the topic of course implementation?

no

VI. Summary

1. Do you find the overall concept and approach of FreD goes net convincing?

Please rate on a scale from 1 (yes, very) to 4 (no, not at all)

1

Reason:

“FreD goes net” is a suitable offer for young people. It talks their language, it is attractive, it is not mentorial or domineering.

2. If you had several pilot sites: Were your experiences at each site fundamentally different? (e.g. with respect to cooperation, access or course implementation)

Skip this question if there was only one pilot site.

yes no

3. Please summarise the aspects you consider central for each of the thematic blocks.

aspects that obstruct...

... cooperation	Personal changes on the positions in the institutions
... access	No comments
... course implementation	There were some cases of situations when: A participant discontinue the course because of illness. Another one discontinue the course because he had to leave the city One participant was placed in a educational / upbringing center. Also earlier instigation of criminal proceedings was a serious obstruction. In above mentioned cases participants had no motivation to complete the course and they even had negative influence on the whole group.

aspects that facilitate...

... cooperation	Good communication and good relations. In some cases even personal relationship.
... access	Good and correct selection of the stuff in the institutions involved in FreD goes net, engagement of the staff
... course implementation	Educational materials / teaching aids, scripts