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It is a great pleasure for me to welcome this report concerned with offending by young people in different European countries and with how it can be prevented most effectively. The key conclusions are that young offenders should be diverted as much as possible away from the formal justice system and that it is important to intervene as early as possible with young offenders and with young people who are at risk of offending, in order to reduce later crime. This report contains many examples of good practice in different European countries that should be implemented more widely, such as the Halt programme in the Netherlands. I encourage policymakers and practitioners in different countries to read these examples (and the very informative Compendium of Best Practices) very carefully and to seek to implement the most appropriate of them in their own countries.

It is important that interventions to prevent offending should be based on the best possible evidence. For example, Mark Lipsey (2009) reviewed nearly 600 of the most rigorous evaluations of interventions with juvenile offenders and concluded that surveillance (e.g. intensive probation), deterrence (e.g. the “Scared Straight” programme in prisons) and disciplinary programmes (e.g. boot camps) were ineffective or even harmful in increasing later offending. There is a great deal of research showing that young offenders get worse rather than better after being processed in court (see e.g. Farrington & Murray, 2014; Petrosino et al., 2014). Therefore, diversion of young offenders is essential.

Lipsey (2009) found many examples of effective interventions with young offenders, including cognitive-behavioural treatment, social skills training, mentoring, tutoring and restorative (mediation and restitution) programmes. These interventions should clearly be implemented in preference to court processing. However, most of the evaluations reviewed by Lipsey were carried out in North America. The present report is excellent in reviewing many innovative interventions in different European countries, but relatively few of them seem to have been rigorously evaluated.
It is important to conduct high quality experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of programmes in Europe to establish what works or does not work. For example, Jessica Asscher and her colleagues (2013) conducted a randomized trial of multisystemic therapy in the Netherlands and found that it was effective in reducing property offences but not violence. It is also important to establish the extent to which results can be replicated in different countries. For example, Frances Gardner and her colleagues (2015) reviewed randomized trials of parenting interventions and concluded that they were just as effective in European countries as in the United States. These are very encouraging findings. Ideally, all evaluations of programmes should include a cost-benefit analysis (see e.g. Farrington & Koegl, 2015).

More information about effective programmes can be found in the three books that I edited with Rolf Loeber, on Child Delinquents (Loeber & Farrington, 2001), Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders (Loeber & Farrington, 1998) and From Juvenile Delinquency to Adult Crime (Loeber & Farrington, 2012). In the third of these books, we argued that there should be special treatment for young adult offenders, since nowadays in many respects adolescence extends into the mid-twenties (see Farrington et al., 2012). I think it would be highly desirable to extend the upper age for special treatment and interventions for young offenders into the young adult years (even up to age 25).

There is a huge amount of very useful information in this report about youth justice and early prevention in different European countries. I learned a great deal from it! This report should be mandatory reading for all researchers, policy-makers and practitioners who wish to contribute to the reduction of youthful offending.

David P. Farrington
Emeritus Professor of Psychological Criminology
Cambridge University, England
INTRODUCTION

The main objective of this report is to pool together European wide experiences of juvenile crime prevention, particularly in relation early prevention strategies. In this context, “early prevention” refers to a series of actions which aim to create an environment that deters children from persistent disruptive behaviour and early-onset delinquency.

What is early intervention?

This means intervening as soon as possible to tackle problems emerging for children, young people and their families or working with the population most at risk of developing problems. Effective early intervention may occur at any point in a child or young person’s life and can be delivered through both universal and targeted services. This can entail providing services to all children and families (i.e. universally), or targeted support offered to those more likely to suffer poor outcomes at any stage of childhood or adolescence.

Early prevention was recognised as a crucial and “essential part of crime prevention in society” by the United Nations in their 1990 Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, also known as the Riyadh Guidelines (‘the Guidelines’), thus highlighting the key role of early prevention in deterring children from crime. The Guidelines stress the importance of all facets of society working together to help young people to develop ‘non-criminogenic attitudes’ and successfully preventing juvenile delinquency. This requires the implementation of “lawful, socially useful activities”, which ensure the harmonious development of adolescents while respecting and promoting their personality from early childhood. Further, the Guidelines encourage a child-centred approach along with “progressive delinquency prevention policies” that avoid criminalising and penalising a child for behaviour that does not actually cause serious harm.

---

3 The Riyadh Guidelines, Annex (Fundamental Principles).
Similarly, the “Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators” (published by United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in 2008) advocates for the creation of an environment that enables children to achieve “meaningful life in the community”, and fosters a process of personal development and education that is as free from crime and delinquency as possible.⁴

**Methodology**

This report sets out and compares the various systems and strategies that exist in respect of children who have entered, or are at risk of entering, the criminal justice system. This is achieved through the analysis of reports from Latvia, Netherlands, Scotland, Lithuania, Estonia, England and Wales, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Sweden; all of which have been prepared by domestic experts in youth justice. Each national report has been considered and, in so far as possible, compared with European counterparts.⁵ Obviously direct comparison in many cases is simply not possible (because of the nuanced systems that are in place in each country), however, there are a number of trends and themes that can and have been identified, such as an overall decline in young people entering the youth justice system; a prevalence of young men committing crimes; an appetite for recent legislative reforms; and the development of innovative diversion and early prevention strategies.

The first chapter of this report provides an overview of the youth crime landscape, with a focus on terminology, trends, along with issues around gender and ethnicity. The second chapter is based around youth justice systems; comparing the key principles, bodies with responsibly for juvenile crime prevention, recent reforms, and methods that are employed to divert young people away from the criminal justice system. The third and fourth chapters examine the youth care, health and education systems in the context of juvenile crime prevention. The fifth and final chapter undertakes a detailed analysis of promising practices in early prevention, teasing out key trends. This is followed by a compendium of best practices and a number of overall recommendations.

---

⁵ References to the original source material can be found in the national reports themselves, which are footnoted where appropriate in this report.
CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW

Introduction

There are obviously clear benefits to developing effective, long term approaches to youth crime prevention; for the individuals themselves, their families, wider communities, and countries as a whole. Commentators note that there are a multitude of ways in which this can be achieved, most notably through developmental, community, situational and criminal justice prevention. Criminal justice prevention refers to traditional deterrent and rehabilitative strategies operated by law enforcement; community prevention refers to interventions designed to change the social conditions and institutions that influence offending (e.g. families, peers, and organisations). Situational prevention refers to interventions which are focusing on reducing opportunities to commit crime and increasing the risk and difficulty of offending. Lastly, developmental prevention refers to interventions designed to prevent the development of criminal potential in individuals, especially those targeting risk and protective factors discovered in studies of human development.6

Encouragingly, as discussed below, there appears to be an overall downward trend in the number of young people entering the criminal justice system. However, such positive results ought not to be taken for granted. Indeed there is evidence that, at one time or another, more than half of young people become caught up in criminal behavior of some sort. Research based on self-reporting in the Netherlands, for example, reveals that between 55 - 65% of all young people between the ages of 12 and 18 years will commit a criminal offence. In Sweden, approximately five out of ten youths admit to having stolen something, purchased something stolen or done something theft related in the past year. Whilst the recorded figures are often much less, for example in Estonia only 1.5% of children were referred to juvenile committees in 20127, it is worth noting such statistics may only reflect the criminal offences which have been reported to the police (for which the offender is known to be a youth), self-reporting, and court data.

---

Terminology and age of youths

In any discussion of early intervention it is important to note from the outset that the age used to determine what constitutes a ‘young offender’ (and indeed the terminology itself) may vary from country to country, even within the close confines of Europe. In this regard, it is worth observing that.

- The Convention on the Rights of the Child defines a child as a person under the age of 18 years old.\(^9\)

- Sweden has no equivalent concept of ‘juvenile delinquency’; instead they speak of ‘juvenile criminality’. According to Swedish law, no legal sanctions can be imposed for acts committed by persons under age 15. Between 15 and 17, a young person may not, except under special circumstances, be sentenced to prison but must be referred to the institutional care facilities of the social welfare authorities. Youths aged 15 or older are tried in the adult criminal justice system, although age is an important mitigating factor in sentencing.\(^10\)

- In Estonia, the age of criminal responsibility is 14 years old and the age of full criminal responsibility\(^11\) (meaning that the special provisions no longer apply) is 18. Compared to its neighbouring countries, Estonia applies somewhat lower and more rigorous age limits. For example, the age of criminal responsibility is 14 in Latvia and 15 in Finland, Norway and Sweden (as noted above).

- In Lithuania, a child is a person under 18 years old and a person can generally be prosecuted from the age of 16, and from 14 years old in the case of serious criminal offences.

---

8 In this report, unless otherwise stated, the terms ‘youth,’ ‘child’, ‘young person’, ‘minor and ‘juvenile’ are used interchangeably.
11 This means that children cannot be prosecuted for misdemeanors or criminal offences if they were less than 14 years old at the time of committing the offence. If the offence was committed at age 14 or over, the child can be prosecuted and serve a sentence, although there are still various mitigating provisions in the law (see Estonia report at page 8).
• Similarly, the age of criminal responsibility in Austria is 14 years old. Youths between 14 and 16 who commit ‘petty offences’ (i.e subject to three years imprisonment or less) are generally not liable to punishment.

• In Latvia, for the purpose of the Protection of the Rights of the Child Law, a child is a person who has not attained 18 years of age, excepting those who have been declared to be of legal age in accordance with the law or have entered into marriage. Within the framework of the Youth Law, it has been stipulated that a young person is a person from 13 to 25 years of age.  

• In the Netherlands, the juvenile criminal law applies to young people between the ages of 12 and up to 18 years old. However, in certain circumstances, the juvenile law can be applied to a young person aged 18-21 if the court deems it appropriate. Equally, 16-17 year olds may be subject to the adult law (albeit only upon consultation with child protection services).

• While the age of criminal responsibility in Belgium is set at the higher age of 18 (or 16 for certain serious crimes), younger children can be dealt with through the criminal system and deprived of their liberty, even though they are not technically given a criminal sanction.

---

13 Netherlands report at p.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Minimum age of criminal responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>18 (16 for serious offences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>13 (but educational measures can be imposed from the age of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>13 (but educational measures can be imposed from the age of 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16 (14 in Catalonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Ages of criminal responsibility**

---

Recent Trends

It is encouraging to see that more or less across the board there has been a steady decline in the number of young people coming into contact with the criminal justice system. The following statistics exemplify this downward trend:

• In Austria, following an increase in police reports of juvenile delinquency between 2002 and 2008, there has been a continual reduction over recent years. Interestingly, the number of convictions has remained broadly the same, which suggests that the willingness of the public to file a report is the main variable to have changed (although there was a 6.7% reduction between 2011 and 2012). By way of example there were 26,549 juveniles subject to prosecution in 2012.\textsuperscript{16}

• In the Netherlands, a recent study found that the number of juvenile delinquents had decreased since 2007,\textsuperscript{17} a decline which was especially noticeable in relation to offences of theft and handling stolen goods.\textsuperscript{18} Notably, 2010 is identified as a key tipping point and the first time in many years that the proportion of arrested suspects and prosecuted offenders among young adults decreased. Indeed in 2011 a total of 54,000 young people below the age of 18 were suspected of having committed a crime, which represents a decrease of roughly 33% when compared to 2008 figures (albeit this differs from self-reporting figures, as noted above).

• In Italy too there has been a significant decrease in the number of children entering the justice system, particularly the number of young people subject to detention. In 2013, for example, from about 16,000 reports of offences per day only around 400 children entered a juvenile facility.\textsuperscript{19}

• In England and Wales, this decline is exemplified by the fact that in 2013/14 there were 22,393 first time entrants, down 20% on the previous year, and 75% lower than in 2003/4.\textsuperscript{20} Further,

\textsuperscript{16} Austria Report at p13.
\textsuperscript{17} Netherlands Report at p11.
\textsuperscript{18} Albeit this is based on limited data sources.
\textsuperscript{19} Italy Report at p4.
the average number of young people in custody in 2013/14 was 1,216, a 21% reduction on the previous year and 56% less than the average in 2003/4.  

**England and Wales: Trends in first time entrants 2003/04 to 2013/14**  

- In Scotland there has also been a recent decline – with the number of young people sentenced at court falling 8% to 556 between 2011 and 2012.  

- In Estonia, the number of criminal offences committed by children has decreased by around a third compared to 2008. At the end of 2012, there were 36 children imprisoned in Estonia; 16 of whom had been convicted and 20 of which were in pre-trial custody. In addition, the number of children in reform schools and in penal institutions has decreased: there were 143 students in reform schools in 2005, compared to only 67 in 2012 (a 53% decrease). 

- In Belgium, data on juvenile delinquency is sparse, having not really been recorded for the past 25 years. Where statistics do exist, these appear to be consistent with the general

---

21 Youth Justice Statistics 2013/14 Executive Summary at p.4.  
22 Youth Justice Statistics 2013/14, Youth Justice Board Executive Summary, 29 January 2015 at p.3  
24 Estonia report at p.10.  
25 Unless otherwise stated, the references in this report are to French speaking Belgium.
downward trend; showing 63,000 cases reported to the state prosecutor’s officers in 1987, down to less than 60,000 in 2008.\textsuperscript{26}

- Lastly, it would appear that Lithuania somewhat bucks this downward trend, as in 2001 there were twice as many juvenile delinquent crimes than in 1990.\textsuperscript{27} In 2013 in there were 2451 minors suspected of committing criminal activities were registered; 2222 – for crimes, and 229 – for penal violations.\textsuperscript{28}

Clearly, a multitude of factors are at play here; varying by degree from country to country. In England and Wales, for example, it has been argued that this shift is due to combination of reasons, most notably a reduction in offending by young people, a renewed government commitment to diversion strategies, and changes in police targets. In particular, there is a growing body of evidence that “diverting children from formal criminal justice processes is ‘a protective factor against serious and prolonged reoffending’.”\textsuperscript{29}

This decline may also simply be attributable to the prioritisation of juvenile crime reduction (the Netherlands for example set a goal of a 25% crime reduction between 2002 and 2010; meaning a 10% for youth crime).\textsuperscript{30} In some places this fall in young offenders can be explained, at least in part, by an aging population. For example, the Scottish population has been steadily getting older (the median age is now 41.3 years old) and in mid-2012 only 17% of the population was aged under 16.\textsuperscript{31} Likewise, in Estonia, the reduction has apparently largely been influenced by demographic factors (i.e decline in the number of children), as the rate of imprisonment per 10,000 children has remained more or less the same.\textsuperscript{32}

However, some less encouraging statistics also emerge. For instance In England and Wales, notwithstanding this positive decline, the number of convictions and rate of reoffending appears to be on the rise. This ‘thicker soup’, as it has been described, means that “there is now a greater concentration of children in the system with higher level offending behavior.” Indeed, of the

\textsuperscript{26} Belgium Report at p4.  
\textsuperscript{27} Lithuania report at p.1 (albeit more recent statistics may show a decrease in certain respects)  
\textsuperscript{28} Lithuania Report at p1.  
\textsuperscript{29} Justice Committee’s report on ‘Youth Justice, Seventh Report of Session 2012-13’, published 14 March 2013 (hereafter referred to as the “Justice Committee Report 2013”).  
\textsuperscript{30} Netherlands Report at p4.  
\textsuperscript{31} Scotland Report at p1.  
\textsuperscript{32} Estonia Report at p8.
nearly 4,000 custodial sentences given to young people in 2011/12, 74% reoffended within one year. Similar trends are identified elsewhere. In Sweden, for example, it is observed that crimes are unevenly distributed and a small selection of youths is responsible for a significant part of the total amount of crimes committed by young people.

**Crime Types**

The type of crime commonly committed by young people appears to be markedly similar from country to country. Overall, the national reports show that property related crimes (i.e. theft, vandalism, burglary etc) are far and away the most frequent sort of offences (particularly in Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, England and Wales, Belgium, and Estonia). In Italy, for example, out of 284 young people coming into contact with the criminal justice system there were 182 property related offences, followed by 45 related to drugs, and 31 offences against the person. In Belgium, among the 55,000 offences recorded on average for a year, 45% involved robbery and extortion, 20% assault and battery, and around 10% concerned drugs, public safety crimes, and miscellaneous offences.

![Offences committed by juveniles in Austria 2012](image)

### Offences committed by juveniles in Austria 2012

33 Justice Committee Report 2013 at p187
34 CPAs are the first contact between arrested children and the justice system. They receive juveniles under arrest until the validation hearing. IPMs are instead the detention facilities for juveniles who committed an offence before 14 years, until 21 years old.
36 Belgium Report at p4.
37 Austria Report at p7.
After property crime, there is a prevalence of drugs offences and offences against the person, with certain countries noting a rise in the number of young people involved in violent crime (particularly when compared with other types of offending). For instance, between 1997 and 2007 the Netherlands saw a significant surge in violent offending, which some attribute to reduced levels of social control on the streets and selective law enforcement aimed at young people and risk areas. Conversely, in Estonia, there has been a decrease in violent offending behavior - in eight years, the proportion of children having participated in fights has dropped from 7% to 4% and that of children carrying a ‘cut-and-thrust weapon’ has also decreased. While 10% of children in 2006 responded that they carry a weapon-like item (a knife, a chain, a baseball bat, etc.), that proportion has dropped to 6% in 2014. Instead it is property offences, such as shoplifting, which have shown an increase in recent years. Compared to 2006 when less than 2% of children stole something from a shop, this rate has increased to 3.4% in 2014.

In Sweden such changes have not been so notable - in the latter half of the 1990s, the proportion of youths who stated that they had committed theft and vandalism lessened, whilst those levels have been more stable in the 2000s. The trend has also apparently been stable during recent years regarding the proportion of youths who committed acts of violence.

Crime types of course often vary within countries, from region to region. In Northern Italy, for example, offences against property show the highest rates with an over-representation of migrant children within the justice system. In the Centre, offences are of the same type but Roma children are rather over-represented. In Southern Italy, offences against property remains the highest portion but with a higher presence of offences related to drugs and against persons as well, which is explicable by juvenile recruitment from organized crime; in the Southern macro-area, juveniles involved are mainly of Italian origin. Nevertheless, offences related to organized crime started to spread also beyond Southern Italy, with a higher presence of Camorra (originally from Campania) and ‘Ndrangheta (originally from Calabria) families and business in Northern and Central Italy.

**Gender Differences**

It is clear that males make up a far higher proportion of young offenders than girls (Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, England & Wales). In the Netherlands, for instance, the number of young men apprehended by the police roughly outnumbers young women five to six times,
although the proportion of girls registered by the police as having been arrested has been on the increase. Indeed, in the Netherlands at least, there is a strong indication that the number of girls involved in the criminal justice system is bucking the general downward trend and is in fact increasing. Whilst in countries such as Austria the percentage of girls convicted is in general lower, ranging at 13% on average.

In The Netherlands, between 2003 and 2008, the proportion of young female suspects was highest among young women of Antillian descent, followed by Moroccan and Surinamese women. The proportion of female suspects was smallest among native Dutch women and young Turkish women. While crime rates have appeared to decrease among all groups of young people toward the end of the 2003-2008 period, the number of female suspects of Moroccan and Turkish descent has continued to increase.

There are also noticeable trends in relation to the distribution of offence types amongst men and women. In Sweden, Estonia and Italy, it is specifically noted that young males are more likely to commit serious theft and violent crimes than young women. However, shoplifting, trying drugs and having drunk alcohol to the point of intoxication are examples of behaviour that are more evenly distributed between the sexes. In Austria, the data shows that 8.2% of convicted young females related to offence against life and/or physical integrity and 34.5% crimes against the course of justice.

Ethnicity

Another obvious trend is the higher proportion of non-native offenders involved in national criminal justice systems. In certain counties, such as the Netherlands, youths of non-native descent (particularly Moroccans) are the exceptions to the rule that young people are becoming less involved in the criminal justice system (as outlined below).

---

42 Austria Report at p7.
Similarly in Estonia, statistics show that Russian children commit offences more frequently than Estonian children. There are also differences in almost all offence types studied, except sales and handling of narcotics where there are no statistically significant differences between Russian and Estonian juveniles. However, the other side of this coin is that Russian children are victimised more frequently than Estonian children; Russian children are victimised two times more often by cyber-bullying and three times more often by an assault and the police receive reports of Russian children being victimised more frequently than reports of Estonian children being victimized in almost all offences (except robbery incidents).

Racial disparities have also been noted in England and Wales, where critics maintain that young black people are more likely to receive additional days in custody following breaches of prison rules than their white counterparts. Conversely however, in Scotland, pupils identified as ‘white British/Scottish’ are more likely to be excluded from school and have lower educational outcomes than those from minority ethnic backgrounds (apart from children from traveler families, who have declining educational outcomes and high rates of exclusion). On the one hand, it is noted that conveys a positive message that children from minority ethnic backgrounds are not doomed to failure within the Scottish education system, but, on the other hand, it again points to the problems faced by Scottish working class young people living in post-industrial areas.

---

43 Netherlands report at p12.
44 England and Wales Report at p3.
CHAPTER 2: YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEMS

Key Principles and Laws
Most of the countries studied have enacted juvenile-specific legislation to provide additional protection for young people. In general, the approach taken is in line with the basic tenets of the United Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC); namely acting in the best interests of the child, using detention as a means of last resort, and having appropriate safeguards in place to protect young people. It is also apparent that countries tend to place the reduction of reoffending at the heart of the youth justice system. This of course means developing effective strategies and measures for diversion, reintegration, and rehabilitation.

Such a philosophy is clear in Austria, for example, where the Juvenile Court Act (JGG) of 1988 establishes that the primary concern of the juvenile justice system is the education and discipline of youths. Likewise the Netherlands shares the same core goal, with juvenile sentencing being largely pedagogic or corrective in action. Italy also take a “child centered” approach (as set out in their DPR 448/1998), aiming to impose ‘minimum harm’ on youths and limit the use of detention.

Similarly, current policy trends in Scotland include emphasising early intervention rather than provision at the point of crisis; investing in early years' services; integrated working across services for children; and holding services accountable by outcomes, rather than focusing on processes. In Scotland, the primary legislation affecting children who offend is the Children’s Hearing (Scotland) Act 2011 (which was only recently implemented in 2013). The legislation aims to strengthen, modernise and streamline the children’s hearing system, ensure improved support for vulnerable children and young people and deliver consistent national practice. The system takes a holistic approach to children whether they are in need of care and protection or have committed offences.
Key guiding principles of the Italian Juvenile Justice system:

- **Minimum harmfulness of the proceeding** (‘minima offensività del processo’): the main objective of juvenile justice operators is to avoid marginalisation and social exclusion for children and to use diversion and alternative measures as much as possible.
- **Residual use of detention** (‘residualitàdelladetenzione’): detention has to be the option of last resort (extrema ratio).
- **Penal responsibility** (‘imputabilità’): article 97 of the Italian Penal Code states that a child below 14 never has penal responsibility; article 98 states that for children among 14 and 17, the “ability to understand and take action” (capacità di intendere e di volere) always has to be ascertained.
- **Suitability principle** (‘adeguatezza’): the proceeding must be tailored towards each child and his/her educational needs.
- **De-stigmatisation** (‘destigmatizzazione’): the Italian law guarantees privacy, protection and anonymity of the child, to avoid further marginalization.

In England and Wales, the principles underpinning the youth justice system are also firmly enshrined in statute. As far back as the Children and Young Persons Act 1933, the welfare of the child was placed front and centre. In more recent years, like so many of its European counterparts, England and Wales have identified the prevention of offending as the core goal of the youth justice system; first through section 71(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and then s142A of the Criminal Justice Act 2002 (the CJA) which list the factors that courts must take into account when sentencing young offenders; namely, punishment, reform and rehabilitation, the protection of the public, and reparation. This section also emphasises that courts must have regard to the principle aim of the youth justice system, which is to prevent offending (or reoffending).

Likewise, in Latvia, *The Protection of the Rights of the Child Law*\(^\text{45}\) regulates the framework of the children’s rights and freedoms, as well as their protection. The law also specifies the rights, duties

---

and liability of parents and others, including state and local municipalities (governments), towards the provision of the rights of the child. Further, the Youth Law aims to improve the quality of life for young people and stipulates the concept of youth policy, its principles and objectives, as well as the competence of state administrative institutions in the field of youth policy.

Some countries, however, have been rather slower to move towards this more holistic approach to young people. In Belgium, for example, critics condemn the country’s historically more punitive outlook towards youth justice, albeit a number of changes have taken place over the years. A number of important factors have influenced the evolution of the system to bring it into its current form (ultimately leading to a new reform law on child protection in 2006). Notably, a 1991 report from the National Commission set out a number of criminal measures for young people, which would later be written into the 2006 law, which outlined a number of core principles such as the diversity of measures, proportionally, and legal guarantees of the juveniles’ rights. Two further laws in May and June 2006 set out additional principles; namely the will to maintain the educative spirit proper to the protectional model, but also to leave space for more restoratives measures.46

**Bodies and Institutions**

Article 1.3 of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice ("The Beijing Rules"), encourages countries to pay sufficient attention to positive measures that involve “the full mobilization of all possible resources, including the family, volunteers and other community groups, as well as schools and other community institutions, for the purpose of promoting the well-being of the juvenile, with a view to reducing the need for intervention under the law, and of effectively, fairly and humanely dealing with the juvenile in conflict with the law.”47

Indeed commentators have noted that crime prevention and its control can be successful if all social subjects – legal institutions, public administrative institutions, municipality institutions, businesses, public organizations, and private people – actively participate in it.48 However, there is a great detail of variance between countries in the degree of linkages between bodies/persons dealing with youth crime and providing other youth services (such as care, social work etc). This is not only apparent from country to country, but internally too, from region to region. Whilst most juvenile courts do bring in personnel from other services to help deal with the young people

46 Belgium report at p.5.
47 Beijing Rules, Fundamental Principles 1.3 (http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/40/a40r033.htm)
48 Lithuania report at p.22.
before them, it is apparent that this can be better formalised and lessons can possibly be learnt from countries such as Italy, Austria, and Sweden which evidence a far more joined-up service.

As noted, some countries appear to make more effort than others to fully integrate the skills and experience of youth justice practitioners. For example, in Austria, judges and prosecutors are required by law to have special skills in pedagogy, psychology and social work. Furthermore, the Guardianship (family) Court must be informed of any criminal proceedings relating to juveniles appearing before it, as does the child welfare authority. Likewise in Italy local services cooperate with regional authorities and private entities, such as community centers, with the department of justice also having a managerial role. The Italian juvenile court consists of two magistrates and two professional experts in disciplines including social work, psychology, or criminology. A comparable arrangement operates in Scotland, (albeit to a lesser extent), where the children’s hearing system deals with the majority of child offenders under the age of 16, rather than the criminal courts. This is an informal tribunal involving three lay panel members (trained volunteers, one acting as the chairperson) and an officiating Children’s Reporter (usually from a social work or legal background).

Similar cross-over also takes place in Belgium, where the juvenile court can not only hear juvenile criminal cases but also deals with cases involving minors considered in danger due to deficiencies in their family environment. In the Netherlands, whilst there is perhaps not this level of integration, there is a significant degree of collaboration between bodies involved in the youth justice system: Young Offender Institutions, the Child Protection Board, Youth Probation, and municipalities all work together in process-related collaborative networks.
Furthermore, the example of Sweden is particularly notable, where responsibility for youth crime is essentially shared by social services and the judicial system. The extent to which responsibility is split depends on the age of the offender; social authorities rather than police deal with youths under the age of 15 and the judicial authorities deal with those aged 15 – 17 (and in certain cases up to 20 years old). In addition, special units have been established to deal exclusively in crimes committed by juveniles.

In the Netherlands services also appear to somewhat more segregated. The Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport is responsible for overall youth policy and most specialised services for families and children; the Ministry of Security and Justice is responsible for juvenile justice policy and related institutions,\(^\text{49}\) and the Ministry for Security and Justice is responsible for the Child Care and Protection Board. The 15 provincial authorities/large urban areas and 408 local authorities also have responsibilities regarding youth policy and related services and carry out their tasks with a great degree of autonomy. However, the greater the division between such different youth services, the greater the negative impact appears to be on young people. For example, in England and Wales, the split of systems dealing with children in need of care and those charged with criminal offence in the early 90s was apparently followed by a sharp rise in the number of youths entering the criminal justice system and particularly those placed in custody. This led to criticism.

\(^{49}\text{http://www.youthpolicy.nl/yp/Youth-Policy/Youth-Policy-subjects/Child-protection-and-welfare/Juvenile-justice-policy}\\)
from the Audit Commission\textsuperscript{50} and a fundamental rethink of the structures and frameworks in place to deal with youth offending. Soon after, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 established a national Youth Justice Board and regional Youth Offending Teams, which have been instrumental in coordinating the provision of services to at risk youths. The CDA 1998 placed a duty on every local authority to establish and fund a multi-agency YOT in their area, made up of representative from social services, health, education and the police. The Government’s \textit{Ending Gang and Youth Violence} programme is a good example of the way that joined up services are working together. It is designed to support local areas to respond in the most effective way to their particular challenges, looking beyond enforcement to early intervention, prevention and routes out of violent lifestyles. This support is offered through a network of over 80 people from a range of professional backgrounds, including health, education and the voluntary and community sector. All these people have practical experience of dealing with gangs and youth violence.\textsuperscript{51}

However, in places such as Belgium, the institutional architecture and language differences can complicate this sort of collaboration. Here the support system for at risk youths is split between Federal institutions (Ministry of Justice) and Federated institutions (Flemish, French, German speaking region and the Bruxelles Capitale Region). In Belgium, the Juvenile Court is the central organ, together with the Juvenile Court Judge, and is competent for any minor suspected of a crime or considered as in danger due to problems with their family environment. As with most other counties, these bodies have a large spectrum of measures to choose from, including protective (educative guidance, health care etc.), punitive, or restorative (community work, mediation procedures).\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{Lithuania: Table of Government and self-government institutions responsible for the implementation of Prevention Program for Juvenile Delinquents.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE INSTITUTIONS:</th>
<th>MAIN FUNCTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>General coordination of the program; initiation of local programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{50} Misspent Youth: Young People and Crime
\textsuperscript{51} Government Response 2014 at p.11.
\textsuperscript{52} Belgium report at p.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children Rights</th>
<th>of Protection of the Rights of the Child, recording specific cases on child rights violations, and informing institutions and public bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Healthy lifestyle education, providing health care for children in temporary care programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td>Early prevention of delinquents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Providing expertise on child rights protection legal documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Regional municipal subdivisions</td>
<td>Coordination and initiation of regional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>Coordination and initiation of local programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rights and Recent Reforms**

On the whole, it appears that the safeguards established by the UNCRC are being put in place across Europe. The Penal Code (StPO) in Austria, for example, which is used for both juveniles and adults, contains specific protections for young people such as the requirement to be accompanied by an appropriate adult and have their parents informed etc. Similarly, in the Netherlands, parents/guardians must attend the trial of juveniles. In Lithuania, children who have not reached criminal liability age, under the Law on Fundamentals of Protection of the Rights of the Child of the Republic of Lithuania, are treated in accordance with the best interests principle.

Recent years have also seen significant changes to laws and policies affecting young people. In Lithuania, for example, there have been a number of programs of reforms since it gained independence from the USSR in 1991. In 1996, juvenile justice reform aimed to create preventive-social intervention measures for juvenile delinquents. Following this, 1999 marked the beginning of the Juvenile Justice Program for 1999–2002, which placed as its main goal a reduction in youth reoffending. In 2004, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania ratified the second Juvenile Justice Program for 2004–2008, aimed at the re-socialization of juveniles who violated the law and thus, reducing the rate of juvenile crime, as well the creation of a network of the institutions that work in juvenile justice system. Both programs appear to have led to a significant progress in juvenile justice system – not least in becoming more focused on the juvenile and their educational needs.\(^{53}\) Likewise, in Latvia, the Youth Law sets

\(^{53}\) Lithuania report at p.2.
several objectives for primary prevention at a local level. This establishes the Youth Advisory Council which promotes the development and implementation of the municipal work with youth, as well as the youth participation in decision-making and sets up local youth centres with the aim of promoting youth initiatives, as well as youth participation in decision-making. The use of diversion in relation to any offence is now also possible in Austria since reform of the Criminal Code in early 2008.

In Scotland, the Government introduced The National Guidance for Child Protection in Scotland in 2010, which brought Government’s Getting it Right for Every Child programme (GIRFEC) and child protection together for the first time and highlighted responsibility for the protection of children in line with the United Nations Convention for Rights of the Child (UNCRC). GIRFEC aims to improve the learning outcomes and life chances of all children by ensuring they are safe, healthy, achieving, nurtured, active, respected, responsible and included in the process. The underlying principle is that, if the right support is provided at the right time, this should help to prevent young people turning to crime. More recently, the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 was introduced to address a number of key areas: strengthening the role of children’s rights in the design and delivery of policy and services; improving early years provision; improving services for looked after children (i.e. children who are in the care of a local authority, who may be at home or may be living away from home); addressing certain legal gaps in secure accommodation and other areas (i.e. children are not able to leave freely from this accommodation). This Act underpins the Government’s Getting it GIRFEC programme, which is the common thread connecting all children’s services.

Countries obviously identify different rights that they feel warrant the most protection. In Estonia, for instance, speed is of the essence. A great deal of emphasis is placed on processing juveniles through the criminal justice system as quickly as possible, with the aim of limiting the potential negative consequences of interaction with the criminal justice system and thus decreasing the probability of future offences. Estonia achieves this in part through the ensuring that investigators and prosecutors are specialised in juvenile cases, thus leading to greater competence and efficiency. This approach appears to have had significant results. According to statistics, the average duration of pre trial proceedings in the case of children has dramatically over six years – from more than five months to half that. Of course speed for speed’s sake risks undermining a
young person’s basic fair trial rights. However, so long as safeguards are in place to ensure that juvenile rights are properly respected then avoiding prolonged contact with the CJS does appear to be a laudable goal.

Staying with positive reforms, the pace of change in England and Wales would seem to markedly greater than most in recent years. From the 2000s onwards, commentators point to a renewed enthusiasm for diversion and early prevention strategies. Most significantly in this regard is the enactment of the LASPO 2012, which has given sentencers far greater discretion in relation to the sentencing of young people.

However, there are instances where laws have not been amended in a number of years, and thus potentially fail to take into account of the changing needs and issues of young people. In Italy, for example, legislation is some years old, the last major change to the youth justice system being the decree DPR 448/1998 (albeit the Charter of Rights and Duties of Children was more recently introduced). Accordingly, the common perception is that the system built upon this law is outdated, and not tailored to meet the needs of children with the social characters and lifestyles of today. Child rights groups in the Netherlands are also less positive about the youth justice policies and programs of the Dutch government. They note that over the years the capacity of youth custodial institutions (YCIs) have increased, that the numbers of children in YCIs have increased, and sentences have generally being getting longer in duration. As the increase in YCI capacity may be seen as illustrative of the increasingly punitive regime has come into practice during the last decade, in which, overall, more and more severe punishments are given and a substantial number of children are held in pre-trial detention (in 2006, for example, 40% of the average population of children in YCIs were in pre-trial detention).

Every year in the Netherlands more children are apparently being deprived of their liberty. In 2002, 3,900 children were held in a youth custodial institution (YCI), in 2005 it rose to 4,965, then falling slightly in 2006 to 4,726 children. Despite this ‘stabilisation’ the government increased the capacity of youth custodial institutions with 172 new places in 2008, 127 places in 2009 and 146 in 2012. This increase in YCI capacity is clearly at odds with the overall recent decline in youth criminality.

54 Netherlands report at p15.
The same could be said for Belgium’s 2006 law, which critics suggest brought in a more punitive approach to youth justice, as new and more severe penalties were introduced. However, set against this is the fact that the 2006 law identifies restorative measures as a priority and ensures that they must be proposed before any other sanction is imposed. The 2006 law also provided more safeguards for child rights (e.g. presence of a lawyer) to respect the requirements of the Belgian Constitution and the UNCRC and placed more reliance on the welfare of the child and the prioritisation of restorative measures.

**Diversion Measures**

There is a broad consensus of opinion amongst youth justice practitioners that diversionary practices are effective in reducing in the number of first time entrants into the criminal justice system. As some commentators have noted,

“In England and Wales, as elsewhere, use of diversion and custody rates appear to be connected – with higher usage of custody found in areas with lower usage of pre-court disposals and vice-versa....These numbers do not necessarily reflect the underlying seriousness of offending, nor variation in local contexts. However, preventing cases from making it to court necessarily lowers the number of candidates for custodial sentences while increasing the opportunity for young people to turn away from crime.”

Over recent years there appears to have been a concerted move towards making greater use of diversionary measures as countries embrace a more child-centric approach to youth justice. The Netherlands stand out as one of the countries with extremely effective, integrated systems in place to enable effective diversion of young people. The government aims to provide a ‘personalised approach’ and tailor the support provided to young people depending on their needs and stage of development. General measures to achieve this include, monitoring/supporting mechanisms through the youth parole system or ‘educational punishment’. But most significantly, they have a progressive diversion strategy in place known as Bureau Halt (see text box). Consequently, the proportion of court-imposed community service orders

---

55 Belgium report at p.8.
56 Belgium report at p.7.
57 England and Wales report at p12.
continues to rise whilst the proportion of orders for deprivation of liberty imposed on young adults steadily decreases.
Bureau Halt: Netherlands

At the police level a unique form of alternative settlement is offered to young first-time offenders who have committed certain minor offences: the *Halt* programme. Juveniles who opt for this type of settlement agree to carry out a project that normally includes damage compensation and/or community service or training for up to 20 hours. Even though the Halt procedure is included in the Dutch penal code, it can be regarded as an alternative to the formal justice system because charges are officially dropped once a successful *Halt* programme is completed.

*Halt* is a Dutch organisation with a national network of offices which aims to prevent and combat juvenile crime. The crime prevention activities of *Halt* consist of advisory services, educational programmes and the development and implementation of crime prevention projects. The activities are carried out at local and regional levels. *Halt* is also responsible for the enforcement of alternative punishment given to young people up to the age of 18. About half of the juveniles arrested by the Dutch police are referred to one of the *Halt* offices to undertake a *Halt* programme.

*Halt* also calls on their parents to accept their personal responsibility and supports them in their role as educators. When there is a suspicion of underlying problems, *Halt* will refer the case to the appropriate professional youth care service. As it has built up a lot of expertise in preventing common juvenile crime, *Halt* carries out preventive actions and gives targeted advice to local authorities, schools and cooperating organisations.

Young people under the age of 18 who commit offences such as theft, vandalism, graffiti, arson, fireworks nuisance, nuisance in public transport and truancy (can be referred by the police to a *Halt* programme. Each year over 20,000 juveniles are referred. The Ministry of Security and Justice finances, and devises a framework for these programmes and local authorities supply most of the money for the crime prevention activities.
In contrast to the Netherlands, Italy’s diversion measures seem to be much more ‘judge led’ - with the judiciary having various options for disposal in youth justice cases at each stage of proceedings. For example, during the pre-trial investigative phase, the judge can choose from the following measures: liberty, prescriptions, custody and community custody. Furthermore, after the end of the investigation, there is the option to stop proceedings and apply one of the various diversion measures (in accordance with the ‘minimum ham fullness principle’). Whilst there is an array of options available, some critics may argue that these measures are not truly diversionary in that they require bringing the young person into the formal justice system in the first place. In Belgium also there appears to be a similar judge led approach - the public prosecutor can put forward a number of diversionary measures before any decision is taken by the judge on the merits of the case (for example meditation procedures of restorative justice groups). Once it reaches court the judge must take restorative measures and hear the child first of all. The Juvenile Court has a large spectrum of measures at their disposal to protect or punish the child; these can include educative guidance, health care, custody, or restorative justice.

**Diversion measures in England & Wales**

Recent developments in diversionary practice in England and Wales include establishment of *Triage* diversion scheme, which puts youth offending team workers in police custody suites and the planned expansion of *Youth Justice Liaison and Diversion Schemes* intended to identify and offer support to vulnerable young people. Further, the *Youth Justice Reinvestment Pathfinder Initiative* attempts to reduce custody numbers through giving local authorities the ability to develop diversion with funding allocated from the central custody budget.

In England Wales, as noted above, LASPO 2012 made significant changes to the use of diversion measures. Importantly, it altered the existing system of out of court disposals (OOCDs) from tiered to a more ‘flattened’ system; enable OOCDs to be used for a far greater range of offences and circumstances. Furthermore, the recent introduction of new remand arrangements, which made every remanded child a looked after child, appear to have improved engagement with children’s services. In one initiative, children have access to ‘Family Group Conferences’ which, in line with theories of restorative and problem-solving justice bring together the child, their family, and the
victim to express their views and endeavour to address the offending behaviour.\textsuperscript{58} Since these changes have come into force in England and Wales, there is emerging evidence that they have resulted in an increase in the use of diversion for young people and their engagement with children’s services. Indeed in 2011/12 approximately a third of all youth disposals were handled prior to court, albeit this varied considerably from region to region.\textsuperscript{59}

Even greater numbers can be found in Sweden where, as noted previously, social authorities have a key role to play (particulacry in repsect of young people aged under 15) and the criminal justice model is more treatement orientated that most Western countires. This clearly has a huge impact on diversion strategies, with over 80% of juvenile crimes not being prosecutioned but instead dealt with informally, such as by caution. Furthermore, prison sentences are also employed very rarely for persons who have not yet reached the age of 18; up until 1999, approximately 60 individuals per year aged under eighteen at the time of their offences were sentenced to a prison term, whilst a further 25 or so were sentenced to a special form of probation that begins with a short stay in prison. However, Sweden does see a high number of young people placed in care, indeed since the Social Service Act introduced this as a court-imposed sanction in 1999 the number of juveniles given a sentence of this kind has increased four fold since the mid 1980s.\textsuperscript{60} The fact that so few young persons have been sentenced to prison since the introduction of the new Act (no more than four per year!) shows that it has achieved its goal. Although, it is notable that the introduction of these measures has resulted in more young people being sanctioned than were previously being sent to prison (and for a longer period of time).

In Estonia, juveniles can be referred to social and educational programs and juveniles committees serve as alternatives to court. In Austria, as noted above, diversion can be used in relation to any offence (albeit as long as the offender has not acted with ‘serious fault’). The measures available for youth are the same as adults, namely a fine community service, probation and community resolution. In practice thought, diversion is used for juveniles involved in up to medium serious criminality. A relatively small proportion of proceedings, however, seem to result in diversion, amounting to only 18.9% in 2012.

\textsuperscript{58} England and Wales Report at p2.
\textsuperscript{59} Ministry of Justice, Youth Statistics 2011/12 www.justice.gov.uk/statisitcs/youht-justice/statistics
CHAPTER THREE: YOUTH CARE SYSTEM

Introduction

The various national reports evidence a clear overlap between children with welfare issues and those who become caught up in the youth justice system. In England and Wales, for example, research has shown that amongst 15-18 year olds in custody, 30% of young men and 44% of young women had spent time in care, and 39% of children in custody have been on the child protection register and/or have experienced abuse or neglect. However, domestic youth care systems do attract a great deal of criticism, such as the comments leveled at youth welfare administrations in Austria; in terms of intervening too late, too vehemently, and for being chronically understaffed.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the general downward trend in young people entering the criminal justice system, there remain a high number of children coming from families from difficult socio-economic backgrounds. Which is not to say that such children inevitably turn to crime; however statistics do tend to show that such persons have “a higher risk of failing in school, not finishing proper job training and by these disadvantages are more likely to develop criminal behavior later on.” Scotland provides a stark example, where one parent families make up 6.6% of all households, 15.3% of Scottish children lived in workless households in 2010, and 13% of children lived in households with income below 60% of the median for at least three of the four years between 2005-2008. It will come as no surprise that there seems to be particular issues for young Scots living in areas of industrial decline, with high levels of economic inactivity, where work is scarce and jobs are often of low quality. Similarly in Austria, as with many other countries, there have been a number of changes over the past decade in the make-up of the societal family unit; with lower wages, and single parent families becoming more and more common.

64 Austria Report at p.4.
65 Austria Report at p.4.
Latvia: Statistical breakdown for care sector

- Average number of foster families in Latvia per year – 420\(^{66}\);
- Average number of children placed/being in foster care per year – 680;
- Number of children under extra-familial care in 2012 – from 1,800 to 2,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2012, 9270 children in Latvia were held administratively liable and got administrative penalties imposed against them, whereas in 2011 – 18091 children;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of State Police registered administrative violations committed by juveniles in 2013 – 5698;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013, compulsory measures of a correctional nature (without proceedings) were applied to 182 children;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From January 1, 2009, till January 1, 2012, according to the data from the Population Register of OCMA the number of registered children in the state has decreased by 21330 children (-5,8%), whereas the number of registered minors has decreased even in 23804 (-23,95%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of prisoners in Latvia at the beginning of 2014 – 5108;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minors in places of imprisonment in Latvia at the beginning of 2014 – 52;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013, the total number of 563 minors were sentenced for various crimes, including 39 girls;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From all 563 juvenile convicts in 2013, 37 were raised under extra-familial care, 419 worked and learned, whereas 414 had never committed any previous crimes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013, 183 minors were imposed conditional imprisonment penalty and they were given under the supervision of probation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2013, a real sentence of imprisonment was applied by the court of first instance to 97 minors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Youth Care Systems

It is difficult to make direct comparisons between the proportions of children in care across European counties due to variances in the recording of data, the definitions used, and the type of statistics produced. However, it is clear that there a number of young people within the welfare system. In Sweden, for example, approximately 2,000 per year are placed outside the family home by social services; 80% of which relate to voluntary care. In Scotland, in 2012, on average three children per 1,000 were on the child protection register and, as of 31 July 2012, there were 16,248 children looked after by local authorities. Further, in 2012/13, 22,561 children were referred to the Children’s Reporter (2.5% of all children in Scotland). Within this, 2.2% of all children were referred on care and protection grounds and 0.8% of these children, aged between 8 and 16 years, were referred on offence grounds.

In Austria, a nationwide average of 0.43% of children are in the State’s full custody, albeit this varies from region to region (for example 0.32% in Upper Austria and 0.68% in Carinthia). This is a decrease compared to the statistics from 2006, where 0.6% of all minors were in the state’s full custody. The percentage of children in foster families, among those who are in the state’s custody, lies between 27% (Carinthia) and 50% (Vorarlberg), the Austrian average being 41%. In Lithuania, in 2012, there were 10.389 families at social risk raising 21.303 children, and by the end of the year, there were 4,030 children living in care homes.

Belgium has had a Youth Care system that is independent from the judicial system since the early nineties; the general philosophy of which is to work in the child’s interest, to try keep them in their family environment and to avoid contact with the justice system. Notwithstanding this laudable aim, in 2011 youth care services took charge of 40,234 minors for at least one day (out of a population of 98,630 under 18s in the French Community, thus 4% of young people); 3,612 of these were juveniles who had committed an offence (8.9%).

---

67 Burgenland: 0.54%; Carinthia 0.68%; Lower Austria: 0.34%; Upper Austria: 0.32%; Salzburg: 0.41%; Styria: 0.41%; Tirol: 0.38%; Vorarlberg: 0.36%; Vienna: 0.55%; Source: BMWFJ: Jugendwohlfahrtsbericht 2012.
70 Lithuania report at p.1.
71 A youth is considered taken in charge either because he is recognised in difficulty or in danger or for having committed a fact classified offence.
72 Belgium Report at p6.
Gender Breakdown of Care Sector, Belgium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young people in difficulty or danger</th>
<th>Young people taken in charge after a FQI (fact classified as offence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already noted, in terms of the principles underpinning the youth care systems in Europe, there does appear to be a focus on matching young people to appropriate services and endeavoring to keep them within the family environment as much as possible. In some countries, the responsibility towards such children is enshrined in statute, such as England and Wales where there is a general duty on the Secretary of State to promote the education of children in England and Wales (section 10 Education Act 1996 (EA 1996)) and to promote the wellbeing of children in England (section 7, Children and Young Persons Act 2008). The Children Act 2004 also provides the legal framework for the Government’s Every Child Matters program of reforms for improving the wellbeing of children.

The approach taken by the Netherlands is very much in line with other well-developed countries, and similar to what has happened in Scandinavia, where care provision for young people has become available for all, irrespective of their background. Further, the Netherlands is one of the few countries where the International Convention on the Rights of the Child has been incorporated into their own constitution. Here, youth care policy can be broadly split into two categories, namely universal and preventative. Universal services are, for example, youth work, child care, and regular schools. Preventive services (or primary youth care services) include child health care, general social work, parenting support and the Youth and Family Centers. The aim of these preventative services is to intervene at the earliest possible state, coordinate support, and to refer children and their families to provincial youth care services. Similarly, in Austria youth care is split in two; albeit the divisions is more focused on the duration of support offered, namely long and short term foster care. Long term care is where a young person usually stays with a foster family until they reach 18 years old, although the intention is to return them to their biological family or at least maintain a relationship with the patents. Short-term care relates to the provision of short
term fostering in the case of a family crisis, which may last between six months and 8 weeks depending on the province concerned.

**Bodies and monitoring mechanisms**

In many countries responsibility for children in care falls mainly, if not completely, to local bodies. Such is the case, for example, in the Austria and the Netherlands, where the child welfare system is subject to the laws of each individual province. The approach taken by each of Austria’s provinces is broadly the same; namely endeavoring to keep children within the family environment rather than placing them in care or foster families. Similarly, in the Netherlands, the 408 municipalities take the lead on provision of youth care services, which are categorized as universal and preventative. However, regional and national authorities have shared responsibility for specialised youth and family services for youth and families, such as care, mental health, and child protection (as set out in the table below\(^{73}\)).

**The Dutch youth care system**

---

\(^{73}\) Netherlands report at p15.
Another common theme is the use of boards or ombudsman to provide oversight of the child welfare systems either nationally or locally. In Sweden, for instance, according to the Social Services Act (SoL), the decisions as to where a child ought to be taken into care is vested with local social welfare boards. These boards are established by law in every municipality, and consist of local politicians (reflecting the party political breakdown of the local government). Likewise, in the Netherlands, the Child Care and Protection Board is responsible for child protection, although the Ministry for Security and Justice plays a supervisory role, and in Austria each provincial law also includes a requirement to establish an independent ombudsman for children and young people (Kinder – und Jugendanwaltschaft). The main task of the ombudsman is to mediate in conflicts between parents, children and the authorities. Although the Kinder-und Jugendanwaltschaft plays a significantly direct role, it bears comparison with Italy, where there are a number of local ‘observatories’ on juvenile delinquency, drug use and schools dispersion, although these are criticised for being too closely linked with local social investments in different regions. Furthermore, monitoring is provided by the Informative Juvenile Justice System, which gathers information about children and informs social services. Likewise, in Lithuania, the Institution of the Ombudsman for Children Rights is an independent children rights monitoring maintained from the state’s budget. It designates responsibility for child protection to Municipal Child Rights Protection Agencies, which assist with the protection of children left without parents; helping with the training material and consultations; preparing and implementing measures for protection of children rights; coordinating decisions about improving child rights and law violation prevention; and, in certain cases, participating in court and during pretrial interviews with young people.

In the same vein, Latvia has a youth care district council in every district (CAAJ). It has the mission of stimulating, coordinating, supervising and assigning budgets to prevention actions on its territory and its members represent the sectors that deal with youth problems (social help, youth care, and youth protection). The CAAJ is also tasked with gathering opinions from youths themselves on the subject of prevention. There is also the Community Council for Youth Care (CCAJ), which advises the government, delivery a report every other year, and has a steering function over youth care politics. Similarly, in England & Wales there is a distinctly localised approach, as local authorities in England must have in place a director of children’s services and appoint a lead member with responsibility for children’s services. Further, section 10 of the

74 Here an example of local observatory on juvenile disadvantage, in Sicily: http://www.distrettosociosanitario39.it/
75 Lithuania Report at p.8.
Children’s Act 2004 imposes a duty on local authorities and their partners to cooperate with a view to improving children’s wellbeing. The Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 also requires local authorities to set up a Children’s Trust Board. Statutory guidance, published in spring 2010, placed an expectation on Children’s Trust Boards that the preparation and development of Children and Young People’s Plans will be consistent with the principles of the UNCRC.

Conversely, in places like Estonia, there appears to be less local government involvement than in other European countries. According to the Ministry of Social Affairs, and a recent audit by the National audit office, only 38% of local governments employ a child welfare official and one fifth of Estonian children live in local government units that do not employ a child protection worker. Usually local governments only provide assistance in cases where a problem has become so serious that the parent or guardian has actively asked for help. Services for children and families are therefore mainly provided through institutions in municipal ownership or nonprofit organisations.

Criteria for placement and links with youth justice system

In Sweden there has been considerable debate about whether or not social services should be able to undertake coercive measure with regard to young people. This resulted in the Social Services Act (Sol), which did not contain any coercive measures whatsoever. The Sol provides that efforts to address the cause of a juvenile’s offending behavior are to be undertaken through cooperation between the young person themselves, his parents, and social services. In extreme cases of anti-social behavior, there are coercive measures that can be used via the LVU (Act with Special provisions on the Care of Young people), as well as the Act on the Care of Drug Abusers in Certain Cases (LVM).

In Italy, anyone can decide to inform the juvenile court about a child/family “at risk”; it is then up to the court to decide whether to intervene, and in what way. Like most counties, the type of interventions are varied and very locally characterised. Further, the same bodies with responsibility for early intervention take on the role of identifying children and families at risk. Primarily, schools have a key role in identifying issues affecting children and informing the social services and/or juvenile court.
In England and Wales, since the Children Act 1989 divided the juvenile court into two separate entities dealing with family and youth justice, links between the crime and welfare systems has remained somewhat tenuous. Although YOT’s serve ‘a similarly and overlapping population’ the past few years have seen a reduction in the proportion of children in care receiving pre court disposals or convictions, from 7.9 per cent in 2010 to 6.2 per cent in 2013. Nevertheless, the proportion of children in care within the justice system itself has increased: “in 2010 they were two and a half times more likely to be sanctioned for an offence, which rose to over three and a half times in 2012” Further, as a result of the LAPSO all children remanded into custody before being sentenced now automatically receive ‘looked after’ stauts.

In the Netherlands, until recently, juveniles with severe behavioral problems were placed in the same institutions as those who had committed criminal offences. However, new secure

---

76 Justice Committee Report 2013 at p16.
77 Department for Education report, ‘Prevention and reduction: a review of strategies for intervening early to prevent or reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour’ (2011) at p.5
institutions have now been created to house children in care. There are a number of different child protection measures that courts can impose; these include family supervision orders (the most frequent) and consensual or non-consensual divestment of parental responsibility. It is difficult to describe trends because of changes in the way of registering custodial placements; however it is known that at the end of 2012 there were 11,978 custodial placement authorisations with a supervision order and 7,202 placements with a guardian. Further, the number of implemented custodial placement authorisation rose by 47% from 2005 until 2007, leveling off or even decreasing from 2008-2009. In Scotland, as of July 2012, 16,248 children were ‘looked after’ by local authorities (a child could become ‘looked after’ due to child protection concerns and/or offending behavior). This number has been increasing since 2001, primarily because of the increased numbers being looked after away from home.78

---

78 Scotland report at p9.
Recreational Activities

Providing young people with a meaningful way to spend their leisure time is seen by many to contribute significantly to crime prevention. This is not just because it occupies them with legitimate activities (as opposed to illegitimate pursuits), but it also provides them with role models, builds their self-esteem, and allows them to form positive social groups. All of which are factors that arguably help to reduce criminality. However, it is worth noting that the way young

---

Secure Youth Care: Sweden

This measure involves young people being sentenced to a fixed term sanction (which should be of approximately the same length as the prison term for which one would be sentenced as a young offender; usually approximately half the length of the sanction that an adult would have received for the same offence) but is served in an institution established for the care of young people (‘a youth care facility’). These are the same institutions where youths are placed in compulsory care by the social services. These institutions are focused on the treatment of young people and have a staff to ‘inmate’ ratio approximately three times that of prisons (approximately three staff members per youth in care). Over the course of 2000 and 2001, around 100 youths a year have been sentenced to the new sanction (of which approximately 85 per cent were aged between fifteen and seventeen at the time of the offence, whilst the remainders were over the age of eighteen). This constitutes a slightly higher number than those who were sentenced to prison (including probation with a prison term) prior to the new Act coming into force. In addition, the introduction of the secure youth care sanction has led to longer custodial sentences. Youths sentenced to prison prior to 1999 served an average sentence of approximately 5.4 months. Youths sentenced to the new sanction, on the other hand, spend an average of 9.5 months in custodial care.

---

people spend their leisure time has changed dramatically over the past decade - becoming more individualised – and, as such, recreational activities must be viewed through this new paradigm. Consequently, it is no surprise that in many counties, such as the Netherlands, socio-cultural facilities and volunteer youth work have suffered a decline in interest. However, this is difficult to reconcile with the Netherlands growing emphasis on promoting the “well being” of children, by utilising a more ‘development-orientated approach’ as opposed to risk-orientated. Programmes and projects therefore aim to develop participation, though school, leisure, and cultural activities as well as youth work etc. It is noted that the Dutch government plans a decentralisation of all administrative and financial responsibilities related to youth policy to local government in 2015. This will enable municipalities to become responsible for a wide range of services for children and families, as well as, it is hoped will also reduce costs.

Some countries appear to place more emphasis than others on the importance of recreational activities. In Italy, for example, the Directive n.17 of February 2007 places sporting activities in schools into national policies80. Further the January 2007 ‘Guidelines on innovative projects for physical and sportive activities in areas at risk’ (allocated a budget of 900,000 euro) aimed to finance projects that use sport to rehabilitate and re-educate children and adolescents “at risk”, teaching how to build relationships and teamwork. Italy also offers the activity of the ‘Sporting Scholastic Games’ (GiochiSportiviStudenteschi, GSS), which promote the inclusion of marginalized and at-risk children, integrating sporting activities with other educative and training proposals81. However, the lack of national coordination has led the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child to comment that, despite a strong commitment from third sector bodies, the ‘right to play’ in Italy is not completely granted.82

In Sweden, a great deal of emphasis is placed on the use of leisure time, which is either financed or directly organised by public sector agencies. Indeed it is estimated that at least half of young people in Sweden are members of one or more organisations, particularly sporting ones. However,

82 See Italy report at p.16 and the General Comment the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, 18.03.2013 n.17 on art.31 of the CRC, available here in Italian: http://www.gruppoare.net/IMG/pdf/Cap_6_par_9_Il_diritto_al_gioco.pdf Project on “Cittasostenibilidellebambine e dei bambini”, pluri-annual experience on sustainable cities for children with the similar project on “Child-friendly cities and the Association of “Cittàamichedell’Infanzia e dell’adolescenza” (http://www.cittasostenibili.minori.it/).
it has been noted that this sort of activity is utilised more so by juveniles from higher socio-economic backgrounds and therefore does not really involve the young people most at risk. Accordingly, “the number of organisations that successfully recruit young people in the risk zone for criminality, and that may serve as an effective alternative to their antisocial network, is relatively small”\textsuperscript{83}.

In Lithuania, work with young people is assigned to Open Youth Centres. Such Centres focus on youths from 14 to 29 years old and provides social, pedagogical, or educational services. They employ people who seek to engage young people to develop socially and personally either through individual work or groups or communities and who have sufficient professional competence to the job. It is therefore important for staff to have background in education, psychology, or social sciences or to have experience in social work with young people. In 2013, 12 Open Youth Centers were financed. Also, in 2013, 13 institutions and organisations received financial support from the Financing of the Activities of the Open Youth Spaces project (Department of Youth Affairs under the Ministry of Social Security and Labor).

Lastly, many recreational activities are provided by or through local schools. For example, in Austria, as with many other counties, schools offer excursion, camping trips, and sports activities as well as subsidising those juveniles from more disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds (see \textit{Alpenverien} below).

\textbf{Alpenverien: Austria}

The adventure-oriented juvenile work offered by the \textit{Alpenverein} includes summer camps (around 1000 children and juveniles join the 50 camps every year); environmental construction sites (“Umweltbaustellen”) in which young people between 16 and 30 are invited to work voluntarily for one week at a natural disaster site; and SPOT experience, which is an experience-based school programme focusing on the topics of personal development, our relation to nature and English experience (this reaches around 1500 juveniles a year).

CHAPTER 4: HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Health Systems

There is extensive evidence that “children in the criminal justice system have higher than average mental health difficulties ... as well as significant learning difficulties and substance abuse problems.” In England and Wales, for example:

- 60% of children who offend have a communication disability (Bryan et al, cited in RCSLT, 2009)
- Around 30% of children who have ‘persistent offending histories’ in custody have IQs of less than 70, signifying a learning disability (Rayner et al, 2008, cited in Hughes et al, 2012: 26)
- Between 65% and 75% of children in custody have a traumatic brain injury (various authors, cited in Hughes et al, 2012: 35-7)
- 17% of incarcerated children have a diagnosed emotional or mental health condition, 20% have self-harmed and 11% have attempted suicide
- 18% of 13–18 year olds in custody had depression, 10% anxiety, 9% post-traumatic stress and 5% psychotic symptoms.

In Belgium, health care in the strict sense (hospitals, general medicine) is a federal matter, whereas prevention and health promotion services are a regional matter. In the French speaking territory, two different services are in charge of prevention and of monitoring infants and school age children: the Birth and early childhood agency (ONE) monitors childhood host organisations (kindergartens, summer camps, etc), organises psycho-medical consultations before and after birth, and provides specialised services for the prevention and monitoring of abuse. Within the school system, health promotion in schools services (PSE) and psycho-medico-social centers (CPMS) are tasked with guaranteeing the wellbeing of children. In terms of policies for the prevention of addictions for youngsters, these are not exclusively focused on illegal substances; they also cater for gaming, internet mobile phone and sex addiction. Front-line stakeholders such

---

as school directors, teachers, facilitators and parents work together with associations for the prevention of addictions. Notably, special addiction support cells have been created in local health centers to reinforce and coordinate the actions that take place in schools. A risk reducing policy has been established at a federal level along with a national alcohol plan that pulls together all relevant stakeholders.

In Scotland, protecting children from abuse and neglect is a top priority for the Government and its children’s services. Systems, services, legislation and policies continue to develop to address child protection, but Scotland remains challenged in its attempts to ensure the safety and protection of all children. In law, the threshold for certain state interventions is a child being at risk of ‘significant harm’. Significant harm is defined as “events… that interrupt, change or damage the child's physical and psychological development.” This concept has no further definition and requires professional judgment, which has been seen as both an advantage (individualised assessments) and a disadvantage (relying too much on professional judgment, which can be particularly difficult for a less experienced professional).86

In Lithuania, between 2006 and 2011, there were 137 in-patient children treated for alcohol

86 Scotland Report at p.7.
dependency and 227 children threatened for psychotropic substance dependency. In-patient
treatment and short-term psychological and social rehabilitation for children with mental and
behavioral disorders related to the use of psychoactive substances are provided by centers of
addictions and the Children and Youth Long-term Rehabilitation Department serves children who
need long-term psychological-social rehabilitation. Lithuania also designates both families and
at social risk’ is one that that raises children under 18 years old and where one of the parents is
abusing alcohol, drugs, or other substance, has an addiction to gambling, or cannot others take
care of his child(ren). As of December 2012, there were 10,389 families at social risk raising 21,303
minors. A ‘child at risk’ is deemed to be a person younger than 18 years old who does not attend
school, has behavioral problems, abuses alcohol or drugs, is involved in criminal activities, or has
been abused. Help and services to the families at risk are also provided by Child Rights Protection
Agency along with NGOs, crisis centers, day centers and other organizations and institutions
working in child rights protection.  

87 Lithuania report at p.9.
### Long-term ANDT policy goals

**Priority goals during the strategy period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curtailing the supply of illegal drugs, doping substances, alcohol and tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protecting children against the harmful effects of alcohol, narcotic drugs, doping and tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gradually reducing the number of children and young people who initiate the use of tobacco, narcotic drugs or doping substances or begin drinking alcohol early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gradually reducing the number of people who become involved in harmful use, abuse or dependence on alcohol, narcotic drugs, doping substances or tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improving access by people with abuse or addiction problems to good quality care and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reducing the number of people who die or suffer injuries or damage to their health as a result of their own or others’ use of alcohol, narcotic drugs, doping substances or tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Promoting a public health-based, restrictive approach to ANDT in the EU and internationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall objectives**: a society free from illegal drugs and doping, with reduced alcohol-related medical and social harm, and reduced tobacco use.

**Priority 1**

- Effective and coordinated supervision of alcohol and tobacco
- Effective measures to combat illicit trading
- Effective measures to combat illicit sales via digital media
- Effective local and regional collaboration and coordination of ANDT prevention and crime prevention efforts

**Priority 2**

- Fewer children born with harmful or disabling conditions caused by exposure to alcohol, narcotic drugs, doping substances or tobacco
- Appropriate support for children in families where abuse, mental illness or mental disability is present
- Better knowledge of alcohol and tobacco marketing practices via digital media, and of the effect of digital marketing on consumption

**Priority 3**

- Reduced initiation of narcotic drugs and doping abuse
- Development of methods for deterring children and young people from starting to use tobacco products
- Wider use of available, effective means of postponing alcohol debut and reducing alcohol consumption
- Emphasis on health promotion in schools
- Greater participation by parents, non governmental organisations and the business community in preventive work

**Sweden: Healthcare strategy chart**

- Increased efforts by the healthcare service to prevent ANDT-related ill health (brief intervention and screening)
- Reduced risk use and less extensive alcohol consumption among students and young adults with mental health problems
- More scope for the dental care service to focus on tobacco prevention
- Improved opportunities for the early detection and prevention of ANDT problems in working life

**Priority 4**

- Greater access to knowledge-based care and support inputs
- A cleaner and more appropriate allocation of competencies among the bodies principally responsible for substance abuse and addiction care
- Reduced disparities in quality, availability and outcomes of regional and local level

**Priority 5**

- Fewer deaths and injuries in road accidents due to alcohol or other drugs
- Fewer deaths and injuries due to alcohol-related, drug-related or doping-related violence
- Lower mortality rate among teenagers and young adults due to alcohol poisoning or drug experimentation
- Greater awareness among the population of the health impact of ANDT use

**Priority 6**

- Active efforts to ensure compliance with UN conventions in the narcotic drug field
- Active efforts to ensure implementation of the EU and WHO strategies on alcohol and health
- Active efforts to ensure compliance with the WHO framework convention on tobacco control
- Active efforts to ensure compliance with UN conventions in the narcotic drug field
- More effective coordination and increased prioritisation of Nordic cooperation in the ANDT sphere
Education Systems

Children spend the biggest part of their time at school, therefore events that take place in school, the knowledge they receive and the relationships they develop have a significant impact on the development of their personality and their communication skills. The school therefore plays a very important role in early delinquency prevention. The Edinburgh Study on Youth Transitions and Crime, for example, has demonstrated a strong association between exclusion and subsequent entanglement in the youth justice system in Scotland.

Overall, there is a decent level of support for children at risk in the school environment, albeit linkages with the criminal justice system tend to vary. In Belgium one type of specialised education is dedicated to young people with behaviour disturbance, as minors in custody or in young offenders’ institutes are educated within these institutions during their institutionalization. A great number of children under Youth care system are either educated in specialised school or are out of school. There are different other services to help the children with educational difficulties: psycho-medico-social centers (CPMS), scholar mediation services and mobile teams (both centered on prevention of school dropout and violence) and school reintegration services (SAS) that welcome dropped out or excluded pupils to help them go back to school. Finally, some private social care services organise, after school hours, an educational help for children of disadvantaged neighbourhoods (homework schools).

In Lithuania, the main body responsible for juvenile delinquency prevention is the Child Wellbeing Commission, which has a presence in every school. Its purpose is to organize and coordinate preventive activities, create secure and healthy environment for the child to develop, adapt education programs for children with special needs, conduct primary assessments those special needs and perform other functions directly related to the child’s well-being. Furthermore, the Government’s National Children’s Day Centres Program organises the education and after-school time for children living in families at risk. Day centers provide at environment for children to socialise, early prevention of juvenile delinquency, and access to social services for families. Significantly, parents of children who go to day centers are given systematic social training and

88 Lithuania Report at p.12.
89 Scotland Report at p.3.
90 Belgium report p.13.
provided with psychological, pedagogical, and legal help hoping to eliminate the reasons which can lead towards putting their children into the care of others. However, the use of day centers is limited by the fact that some municipalities do not have enough centers or they are already overcrowded. Lastly, ‘Socialisation Centers’ are separate secondary education schools for children with mental and physical disabilities who have special needs. The goals of these centers are to ensure appropriate education, professional help and services for the child which can help to change child’s behavior into positive, nurture his moral principles and social skills, and prepare him for independent life in society.

In Scotland, a relatively new umbrella concept of “additional support needs” aims to embrace the traditional categories of children with learning difficulties and disabilities, but also includes children growing up in poverty, looked after by the local authority, experiencing disrupted education or whose parents misuse drug or alcohol. There are staged levels of support, ranging from the provision of some additional help in the classroom through to multi-agency input, each of which are underpinned by different. However, apparently levels of educational inequality in Scotland are not decreasing and about 4% of children still remain excluded from school each year (albeit mainly temporarily). Further, the basis of the number and proportion of children in mainstream and special settings, there is little evidence of a major shift of children with additional support needs from special to mainstream, despite the anxieties sometimes expressed by teachers’ unions. About 1% of children continue to be placed in special schools. As well as showing little change in the use of special schools, Scottish Government data show a steady increase in pupils recorded as having additional support needs in mainstream schools. In 2004, children with additional support needs (those with an Individual Educational Programme and/or a Co-ordinated Support Plan) made up only 4.5% of the total pupil population, whereas in 2012, this proportion had risen to just under 18%. The increase appears to be most marked in primary schools, and the vast majority of children are recorded as spending all of their time in mainstream classes.

---
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CHAPTER 4: BEST PRACTICES IN EARLY PREVENTION

Common themes and notable examples

It is of course incredibly difficult to make like-for-like comparisons of the various early intervention projects, which utilise a range of approaches to address a variety of issues. They are of course also grounded within different geographical, socio-economic and cultural areas. Nevertheless, a number of key themes do emerge and certain practices stand out as pioneering innovative approaches and achieving commendable results.

One of the most notable common denominators, and in many ways perhaps the greatest contributor to success, appears to be the use of collaboration between various interested bodies (from children’s service providers, schools and voluntary organizations to law enforcement authorities and child protection agencies).

Scotland’s Pre Referral Screening (PRS) is one such example of the benefits of collaboration. PRS endeavors to divert young people (aged 8 to 17) who commit an offence towards appropriate service providers as an alternative to more punitive judicial measures. It consists of weekly group meetings of key practitioners, as outlined below, and has seen a 31% reduction in reoffending:

**PRS Scotland – collaborative approach involving:**

- Police Scotland - Juvenile Liaison Officer
- The Youth Offending Service
- The Education Welfare Service (EWS)
- The Early Intervention Service
- Community Safety Officers
- Mental Health workers

Criticism could of course be levied at PRS by virtue of the fact that interventions only take place after youths commit an offence. However, as a diversionary practice the results speak for

---

96 These Best Practices can be found in the attached Compendium (or at the end of National Reports).
themselves. It is also notable that funding for the project is absorbed by the individual partners, although of course the financial impact will therefore vary from person to person and depend on the nature of support provided to them.

A similar initiative takes place in England and Wales, with the *Triage* scheme, which intends to assess and divert young people held in police stations following the commission of low-level offences. Through involving the YOT at an earlier point than in a standard process, police are advised of factors relevant to the decision to charge (including unmet welfare needs or other underlying problems). Young people who engage with interventions, typically including a restorative justice element, have their cases closed without a criminal record. An evaluation found promising stakeholder perceptions of the scheme, but reported insufficient data to establish effectiveness as consistent measurement was not included in pilot areas. The Ministry of Justice cited promising early findings from Triage initiatives, which bring YOT workers into police custody suites to assess young people and ensure information is shared between children’s or social services and the police, to help inform charging decisions and ensure that appropriate support is provided by agencies outside the criminal justice system. Similarly Sweden’s *Social Action Group* (SAG) is an extremely collaborative approach to tackling gang membership, involving many of the same partners as in PRS. In the same way that PRS tailors responses to the needs of the individual, so too does SAG base the support it provides on a case by case basis.

Another example of the importance, and effect, of collaboration is Italy’s *Civico Zero* project, which uses an overall presence in the city of Rome to protect and divert young people away from criminality. Through its multi-layered approach, it aims to intervene in almost every conceivable point in society where at-risk young people can be found, particular homeless and migrant children. It works by partnering with juvenile and care practitioners and setting up mini-projects on the street, in penal institutions, Roma settlements, and in day centers. It has seen some very positive results within the first year and reached a number of individuals. These are outlined below:

- With the ‘street-intervention’ (outreach activity) 149 youths aged 6 to 18 have been reached, mainly from Afghanistan, Romania, Egypt, Italy (with children of Bosnian and Roma ethnic origin but born in Italy), and from sub-Saharan Africa.
• Within the justice system, about 200 youths in juvenile classification homes (CPAs) entered in contact with the project team, half of whom were migrant children (former Yugoslavia, Roma, Romanian)

• In the CPAs, twice a week a workshop on communication-expression was established, to integrate the CPA’s educators’ interventions and introduce the children to the possibility of attending the day-care centre as alternative to the street. This workshop involved 150 children and youths.

• The day-care Centre ‘CivicoZero’, from February to October 2009, received 534 children (506 males and 28 female), plus 35 entries in the daytime ‘help-desk’, established in another area of the city

• At their first access to the Centre, a significant number (160) of children/youths were living in the streets, 151 in communities managed by the municipality, 50 in House-Family (communities called ‘Case-Famiglia’), 41 in Roma camps, 22 in spontaneous settlements.

• A vast number of these children (239) learnt about the Centre through other children/friends who had already been in contact with it. It is an important indicator of the efficacy of ‘peer’s motivation’ and also of the trust created in the children who benefit from the Centre’s activities, being its main ‘promoters’

• Between September 2008 and October 2009, 71 legal counselling and take on responsibility were registered

Impressively, Civico Zero also appears to be extremely sustainable and transferrable, with an extremely wide reach. Even more commendably, it has trained 10 young people as peer educators themselves, and is this way not only directly helps those individuals, but also enables the project to sustain itself, at least in part, and arguably has a greater impact on those it seeks to help.
This multi-faceted approach is shared by Sweden’s *Young Kris*, which also stands out for the fact it was set up ‘by kids for kids’. This project provides support to young people (aged between 3 and 25 years old) who are engaged in, or most at risk of getting involved in drugs and/or crime. In cooperation with a number of different bodies, *Young Kris* uses a three limbed approach achieve its goals, namely (1) providing a drug and crime free social network, (2) offering early intervention immediately if the young person commits an offence (through collaboration with the police, social services, probation etc) and (3) providing longer term job and study support programs. It has seen a large amount of success, being rolled out in 14 counties across Sweden and plans to be self funding by 2017.

In the same vein, this peer to peer method sees success in both the Netherlands’ *Peer Motivation* program and in Austria, where *Peer mediation* has been used in secondary school for the past 15 years. This involves training pupils from 9th to 12th grade as mediators for conflict resolution for pupils from 5th grade to 8th grade; thereby, the pupils feel like they do not only cause problems, but can also contribute to their solution. The juveniles who are educated as mediators take part in a seminar with two days duration. Teachers also take part in this seminar and have the obligation to support the mediators in the following time. After the first seminar there is an additional seminar held annually. Additionally, brief training sessions on gender-sensitive conflict resolution, intercultural mediation, *Forumtheater* as well as constant supervision are offered.97 Similarly in the Netherlands, peer mediation is used as a form of conflict resolution, where pupils learn to find a solution under the supervision of one of two other students.

In a similar way, Lithuania’s *Big Brothers Big Sisters* program is based on the principles of mentorship and serves as a tool for prevention and early intervention. Its main idea is personal and voluntary help for children where carefully selected and trained volunteer interacts one on one with the child aged 7–17 and helps him to deal with uncomplicated psychological problems. The relationship between the volunteer and the child is supervised and facilitated by specialists (psychologists, social workers, and etc.). The volunteer (Big Friend) and the child (Little Friend) meet once a week and spend together no less than two hours. At the beginning of the friendship, they sign a Contract of Friendship that lasts a year. After one year, the contract is terminated or renewed for another year by mutual agreement of the child, volunteer, child’s parents or foster-

parents and program coordinators.

One project which takes a particularly innovative approach is Sweden’s *Net for you*. This uses ‘bystander intrusion’ to reduce gender based violence, including homophobia. Bystander intrusions is a method designed to break the culture of silence/passiveness, is not unlike the principles around the interrupters model used by a number of youth organisations to reduce gang violence. Through seven sessions with young people it aims to firstly identify difference forms of gender based violence and secondly, equip the participants with skills in bystander intrusion; in this way everyone is addresses as a potential ‘change agent.’ The project is a further example of the success of collaboration, and requires the input of schools out of school clubs and a violence prevention expert (FPV), with schools paying for the training. The results themselves have been very positive.

**Specific vs. General**

Some practices target particular groups and/or issues, whilst others take a broader approach, either in terms of the problems they seek to solve or in the way they are implemented. Examples, of these more ‘general’ practices include Scotland’s *PRS*, Italy’s *Civico Zero*, and Austria’s *Young Kris* program. In Scotland for example, their restorative practice is as much a criminological philosophy as anything; drawing on principles of restorative justice to improve discipline and relationship through careful use of language. The underpinning principles are worth setting out, given that such concepts can of course apply throughout a variety of other projects:

- The importance of fostering social relationships in a school community of mutual engagement
- Responsibility and accountability for one’s own actions and their impact on others
- Respect for other people, their views and feelings
- Empathy with the feelings of others affected by own actions
- Fairness
- Commitment to equitable process
- Active involvement of everyone in school with decisions about their own lives
- Issues of conflict and difficulty returned to the participants rather than behaviour
- Willingness to create opportunities for reflective change in pupils and staff.
Into this broader category, one could also put the information sharing projects such as Sweden’s *Information Exchange* as well as Italy’s *Observatory on Bullying*. Similarly, *Civico Zero* – a multi-faceted project – and *Young Kris*, whilst with specific structures, appear to take broader approach to diverting young people away from drugs and crime. For example, *Civico Zero*, whilst general in the way in which it deals with problems, does provide particular support for migrants children.

More targeting approaches, such as Italy’s *Bullying Observatory*, develop projects around a particular concept/theory. In this case, it is the link between bullying and deviant behavior; using bullying as an indicator of anti-social and divergent behavior. There are also, unsurprisingly, a large number of projects that deal with alcohol and drugs issues. Often these go hand in hand with anger management and conflict resolution. A wide range of such initiatives operate in Austria, such as the school based programs *Los* and *Jus*, whilst elsewhere in Austria there are projects that use theatre to confront the same uses. Likewise, Austria’s *Peer Motivation* incorporates training in gender and cultural sensitivity.

**School Based**

A number of projects take place in or around the school environment. This makes sense in a number ways: it is a place where young people already attend; there are pre-established relationships of trust; frameworks and structures exist; and there is access to funding etc. The purest examples of this are perhaps *Los, check dein Leben* (Go, check your life) and *Just for mi* in Austria, both of which address issues of addiction and conflict resolution.

*Los* was developed by the local police, the youth ombudsman and the province of *Landesschulrat* in 2009/2010 and is offered in all types of secondary schools (with a target group of juveniles in 8th grade). There are five sessions, consisting of three lessons each, which are conducted during one semester. The main aim is to make adolescents reflect on their search for their own identity, peer group pressure and appreciation within the group, accepting responsibilities, their consumption patterns and handling of frustration and aggression. This approach intends to support the juveniles in developing their social competences and to avoid addictions and violence.\(^{98}\) Furthermore, courses for multipliers, who shall carry on independently the knowledge to other persons of the

---

\(^{98}\) Fachstelle für Suchtprävention Burgenland: Jahresbericht 2010, page 11.
target group, were held at the fire fighters’ school to train fire fighters as youth workers in cooperation with the Fachstelle Suchtprävention (specialist agency for the prevention of addictions). Similarly, the project Just for mi has been around since 2009/2010 (formerly Suchtfrei.ok since 2004/2005) to prevent drug abuse, addictions and violence in schools. It is organised conjointly by the local police and the Landesstelle für Suchtprävention (province’s agency for the prevention of addictions) and is supported by the education ministry (BMUKK). The program focuses on children in 7th grade and aims at enhancing the juveniles’ knowledge on addictions and their emergence, the involved substances, risk factors as well as laws and regulations concerning the protection of juveniles, also with regard to new media. Furthermore, nonviolent conflict resolution, alternative behavior and strategies for coping with stress and aggression as well as verbalisation of conflicts and feelings are part of the contents. The sessions are held during the whole school year. The parents are also addressed by evening meetings.

In Belgium, the School Reintegration Service (SAS) hosts excluded pupils during the day for six month periods as an alternative to compulsory education. A 2004 law set out 12 SAS structures, each of which has five full time educators and a budget of approximately 350,000 Euros per year. The SAS has active partnerships with different actors, in the justice, youth care, health, social, and education sectors. Central to SAS’s philosophy is the building of self worth this is done through integrating young people in group teaching activities, allowing them to build and deep their confidence, and ultimately reintegrate them back into the school environment. The objective here is to bring the young person back into the structures of education or within a vocational training system.

Somewhat more progressive is the approach taken by the Peer Mentoring project in Austria. This project is based in secondary schools, and essentially trains older students in mediation in conflict techniques, in order to assist younger children in the years below them. The training itself only involves a two day seminar, which involves teachers, and is following up with further training sessions once a year. Further, Sweden’s Net for U (which focuses on gender related violence), whilst not exclusively based within the education context, does involve participants from schools and out of school clubs, along with FPV experts.

100 Info-Folder, http://olga.pixelpoint.at/media/PPM_3DAK_suchtvorbeugung/~M0/224.3dak.pdf (29.01.2014)
Lastly, as noted above, Scotland’s PRS sets out general principles that filter throughout dealing with young people at school. Such concepts could not only be brought into the projects mentioned above, but also outside the school environment to all those dealing with young people.

**Information Exchange/Observatories**
Some projects take more of a less hands on roles; acting more as observers and/or information exchange networks. Such initiatives have a key role to play alongside more direct projects and there is arguably potential for greater collaboration between such organizations.

A couple of good examples of this are Italy’s Bullying Observatory and Sweden’s Forum for Information Exchange. The Bullying Observatory was established by police in 2007, and is driven by the idea of bullying as an indicator of anti-social and divergent behavior. The project helps facilitate and support those who wish to change their behavior. As for the information exchange, this provides a deeper level of scrutiny and continuing information about those considered most at risk. Furthermore, Bravvo in Belgium, holds and manages all the city budgets dedicated to prevention, and supervises the entire workforce in charge of implementing these polices. This ‘platform’, as it is described, aims to improve urban security, reduce social exclusivity and generally develop communities’ quality of life. Bravvo endeavours to place itself at the intersection of neighbourhood social action, socio-cultural action, and is able to develop innovative functions in the field of prevention. More than just a prevention tool, it claims to be an instrument of ‘urban policy’ that “acts on both the causes and symptoms of urban crime.”

**Culture and Gender**
Even within projects that do not focus on cultural, ethical, or gender differences, there is still a place for such issues. For example young people who participate in Austria’s Peer Mentoring program receive gender and cultural sensitivity training. Like PRS concepts in Scotland, these are the sort of theories than could (and some might argue should) be incorporated as universal best practice.

Also Austria’s Lebenswelten – Kulturaufklauf (“living worlds – cultural mash”) brings together youths from different cultural and social backgrounds to develop strategies for the prevention of
violence. The aim is that the juveniles become emotionally involved in their work on active or passive experiences of violence and reflect on them in group sessions and together with professionals. The project has its origins in Vorarlberg, where it was supported by local governments, the youth welfare administration and the province Vorarlberg. Today the project is not only used in Vorarlberg, but all over Austria.¹⁰¹

Similarly, Civico Zero focuses on children living on the streets and those from a migrant background (in 2008 47% of all migrants children were in first care). Most represented countries among the children in the Centre were Afghanistan, Egypt, Bangladesh and Romania.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Public policies should act both on neighbourhood dynamics, peer relationships and failure at school. It is helpful to focus on positive socialisation, to bolster self esteem, and provide long term opportunities.

2. Meanwhile, it is important to implement "general" prevention policies, in other words policies that address the roots of the experienced difficulties, which means the economic inequalities and the frustrations they generate. This obviously raises the question of the level at which these policies should be led. If the local level is the best level to establish accurate diagnosis and to provide solutions that are as close as possible to the specificities of the target audience, the questions of the redistribution of resources and of the improving of the quality of life call for policies taken at a higher level.

3. In this sense, the establishment of an effective prevention policy begins with the definition of a youth policy which allows the formulation of a more general and cross-cutting objectives (education, health, support, leisure, etc).

4. However, on the local level, effective prevention policies start with openness to other possibilities whatsoever in terms of recreation, education, meetings. Providing access to things that would otherwise be inaccessible (S. Smeets) is a step in the right direction.

5. A key place for juvenile delinquency prevention is the school environment. This institution continues to operate as a "social elevator". It is with school failure that many of the exclusion processes begin.

6. It is important to provide assessment tools to see the effects of policies on problematic situations and not only on target populations, the solution to a problem does not always come from an action on a population but from a work on a social relationship.

102 J. Fastrès et J. Blairon, La prévention. Un concept en déperdition ?, Bruxelles, Luc Pire, 2002,
7. The implementation of effective preventive measures is significantly related to: level of knowledge and ability of timely mutual communication in the interests of the child of the specialists who work with children;

8. Preventive measures are more efficient if the child is allowed to make choices and take decisions about the type of participation in prevention programmes;

9. It is important for children to participate in the decision making process at their place of residence (local municipality). The specialists from the Inter-institutional work group have emphasised this method of participation as one of the most efficient forms of inclusive prevention;

10. Extra attention should be turned to the monitoring of expediency of services and activities provided for children and families in local municipalities, thus, for instance, none of the regions (pilot projects) have a practice of assessing the activities provided for children, which would be performed by an independent third party. Nevertheless, it has to be taken into account that the assessment and evidence-based recognition of efficiency of the provided services is a significant precondition, for instance, for a potential possibility of funding and improvement of the services.

11. In terms of best practices, a number of key principles stand out. There are:

   A. Understanding/ (culture, gender etc)
   B. Flexibility
   C. Collaboration
   D. Follow through/support
   E. Empowerment
   F. Opportunity
ANNEX:

COMPENDIUM OF BEST PRACTICES
AUSTRIA

Local communities and NGOs play a key role in juvenile crime prevention. This is done through a variety of projects, such as:

Burgenland: Freizeit sucht Grenzen (leisure seeking borders) is a workshop-based programme which intends to make juveniles deal critically with their own consumption habits. Additionally, there is also an outdoor-programme including elements from experimental education, adventure games and learning experiences involving the environment and nature.

Way out is a programme for juveniles aged 14 to 21 who show problematic consumption of drugs or alcohol and are first-time offenders. The program has been in use since 2002. The main aim is to avoid the affected youth’s potentially developing involvement in criminal acts and to point out alternatives instead. The project is conducted by the police and the organisation Neustart. Around 100 juveniles take part in that project every year.

Lower Austria has, besides projects which are similar to the projects in other provinces mentioned before, a focus on theatre projects. Two of these are called Forumtheater: Geh kum, Oida! (Come on, dude!) and Forumtheater: Whats Up. These pedagogic theatres show an unresolved conflict in an everyday situation in the context of alcohol consumption, nicotine or new media. The actors at Geh kum, Oida! are professionals who present a scene, while the adolescents can suggest solutions and intervene in the acting to try out different ways of conflict resolution. The main topics discussed are peer group pressure, identity development, and finding a balance between one’s social and individual self. In the Whats Up project, juveniles act themselves.

---

104 See http://www.suchtvorbeugung.net/suchtpraeventionsinfo/Schule (03.02.2014).
105 The German word “sucht” as a verb means ‘to look for’ or ‘to seek’, as a capitalized noun, however, it means ‘addiction’. The dittological name of the program was certainly intended.
106 See http://olga.pixelpoint.at/media/PPM_3DAK_suchtvorbeugung/~M1/784.3dak.pdf (03.02.2014)
Vienna, as Austria’s capital and by far biggest city, has the broadest offer of prevention projects. These programmes include GrenzGang, an outdoor-programme for school classes, MOVE, a short intervention against hazardous consumption patterns, Forumtheater: Mit Maß und Ziel – Es kotzt mich an, short films produced by juveniles concerning addictions and finally also small brochures called “pocket information” for juveniles about alcohol and cannabis.

In the field of preventive programmes that consider the juveniles’ cultural background, there is a project called Lebenswelten – Kulturauflauf (“living worlds – cultural mash”) which is conducted by Culture Factor Y – Autonomer Jugend- und Kulturverein. In this intercultural project, juveniles from different cultural and social backgrounds develop strategies for the prevention of violence by themselves with support from social and youth workers. The aim is that the juveniles become emotionally involved in their work on active or passive experiences of violence and reflect on them in group sessions and together with professionals. The project has its origins in Vorarlberg, where it was supported by local governments, the youth welfare administration and the province Vorarlberg. Today the project is not only used in Vorarlberg, but all over Austria.

The project Aggression-training and conflict resolution for juveniles involves juveniles aged 12-22, prison inmates in this age group, multiplicators in youth work and teachers. The course includes methods such as group work and single sessions, the development of communicative skills, musical therapy, ritual pedagogics, and Original Play (game theory after Fred Donaldson) and Silek (martial art from Sumatra). There are at least three sessions which take two to six hours each; long term interventions can take up to six months. The main aim is to find out about one’s own and other person’s borders and respect them. In its current form, the project has been in use for two years, with 8 years of development.
Peer mediation is used in secondary school (AHS, see chapter I.C.1.) and has been in use since 15 years. Pupils from 9th to 12th grade are trained as mediators for conflict resolution for pupils from 5th grade to 8th grade. Thereby, the pupils feel like they do not only cause problems, but can also contribute to their solution. The juveniles who are educated as mediators take part in a seminar with two days duration. Teachers also take part in this seminar and have the obligation to support the mediators in the following time. After the first seminar there is an additional seminar held annually. Additionally, brief training sessions on gender-sensitive conflict resolution, intercultural mediation, Forumtheater as well as constant supervision are offered.117

The ministry of education, art and culture financially supports crime prevention projects which are conducted in schools, for instance Friends: Kinder-, Jugend und Familienzentrum. The ministry also provides training and teaching material for the use in schools, e.g. on media and violence (see chapter II.2.2.2.)

The ministry of economy, family and youth supports some projects which do not target the prevention of crime directly, but focus more on establishing and maintaining appropriate conditions for a healthy and normal development of children and juveniles, i.e. Friends: Kinder-, Jugend und Familienzentrum. The ministry also co-financed, for example, the teaching materials on media and violence.

Furthermore the city governments and the provincial governments, especially the departments which are responsible for family and youth, also co-finance several projects. Some cities, for instance Vienna, have created their own departments for the prevention of drug abuse (Sucht- und Drogenkoordination Wien). Partly, the departments which are responsible for integration as well as those responsible for gender-related questions are (also financially) involved in projects. Mentionable examples are Gemeinsam Schlau Im Gemeindebau (City of Vienna), Lernhilfe Kirango (Integration department, Vienna).

EU-funding is provided for several projects, for instance for the project JUMMIG and for the training and teaching material used in school.

The majority of projects are conducted (and co-financed) by **NGOs**, which have all specialised in certain fields, for instance child protection, social work, street work, probation services, migration and integration, addiction and drugs. The amount of NGOs which are active in these fields is far too large to mention them here. Concerning their respective involvement in certain projects, see chapter II.2.2.

The **participants** themselves sometimes have to pay varying amounts of money which range from a symbolic fee up to higher sums. Especially training sessions for parents and teachers are usually not free.

The use of **volunteers** is common in several projects, especially those which offer support for juveniles and children at a very early stage, for instance at learning aid.
ENGLAND & WALES

Triage
The Triage scheme intends to assess and divert young people held in police stations following commission of low-level offenses. Through involving the YOT at an earlier point than in a standard process, police are advised of factors relevant to the decision to charge (including unmet welfare needs or other underlying problems). Young people who engage with interventions, typically including a restorative justice element, have their cases closed without a criminal record. An evaluation found promising stakeholder perceptions of the scheme, but reported insufficient data to establish effectiveness as consistent measurement was not included in pilot areas. Triage currently operates in 69 localities. See page 46 desk research.

The Ministry of Justice cited promising early findings from Triage initiatives, which bring YOT workers into police custody suites to assess young people and ensure information is shared between children’s or social services and the police, to help inform charging decisions and ensure that appropriate support is provided by agencies outside the criminal justice system.\textsuperscript{118}

Youth Justice Liaison and Diversion (YJLD).
YJLD aims to identify under 18-year-olds with mental health issues, learning disabilities, speech and communication problems, or other vulnerabilities as early as possible in the youth justice system and to divert them to supportive services outside the system or ensure that their needs are known and addressed within the system. An evaluation of the pilot schemes reported significant reductions in time to reoffending and improvements in mental health outcomes. YJLD operates in 36 pathfinder sites. The government has committed to make liaison and diversion services available nationally for all ages from 2014. For both of these schemes, there is no national model – operational details, importantly including the nature of the partnership between police and YOTs, are determined locally.\textsuperscript{34} While they appear to be promising, more outcomes evidence will be necessary to encourage and shape their development across the country. Meanwhile they may already be serving to advance a consensus that, where a young person’s offending is caused by underlying unmet needs, it can be more effective to address these needs than to take the case forward.

\textsuperscript{118} p8 HC report
The YJB is exploring means of further reducing the use of custody via the Youth Justice Reinvestment Pathfinders schemes, which commenced at the end of 2011 in Birmingham, North-East London, West London and West Yorkshire, to explore robust and credible alternatives to custody, thereby reducing its use. Under the scheme, the YJB invests a proportion of the central custody budget in local authority schemes, on the basis that those authorities reduce their use of custody by an agreed amount over a two-year period. Submissions to our inquiry were positive about the aims and designs of the schemes. For example, the Howard League praised the fact that they draw together agencies locally from both within and without the criminal justice tramlines. By their nature, they focus on the most difficult children in the system, which mitigates the risk of cherry-picking inherent to some of the payment by results models in the adult system.

In addition to these better-known diversion schemes, individual YOTs have an array of diversion practices and programmes tailored to meet their local circumstances. The Youth Justice Board has a statutory duty to “identify, to make known and to promote good practice”35 and maintains an “Effective Practice Library”36 intended to satisfy this requirement.
SWEDEN

Social Action Groups

Gang criminality is a rising problem in Sweden and all actors are now involved in helping youth with some kind of exit programs. But the police alone cannot handle crime problem, there are factors underlying crime and disorder in the community that cannot be handled solely through arrest, prosecution and incarceration. Across Europe, North America and Australasia crime prevention has become intimately bound up with the proliferation of a partnership approach where various relevant agencies, organizations and the public are summoned into being active co-producers of crime prevention and public safety, Crawford (1998). Sweden is no exception and has not been left behind in this regard, a very good example of this partnership approach in Social Action Groups or SIG (Sociala insatsgrupperna). It is an initiative from the government from 2012 that brings together the police, social services, the schools, the unemployment agency, the local business actors and the civil society. The initiative gives the groups the mission to cooperate in order to propose the criminal youth individual support that fits just his/her situation. The social services have the head responsibility for the work of the group, in the city where the youth lives. The goal of this initiative is to fight recruitment to criminality and gangs and to help youth who already started a career but want to leave it. Those social groups are really about quick and concrete actions and the success is really based on the cooperation between different authorities.

Information platform - SSPF

A useful complement to the social action groups is the forum for information exchange SSPF between schools (inclusive extra curricular activities), social services and the police. This forum was launched in Gothenburg. The exchange of information about kids in a risk-zone has always been considered as relevant. But this forum goes deeper and allows the functioning of a settled structure with continuous information on youth that drop from schools, commit offenses, have an addiction or live in dysfunctional relations or homes. All neighborhoods in the city of Gothenburg have access to this system. But this system is also based on the authorization given by the parents to the three instances to brake the usual secrecy and to share information about their kid.
Young KRIS projects

This organisation started as a project with grants from the Swedish Inheritance Fund. It has developed fast and successfully and is since 2010 an independent organisation. The uniqueness of Young KRIS is that this organisation was created by youths and for youths, a truly peers-to-peers organisation. The organisation that is present in 14 cities around Sweden offers the youth a meeting place, a new social network free from drugs/alcohol and criminality (zero tolerance) and offers support for youth that want to change their lives or to get a new start. The organisation programs are based on tools that can be adapted to any individual’s situation. They do not give the youth “ready-to-go” solutions but offer them tools to find what they want to achieve and how to be helped on the way.

The organisation offers its members early prevention actions that aim to offer youth very early actions in cooperation with the authorities. Young KRIS offers the youth a contact person 1 and if it is necessary the contact person will be affected to this youth and follow him/her under 3 months. The social services are paying for this service. When a youth commit an offence is of utmost importance to act as quickly as possible to “stop the process” and discourage the youth to continue on that path. This method is very successful but requires high collaboration with the police, the social services, the prosecutor, the probation services, etc. A working group where all the actors are represented is available in all cities where the early intervention project is run.

The early intervention is available to youth between 13 and 25 that:

- Are released after trial or from custody
- Are suspected of drug offenses and released from custody after drug testing
- Are suspected of other offenses and released after interrogation

Mentors in Violence Prevention – MVP

This is also a project financed by the Swedish Inheritance found and the owner of the project is the organisation called men for gender equality (män för jämställdhet – MFJ). The long-term objective is to reduce gender-based violence, including sexual, homophobic and dating violence. The mid-term objective is to break the culture of passiveness and silence around violence and replace it by social norms of caring, responsibility and leadership. The short-term objective is to increase the readiness for and the frequency of bystander interventions among youth and adults working with
youth. The universal and primary violence prevention program Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) is implemented by staff and youth within the institution/organization itself. Guidance, training and support are provided by Freedom from Violence, a branch of Men for Gender Equality Sweden.
Development of Restorative Practice Justice in Education in Scotland

The behaviour of children is a topic of enduring public interest and concern. It is generally accepted that the ending of corporal punishment signaled a move towards more humane and child-centered educational systems in schools, and that, as schools developed ‘behaviour management’ systems to replace older ‘discipline’ systems, significant progress has been made to this end. As some schools in the UK and internationally have more recently begun to embrace ideas about Restorative Practices in education (McCluskey and others, 2011; Kane and others, 2008) this progress seems set to continue and maintain momentum.

At the same time, however, national and international statistics and research continue to point to significant challenges in education. There are concerns about high levels of disruption, disaffection, truancy and exclusion, but also about the disproportionate over-representation of some marginalised and vulnerable groups in related statistics. The first joint report from the UK Children’s Commissioners to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (2008) produced a long list of ‘good things’ but also of ‘bad things about being a child’ in the four countries of the UK. Alexander’s recent large-scale study of primary education in England also noted ‘deep anxiety about the condition of childhood today and the society and world in which children are growing up’ (2009, p.10).

Restorative Practices have provided one highly effective response to the challenges faced by schools in these difficult times. This approach is described briefly below, with examples of ways in which schools can develop it through the curriculum, the use of language, mediation processes and meetings.

Schools looking for strategies to address disaffection, behaviour difficulties and violence were attracted by the key ideas:

- the need to restore good relationships when there has been conflict or harm; and
- develop a school ethos, policies and procedures that reduce the possibilities of such conflict and harm.

It is an approach that acknowledges that schooling is an increasingly complex task, with
increasingly wider demands on schools in a diverse world and that teachers’ work can be challenging and stressful.

**What are Restorative Practices? Some Definitions.**

It is important to emphasise that there is a variety of practices, with differing levels of formality; many terms are used flexibly in different contexts, as practitioners make the terms real in their own practice and settings. People in schools (pupils, teachers, managers, classroom assistants, janitors, dinner staff, educational psychologists, parents…) bring varied and sometimes conflicting values, experiences and expectations. Government, local authorities and parents can make differing demands of schools so schools have to manage these and promote effective and improved learning while also providing supportive pastoral care. Restorative Practices can address these differences and be supportive to all those involved; for example they can be experienced as helpful by both staff and pupils. Restorative Practices were argued to be, not so much as an entirely new approach for innovation stressed schools, but one that does offer a framework within which existing good practice can build and develop. There is compatibility with other recent initiatives such as Staged Intervention, emotional literacy/empathy development and also to Solution Focused or person centered planning approaches; it was seen to add a new dimension to thinking and practice for Inclusion.

Restorative Practices, as developed in Scotland, therefore involved a set of principles, strategies and skills. The underpinning principles include:

- The importance of fostering social relationships in a school community of mutual engagement
- Responsibility and accountability for one’s own actions and their impact on others
- Respect for other people, their views and feelings
- Empathy with the feelings of others affected by own actions
- Fairness
- Commitment to equitable process
- Active involvement of everyone in school with decisions about their own lives
- Issues of conflict and difficulty returned to the participants rather than behaviour
- pathologised
- A willingness to create opportunities for reflective change in pupils and staff.
Restorative Practices emphasize the human wish to feel safe, to belong, to be respected and to understand and have positive relationships with others. They acknowledge the potential of social and experiential learning approaches that enable pupils (and staff) to understand, and learn to manage, their own behaviour. They recognise the fundamental importance in schools of both effective support and clear control and boundaries. Practices range on a continuum from whole school approaches to those used in more challenging situations or with individual students. They include:

**Restorative ethos building**

Staff and pupils discuss and work on improving school ethos, culture and climate. Features of a restorative ethos would include:

- All participants in the school understand the importance of preventing harm to others and of resolving harm and conflict in helpful, supportive and restorative ways.
- Respect between staff and pupils and among pupils
- Pupils and staff feel included and treated equitably
- All feel that school processes are carried out with fairness and justice
- Pupils and staff feel safe and happy.

**Curriculum focus on relationship/conflict prevention** This involves either particular programmes, or a permeative approach to Personal and Social Education, that aim to promote social skills that avoid conflict and harm and enable pupils (and staff) to learn restorative strategies.

**Restorative language and scripts** Early work on restorative justice emphasised the use of restorative scripts. They derived from a particular theoretical perspective on psychotherapy, explaining how we make sense of our histories and organise our emotional lives (Tomkins 1991) but have become used in a broader way. Such scripts were often used by a conference co-ordinator, using the following or similar questions:

- *What happened?*
- *What were you thinking at the time?*
- *What have you thought about since?*
- *Who has been affected by what you did?*
- *In what way?*
• What do you think you need to do to make things right?

Such scripts help to structure and enable the Restorative approach, to make the process clear and standard, to enable participants to experience a feeling of responsibility. Participants would be familiar with the script before the conference. In some schools such scripts are used quite formally in Conferences. In others they become a pocket-sized guide for staff and sometimes also for children, a resource for easy reference in case of need, used in a range of both formal and informal settings, for example in the playground. The use of a script can reinforce knowledge and awareness as well as practice, according to the principle of using language to shape cognition and values. It can also be very helpful, in an emotionally charged situation with a high potential for conflict amplification, to have a set of ready, calm words practised.

Restorative language is broader than the idea of a script and involves staff reflecting generally on their use of language in school, and promoting effective listening, open-ended questioning, empathy and using non-judgmental words. It involves incorporating a Restorative approach into the daily language of school interaction. ‘People's identities are created through the ways they are spoken about by others, and in the ways they learn to speak about themselves’ (Drewery 2013) (http://www.waikato.ac.nz/wmier/publications/books/restorative-practices-for-schools)

Restorative enquiry is described as the starting point for all Restorative processes involving active non-judgmental, listening. It is intended to illuminate the problem or situation. The process can be used with one person to help them reflect on a situation and find ways for forward for themselves. It is also useful before and during face-to-face meetings (Transforming Conflict 2006). Restorative Enquiry involves curiosity: ‘How do you feel about that?’ It can involve actively owning a problem: ‘I have a problem that I would like to discuss’. ‘Can I tell you what happened from my perspective?’ and aims to resolve issues: ‘Why don’t you tell me how you see things. I’ll do the same and then we can try and sort this out.’ Restorative Enquiry also describes a way of listening and responding to other people’s points of view. It also involves the use of open body language, listening with empathy and listening for feelings and needs. The listener takes a neutral perspective and aims to help the other person identify what needs to be done in order to put things right or move on. In a school setting this could include a discussion between a teacher and a student following an incident that has caused concern to either person.
Restorative conversations or Restorative discussion happen when someone uses the skills and language of Restorative language and Enquiry in an informal conversation, for example a teacher with a pupil in a corridor. Skills include expressing and listening for feelings and needs, and understanding why each has acted the way they have (Transforming Conflict 2006).

Mediation This is particularly useful when two or more people believe the other person(s) may be the cause of the problem or has caused harm. The mediator should remain impartial, and helps both sides to consider the problem as a shared one that needs a joint solution. This can be undertaken by adults in school and by trained pupils acting as Peer mediators. It may also involve shuttle mediation.

Circles - checking in and problem-solving circles The term circle is used in a number of different ways, although there may be common ideas and practices. Also confusingly the terms conference and circle are sometimes used interchangeably. The latter sometimes simply refers to the style of organisation of a meeting or conference; for example Thorsborne and Vinegrad say that ‘meetings/conferences are conducted in a circle’ (2004: 12). In this context the term circle means that people sit round in a physical circle, there are some ground rules about listening and not interrupting and the coordinator acts in a facilitative rather than directive manner, often using a talking piece and a script.

In Scotland many primary teachers will be familiar with Circle Time, which is aimed at whole classes and has a general aim of promoting good relations within the classroom, fostering self-esteem, respect and developing communication skills. Circle time is intended to happen in a positive, warm and confidential context, often using strategies like a talking piece or games and exercises. Circle time is not mainly about solving particular issues or discipline problems. In some classrooms staff operate ‘checking-in’ and ‘checking-out’ circles, to start or finish the day or lesson, to set an open climate, to ensure good communication, or to establish what the class thought of a lesson. Such circles can also be used then reactively to deal with a problematic incident in class (Wachtel, 2004). Problem-solving circles differ, in most views, from meetings or conferences in that they tend not to have such a formal structure - they may be used in a classroom or with a small group and may focus on a general difficulty as well as than a particular incident. They may not use formal script but make a general democratic invitation to members to address the issue or difficulty facilitated in the style discussed above. They are more informal than
meetings or conferences. More ‘healing’ or therapeutic circles/groups or social skills small groups also happen in schools, focusing on particular difficulties experienced or presented by pupils. Their structure and facilitative style has much in common with restorative circles.

**Restorative meetings, informal conferences, classroom conferences and mini-conferences**

Restorative meetings often involve taking a Restorative approach or introducing Restorative practices to meetings that would already happen in schools, eg case reviews, meetings with parents, reintegration after exclusion and pupil councils. These meetings will be conducted using Restorative principles and language, although they may have wider purposes than addressing conflict or harm. **Informal conferences**, sometimes called corridor conferences occur when a group of people gather to address an issue, using methods of Restorative Enquiry, perhaps using a script, to discuss and resolve an issue. For example if there has been difficulty among a group of pupils in class a teacher might ask them to come out of the classroom and hold an informal conference. **Classroom conferences** occur in response to issues in a whole class, for example a ‘disruptive’ class. This is prepared for and in many ways structured like a conference, but includes all the class members, who are willing to participate. **Mini-Conferences** have some of same features of conferences, for example a formal structure and script, however they are not on the same scale as a full Conference and may not include all relevant personnel or supporters. **Conferences** involve those who may have been involved in conflict or caused harm or distress, meeting formally in a pre-arranged conference with those affected and ideally with key others involved, such as peers and or families. The purpose of such conferences is to allow all parties to be heard, to find ways to restore and repair relationships and prevent future harm.

In practice it can be quite difficult to make definite distinctions between the different practices - boundaries and definitions are somewhat blurred and terms used interchangeably.

**Evaluation of Restorative Practices**

In 2004, the Scottish Executive funded a pilot project on RP in three local authority areas, commissioning a team based at Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities to carry out a two-year evaluation in 18 pilot schools. Gillean McCluskey was involved in the original evaluation and its follow up (Restorative Practices in Three Scottish Councils: Final Report of the Evaluation of the First Two Years of the Pilot Projects 2004 – 2006 (Kane et al 2007) and Restorative Practice Pilots and Approaches in Scotland - Follow Up (Lloyd and McCluskey 2009). Together, these comprise the
largest evaluation of Restorative Practices undertaken to date in the UK\textsuperscript{119}. The design and methods used in the evaluation were negotiated throughout the research period with a range of stakeholders, including the funders, the local authorities and key school personnel. The findings of Restorative Practices evaluations were very positive, with most schools, and in particular primary schools, making significant progress in key areas of school discipline and staff and pupils relationships.

As a result of these positive findings, the Scottish Government has supported local authorities and schools nationally to introduce Restorative Practices through the work of its Behaviour, Rights and Wellbeing team, led by Maggie Fallon and based within Education Scotland

**Edinburgh Pre Referral Screening (PRS)**

Pre Referral Screening (PRS) began in Edinburgh in July 2008. The model was developed in response to the Scottish Government’s principle to ensure children and young people receive the help they need, when they need it and are only referred to the Scottish Children’s Reporter Administration (SCRA) when compulsory measures are necessary. This is underpinned by the Scottish Governments’ *Getting it Right for Every Child* approach.

The aim of PRS is to divert young people involved in offending behaviour to appropriate interventions through partner agencies that ensure those children and young people receive the help they need, when they need it.

The objectives are:

\textsuperscript{119} Scotland is a small country, with a population of 5.12 million. It is a semi-autonomous part of the UK with its own Parliament and Government since 1999, responsible for domestic legislation and policy on education, social welfare, justice and the environment. The Government in London remains responsible for international affairs, defence, broad economic aspects and equal opportunities. Recent elections in Scotland returned a Scottish Nationalist Government, creating the possibility of disagreements with the Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition administration in the UK Parliament. A referendum on 18 Sept 2014 will give Scotland the opportunity to vote for independence from the UK. A third of Scottish children live in families whose average income is less than 50% of the British average income.
• To ensure young people are only referred to the Children’s Hearing system where it is likely that compulsory measures may be required
• To support a faster, more focused and appropriate response to young people who have been reported for offending
• To promote better information sharing and consistency in decision making

What is Pre Referral Screening?

The Pre Referral Screening (PRS) is a weekly operational group meeting of key partners, including police, social work, community safety, education and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). They meet to discuss young people aged 8 to 17 years who have been reported for an offence. Where appropriate, the young people discussed will be diverted from the Scottish Children’s Reporter Association or the Procurator Fiscal to professional services.

An information sharing protocol has been agreed between partners. Representatives from partner agencies who attend the PRS meeting have the authority to allocate the resources identified.

Edinburgh PRS partner agencies are:

• Police Scotland - Juvenile Liaison Officer
• City of Edinburgh Council Children and Families – Team Leader, Youth Offending Service
• City of Edinburgh Council Children and Families – Senior Education Welfare Officer, Education Welfare Service (EWS)
• City of Edinburgh Council Children and Families – Team Leader, Early Intervention Service
• City of Edinburgh Council Services for Communities – Community Safety Officer
• National Health Service Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) – Mental Health worker

The Pre Referral Screening process

Each week the Police Juvenile Liaison Officer screen all juvenile offence notifications forms, commonly referred to as TA83’s that have been submitted by officers across Edinburgh.

The Juvenile Liaison Officer sends a list of young people to be discussed at the PRS to representatives for individual agency database checks. Information available for each case forms
the basis for the weekly PRS discussion. The following options are available to the PRS for every case: What can the PRS decide to do?

With the information available the following options are considered;

✓ Police: the case is retained by Police Scotland to issue a Police Warning or restorative justice warning

✓ Community Safety: The young person is diverted to Community Safety who may address the offence by issuing a warning letter, Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) or community based activity.

✓ Education: The young person is diverted to the Education Welfare Service for the issues to be addressed either by the Education Welfare Officer or school staff. Information is passed to the head teacher and kept on the pupil's school record.

✓ Diversion to either Youth Offending Service or Social Work practice team.

✓ Referral to the Children’s Reporter.

The PRS does not discuss young people when;

- The case has been jointly reported to the Scottish Children’s Reporter Association (SCRA) and Procurator Fiscal

- The case is currently open to SCRA and being investigated

In August 2012 the criteria for young people discussed at PRS was widened to include those on supervision, where appropriate. The criteria was widened further in 2013 with the introduction of 16 and 17 year olds, this development was supported by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Lord Advocate who provided clear guidance on cases which were appropriate for diversion via PRS.

**What impact has the PRS had so far?**

The PRS has had a significant impact in the number of young people referred to the Children’s Reporter – there has been a 31% reduction in referrals on offence grounds between 2008 and
2012. This has led to a reduction in the number of report requests from the Children’s Reporter and thus helped to ensure that services for young people involved in offending and antisocial behaviour are provided in an appropriate, proportionate and timely manner.

**Number of young people referred to SCRA on offence grounds in Edinburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children referred to SCRA on offence grounds in Edinburgh</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>PRS introduced in June 2008</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth Offending Service 2013

**What makes PRS work?**

“All key professionals being around the table means we share responsibility in making sure all the needs of the child are met.” (Janine McGowan, Team Leader Youth Offending Service)

Anecdotal evidence suggests PRS success lies in practice that supports an holistic view of the child, where the child’s wellbeing is discussed alongside their deeds, by a number of key agencies at an early point in offending behaviour.

A potential outcome of the process is partner agencies taking responsibility to support a young person at an early stage of intervention - prior to their being referred to the Children’s Reporter, where previously they may have waited to become involved until after the Children’s Hearing or investigation by the report via a report request from social work. An increased level of information sharing provides a forum for improved and informed decision making (and recording), enabling timely and appropriate action without drawing young people inappropriately into the formal criminal justice system, or children hearing system.
Percentage of reports taken off table by partner agencies

Source: Youth Offending Service 2013

Summary:
PRS is now a well established model involving police, social work, education, community safety and health colleagues in Edinburgh. Since its implementation in 2008, PRS has resulted in a significant reduction in the number of children referred to SCRA on offence grounds. PRS is GIRFEC compliant, identifying which outcome and/or which service best meets the needs of the child.
An increase in the number of young people and Police Juvenile Offence Reports discussed at PRS is anticipated in the coming year due to the widening of the PRS criteria which will now include:
  o Children subject to a Supervision Order;
  o 16/17 year olds who were previously referred to the Procurator Fiscal Service.

References:
Youth Offending 2013 Edinburgh’s Pre Referral Screening - Annual Summary April 2012 to March 2013. City of Edinburgh Council
Practices to be developed and positive examples in the field of children and youth crime prevention

Acknowledging that practical experience is one of the best means to convince specialists and develop a new policy, the project120 “Building a Support System to Prevent Juvenile Delinquency” was initiated in 2011. The objectives of the project were to reduce risks of exclusion for children with deviations in social behaviour and to create a safe environment for a successful development of these children in rural regions of Latvia (a), to create and approbate a sustainable support system for the prevention of juvenile offences suitable for the specific needs of various regions of Latvia involving municipal specialists, members of society and children themselves in this social process (b); to promote a philosophy of change in the work with children of social risk groups: to develop a supportive and restorative approach instead of punitive approach used by the specialists of children’s affairs working with children in all the interested institutions (c).

Within the project, it was planned to work with children from risk groups thus being under increased threat of committing crime and causing harm to the community. In fact, they were children already noticed by the police for their actions, however, also the condition was taken into account that not only the police but also information from schools, social service, custody court and other institutions may indicate to the delinquency risks. It was planned to involve children from populated areas away from the big cities because there are less resources for those children and their families to spend for various social problems. The project was implemented involving children from needy or low-income families (a), families with addicted parents (b), truant and vagrant children. The target group included also children who have problems in acquiring education or whose parents had left the country for economic reasons to work abroad.

Taking into account that the work of the state and local municipalities is not sufficiently coordinated, moreover, their officials usually complain on the lack of financial resources and do not see the existing possibilities to solve problems with available resources, the implementation of the project was ensured by involving active members of local communities who shared their experience and knowledge and helped children to discover new opportunities, motivated them for spending time in socially favourable activities thus keeping them away from roguery. The project

involved a group of 9 seniors to contribute by communicating with youth within their community, thus ensuring the sustainability of these relationships.

The needs of the children target groups involved in the project were identified by recognising their social behaviour risks – using risk and needs assessment tools specially designed for this intention and making a progress report for each child at the end of the project. The specific nature of the project objectives envisaged that all the potential participant groups of children have social behaviour risks but their reasons are different, for instance, lack of financial resources; objective or subjective obstacles in acquiring education; unemployment; fact of the commitment of a crime and inability to manage one’s personality; experience of dependence and violence; inability to solve problems in an appropriate manner. The needs of child to be involved in each project activity were identified individually by the project Inter-institutional work group elaborating an individual work plan for each child. At the same time, the inter-institutional work group had a task to acknowledge resources available in their municipalities that could be used for the compilation of the catalogue of useful activities for children.

At the beginning of the project it was planned that by involving children in socially useful activities, introducing them with the possibilities to organise their free time in an interesting manner, demonstrating real interest in their lives, delinquency risks would decrease significantly. Involved in project activities, children would acquire new knowledge and skills, broaden their horizon, and get motivation to act for their future to achieve important and useful goals. During the project, monitoring was carried out and a research was performed. In 18 months of the project more than 250 children were involved and Support systems for juvenile prevention were established in three local municipalities in Latvia. The Support systems included:

a) Inter-institutional cooperation model. It means that every local municipality has developed a cooperation model among institutions that work with and for children. The implementation of this model enhanced the situations when specialists solve problems of particular children avoiding matters of form in issues where they can be left out.

b) Regional work groups were one of the most significant components of the Inter-institutional cooperation model. Within its functions, various specialists from various institutions who work with children on daily basis met twice a month in each of the project

implementation sites. The method worked for the interests of each child as the child and his/her parents did not have to go to innumerable institutions to solve their problems – specialists gathered around the child and made common effort to find the best solution.

c) Accessibility to the procedure of selection of children and youth groups. Within the project, children were involved in useful activities, according to their risks and needs, identified beforehand. The project and its resources were planned for youth with low risk social behaviour problems, therefore the majority of project activities were based on group work, not individual work.

d) Risk and needs assessment was one of the most significant tasks of the Regional work group: in order to determine whether the activities envisaged in the project could be useful for the child, his/her behavioural risks and needs to eliminate these risks were identified. As the result, it was realised that many children have significantly higher social behaviour risks than it was expected. Taking into account that there were no alternatives for work with those children at the project implementation sites or the possibilities to perform individual preventive work were limited, the children were involved in the project elaborating an individualised plan.

e) Catalogue of useful activities for minors. There is no doubt that each local municipality has some kind of resources to use as a basis for the organisation of preventive work. However, at the initial stage of project planning it was realised that very often local municipalities have not batched all the possibilities of preventive work with children. Due to that, the Catalogue of Activities was created to offer appropriate activities to the child according to his/her risk and needs assessment, including individual prevention.

The study\textsuperscript{122} revealed project results admitting that the Inter-institutional cooperation model is a method of children’s right protection and delinquency prevention which is suitable to use at the child’s place of residence and is focused on the cooperation of specialists from various institutions for the improvement of the particular child’s living environment. At the same time, inter-institutional cooperation allows involving the child’s parents and family, as well as listening to the child’s opinion. If the inter-institutional cooperation among the specialists from law enforcement agencies, local municipalities, specialists of children’s affairs and other practitioners is organised

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid, p.53.
setting topical priorities for a particular child and taking into account his/her needs, all specialists involved in the Inter-institutional work group can be theoretically divided into three categories: early prevention providers – preferably the closest people to the child – social service, parents and family, school, family doctor (GP), Children and youth centre, specialist of children’s rights (a), general prevention providers – preferably the more distant – custody court, police (b), and institutions involved in special prevention – court, prosecutor’s office, State Probation Service and prison (c). On the basis of the mentioned, it is possible to conclude – if level (a) specialists from the Inter-institutional working group perform their duties with the highest quality, there is no need to involve level (b) and (c) specialists. It proves that inter-institutional cooperation is a significant segment of early prevention work – the earlier the problem is identified and intervention is performed, the less capacity is needed from the involved institutions.

At the same time, several problems were discovered during the implementation of the project: project activities (interventions) were planned only for children, allocating insufficiently active role for their parents (a); risk and needs analysis was performed only for the child, not the family in general (b). Due to that, a situation occurred when the cooperation with parents as informers on the child’s needs often became formal and a row of problems which caused the child’s antisocial behaviour risk was not identified at all. Therefore, when planning preventive group or individual activities and performing children assessment, a significant and active role has to be allocated to the children’s parents and families. Besides, it has to be taken into account that the younger is the child, the greater has to be the role of his/her parents and family in any prevention activities. At the same time, it has to be emphasised that the second most important role after parents and family belongs to the attitude of the specialists at educational institutions (teachers, pedagogues, educators in general) towards the child’s involvement in preventive programmes. Educators and the class teacher of the child in particular have to be very well informed about the prevention programme or intervention, and take active participation in it.

The evaluation of the project results\(^{123}\) included the following main conclusions: Prevention is a set of purposefully performed activities in the child’s daily life – including the planning of the free time, elimination of the obstacles to access sport and healthy lifestyle activities, as well as individual and group interventions. The establishment of prevention system is a long-term activity which has to be carried out by the government and specialists in the field who work with children and families on daily basis, together. Educational institutions play a very significant role, as well.

It is necessary to introduce tools which would influence parental behaviour, for instance, supportive programmes for children together with their parents, and to control their implementation thus leaving the termination of parental rights as the last influential measure. The lack of a common legal enactment is obvious in Latvia which would provide for all the procedures with minors – both preventive, and reactive. The current situation when all the legal enactments that stipulate juvenile justice framework in Latvia are fragmented into three separate legal enactments: Latvian Administrative Violations Code\textsuperscript{124}, Criminal Law\textsuperscript{125} and the law “On Application of Compulsory Measures of a Correctional Nature to Children\textsuperscript{126}”, whereas early prevention regulation is aloof – in the Protection of the Rights of the Child Law\textsuperscript{127}, does not serve the interests of qualitative and safe development of the child and the family. Children and parents occurring in the middle of such legally and institutionally complicated system most probably would feel helpless and fearful, but not strengthened. Prevention is a simultaneous task of the state and the local municipality, where the state is responsible for prevention planning, financial support, providing information to the society, but the local municipalities organise individual preventive work, at the same time having the preventive work of state and local municipalities coordinated in a professional manner.

Taking into account the significant role of early prevention measures and the fact that this form of prevention is not highly developed in Latvia, at the end of 2013 PROVIDUS initiated the project “Reducing youth at risk numbers: modelling early childhood intervention approaches\textsuperscript{128}”. The project has the objective to develop innovative methods for preventive work to create inclusive environment for children at pre-school and primary school age and their families.

It is planned that the implementation of the project activities would: reduce social exclusion risks for children at pre-school and primary school age with early social behaviour disorders and create a safe environment for a successful development of those children in rural regions of Latvia (a); create and verify in practice a system for the recognition and elimination of children’s early

\textsuperscript{127} Protection of the Rights of the Child Law, http://ej.uz/4rdo (last visited on 25.05.2014).
behaviour risks, involving pre-school and primary school teachers, parents, local municipality specialists, members of local community, as well as children themselves (b); promote philosophy of changes in work with children at pre-school and primary school age with antisocial behaviour risks (c); create supportive and restorative instead of punitive approach in work with children performed by the specialists of children’s affairs and specialists from other institutions (d); strengthen the cooperation among the parents of the child and pre-school and primary school teachers in order to identify and prevent early behaviour risks for children at pre-school and primary school age; establish inter-institutional cooperation platform for preventive work and early interventions (e).

In order to provide assistance and support to parents in children upbringing, the project envisages the following results in three local municipalities of Latvia involved in the project – Saldus, Kuldiga and Cesis: a multi-disciplinary cooperation model will be developed (1) among the specialists of pre-school, primary school, local municipality and NGOs, with the aim to elaborate and implement in practice methodology suitable for local needs for early recognition and prevention of children’s social behaviour risks (2), thus enhancing the cooperation with children’s parents or persons substituting for them. It is planned that the developed cooperation model and methodology will be created to be sustainable and usable in other regions of Latvia.

The methodology for the early identification of children’s social behaviour risks and cooperation with parents will be elaborated during the performance of practical work and analysis – in 2 year time 15 lessons will be held for children and their parents involved in the project from pre-schools and primary schools. In order to enhance cooperation among institutions and qualitative decision-making process to support families with children inter-institutional work groups (IWG) are planned (SDG) (3) with the core consisting of each region’s NGOs members working in the field of children’s rights protection, pre-school and primary school specialists, and state and local municipality specialists. Two of the regions involved in the project (Saldus and Cesis) have already a working IWG (or RWG – regional work group) for the work with at-risk youth and children from previous projects – therefore pre-school and primary school specialists will establish a subgroup of the existing inter-institutional group, but in Kuldiga it will be a totally new experience.

One of the main tasks for IWG is to provide mutual support for colleagues in solving professional issues; therefore it is important that problems identified in regions are discussed also on the interregional level. The project envisages Failure Reduction Strategy (FRS) tool or regular consultations with colleagues (4). The aim of regular consultations with colleagues or FRS – to
ensure specialists with the possibility to solve professional problems in cooperation with colleagues from other regions and reduce failures at work, as well as acquire new skills and knowledge in the field of early prevention. In addition, other skills and knowledge developing activities for specialists are also planned in the project – the elaboration of study-based publications on early prevention issues and wider international forums for practitioners and specialists in the field.

It is planned to identify best practices in the field of early prevention with the help of specialists from Norway, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Estonia and Belgium. Right now\textsuperscript{129}, the project has been started and more than 50 children from three preschools and three primary schools are involved in it, as well as their pedagogues and parents. During the whole project, children and their parents have a possibility to participate in activities that are appropriate for their needs, both individually and in groups. Children and their parents’ needs are assessed using a special needs assessment tool. At the moment, monitoring activities are performed in the project and the first results show that children and their parents gladly participate in early prevention group activities and a significantly wider target group than planned will be reached. Project results will be summarised\textsuperscript{130} at its final stage and included in the monitoring report which will be available in English and Latvian.

\textsuperscript{129} Author’s note: the project implementation time is from January 7, 2013, to January 6, 2015, more information is available in Latvian: \url{http://www.providus.lv/public/27875.html} and in English: \url{http://www.providus.lv/public/27876.html} (last visited on 25.05.2014).

\textsuperscript{130} Author’s note: Monitoring report on the practice to be developed in this project will be publicly available in September 2015.
BELGIUM

School Reintegration services (SASS)

School reintegration services can host excluded pupils or re-oriented pupils during daytime for a six month period, as an alternative to compulsory education.

The objective is to bring the Young person back to a scholar structure or a vocational training system and for its life to come back to its « normal course.

A 2004 decree131 reinforces the SAS system: it puts up 12 structures of the type on the French Community territory and gives them mission to « give a social, educational and teaching help » to dropped out minors. By social, educational and teaching help, one must understand any form of help or action that allows to make these minors’ conditions of development and learning better when they are jeopardised either by the child’s behaviour or by difficulties met by his parents or the persons having parental care over him in order to realise their parental obligations » (art 19).

Obviously, these missions are related to the ones of Youth Care. SAS are indeed financed 50% by the Youth Care budget, and 50% by Education.

The decree also sets up the way of financing SAS and their obligations. Every structure is given 5 full-time educators. The maximal authorised number of youngsters to be hosted for a six months period is 20 and the global budget is approximately 350.000 euros per year for each SAS.

The BRAVVO example

Since 2004, Brussels city has put up an original prevention platform under the form of a non-profit organisation (asbl Bravvo). It holds and manages all the city budgets dedicated to prevention polities (in a broad sense) and the total workforce in charge of these policies. Under the direct responsabilily of the town council’s politicians and of the policy-makers in social care (social action public centre), the platform is directed by the prevention officer mandated within the PSSP (strategic security and prevention plan).

Bravvo’s activities, as well as its funding, are mixed, at the cutting edge of social policies and security policies. The platform aims at improving urban security, struggling against social exclusion and developing the quality of life in town.

131 May 12 2004 Decree on different struggle measures against school dropout, exclusion and violence in school.
Bravvo must implement an « integrated » prevention policy, which means a set of actions that make a link between situational crime prevention and a more social prevention.

Furthermore, a special organ called « general coordination » is there to ensure coherence between actions and the correct use of resources. General coordination also manages the partnerships with local stakeholders, in accordance with the PSSP’s goals. As the platform ensures that all the projects, fundings and actors get integrated in one single policy, its role is particularly crucial in integrating federal plans and regional plans for prevention.

A "Finance Service" is responsible for the smooth running of the financial tasks including its administrative and contractual aspects. The diversity of sources of funding and subsidies makes the financial management of the association complex. The "Finance Service" follows various procedures in the procurement of goods and services that are necessary for the association’s running. It maintains accounting and gather the supporting documents for the payment of state and region subsidies. The cell also provides control on the budgets’management by implementing monitoring tools.

Funding sources are multiple. The most important part of the them comes from the PSSP, from the Regional Prevention Plan, the Big Cities Program, the "European Summits" Fund, the district contracts. You should also add the "employment aid" provided by the federal level that allows the financing of « town guards ».

Bravvo now has more than 240 workers. Bravvo conducts its activities of integrated prevention along the following principal axes of intervention:

**Transverse forces**

- In the Belgian context, the great strength of Bravvo is to be a structure that can sustain existing projects despite regular changes in subsidy programs, institutional uncertainties or changes in priorities of the subsidising authorities. Bravvo is guaranteed to develop long-term consistent policies by aggregating various means in a common policy that is approved by the local political authorities.
Bravvo placing itself at the intersection of social action in neighborhoods, socio-cultural action, political participation and strengthening of the dialogue, is able to develop innovative functions in the field of prevention (manager of public tranquility, social mediator ...). This unique position allows to create new functions, new jobs that meet needs but wouldn’t be imaginable in a specialised vision of the social action.

- The strong link between a diagnosis phase, data collection, project implementation and their evaluation. Bravvo is very careful to professionalise social intervention, to constantly build projects based on field observations and assess their effects also on the basis of observations. This process needs to be strengthened in future years through better harvesting of field observations and their formalisation via computerisation, better monitoring of the evolution of the treatment of problems identified in the field and finally through the creation of a Bravvo Observatory (diagnosis, evaluation and methodologies)

"Best Practices"
- General attention to worker training, internal communication and formalisation of practices. Bravvo has implemented a policy of training addressed to all workers, both individually (more than 12,000 hours of training in 2011) or transverse (Interservices).

Bravvo also systematises the contacts between the different teams, thereby strengthening cohesion, information exchange, cross-cutting approach. Inter-disciplinary meetings, organised every six weeks in six target neighborhoods, form the heart of the exchange policy. Given the complexity of the themes that the agents face (wandering people, occupation of public space, acts of delinquency, substance abuse indices, etc.), these meetings enable the development of new projects, the relay of issues and observations, internally and to specialised services, and finally, openness to partners and initiation of workers to new practices.

In each of its areas of focus, Bravvo sets up spaces for reflection on the work. For example, the "social and civic prevention" axis has established general assemblies of workers, workshops and team time outs to think about the job issues, the main objectives and about methodologies in supporting young people.
This helped realise animation guidance documents, redefine the hospitality function within the centers, decide to hire an academic advisor for the academic support activities, decide to make more visible the participation and achievements of young people by organising exhibitions and theatrical performances in several venues in Brussels, etc. In the same vein, the "Conflict Prevention" axis is also working at the dialogue between partners and the formalisation of the mediator’s specific practices.

The development of a comprehensive and integrated approach
Bravvo surches to increase partnerships with other actors present on the territory of the City. For example by being active in "social coordinations " that include civil society actors by districts or theme (mental health, social work, ...), by signing collaboration agreements with major stakeholders of the Brussels landscape such as the transport company (STIB), by working closely with the local police or the City services.
## CONTEXT

In Belgium, especially in the French-speaking part of the country, exclusion, school dropout and school relegation process are very important phenomenons.

Following Eurostat figures, 12% of young adults aged between 18 and 24 in 2007 have prematurely left school.

Many scientific studies show a statistic link between school dropout and delinquency.

A lot of studies focuses on this issue, i.e. one from Unicef Belgium and another from Belgian Forum for Prevention and Urban Security

## GOALS

The goal of the programme is:

- In the short-term to reintegrate the droppedout youngsters into school.
- In the mid-term to modifytheir relations to school and to the adults in order to allow them to elaborate plans for the future.
- In the long-term to propose another type of pedagogy for the youngsters who are not adapted to regular school.

## DESCRIPTION

The programme organises and gives funds to 12 School reintegration services.

These services are committed to give a social, educational and teaching help to droppedout minors.

By social, educational and teaching help, one must understand any form of help or action that allows to make these minors’ conditions of development and learning better when they are jeopardised either by the child’s behaviour or by difficulties met by his parents or the persons having parental care over him in order to realise their parental obligations.
Each service is funded 350,000 euros per year. SASs are much less expensive than special education or the hosting of dropped out youngsters by medico-psychological institutions. SAS are financed 50% by the Youth Care budget, and 50% by Education.

80% of the youngsters get back to school or to a training project after being hosted in a SAS.

Every structure is given 5 full-time educators.

The SAS has active partnerships with different sectors: justice, youth care, health, psychological care and social care, and of course, education.

SAS “Parenthèse”
Maurice CORNIL, director
cornilmaurice@hotmail.com
www.sas-parenthese.be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Evaluation</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Good Practice document : BRAVVO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>General context is the assessment that the Brussels population gets younger and younger. Lots of these young people are in a particularly vulnerable situation and often without supervision. This situation stresses the conflicts of generation, the appearance of violence and the feeling of insecurity. This situation is revealed by a diagnosis tool that is based on inhabitants consultation, social services and police reports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>The objective of the program is to implement an « integrated » prevention policy, which means a set of actions that make a link between situational crime prevention and a more social prevention. Short-term objective is the reduction of insecurity. At long-term, the program aims at improving urban security, struggling against social exclusion and developing the quality of life in town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>The principal axes of intervention are: - social and civic prevention - conflicts prevention - prevention through presence in the neighbourhoods - prevention by the quality of life - prevention by alternative measures and sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>In Brussels, Bravvo is the sole operator for prevention policy. The program centralises all the available financial means (federal, regional, municipal and side fundings). It is thus hard to define exactly what is the budget for prevention policies. The entire budget must be approximatively 8 million euros per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTCOMES
Bravvo is subject to continuous assessment. A series of “good practices” has been identified, such as:
- general attention to worker training, internal communication and formalisation of practices
- the development of a comprehensive and integrated approach
- the development and strengthening of the coordination function
- the ongoing effort to inform and raise awareness among target audiences
- the use of systematic participation of target audiences

PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED
More than 240 persons work for Bravvo. The larger part are educators and social workers, but Bravvo also employed criminologists, accountants, teachers, lawyers and a lot of people under qualified as “town guards”.

INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS
Bravvo is active in "social coordinations " that include civil society actors by districts or themes (mental health, social work, ...). Bravvo also surches to increase partnerships by signing collaboration agreements with major stakeholders of the Brussels landscape such as the transport company (STIB) and of course by working closely with the local police or the City services.

CONTACT
Thierry Hendrickx, évaluateur interne
infoprevention@brucity.be
www.bravvo.be

Practice Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOLLAND**

The tables below provide a more detailed description of two promising practices in the Netherlands, namely the New Perspectives initiative, which is delivered in major cities in the Netherlands by Youth Care institutions, and The HALT Peer Mediation programme, which is delivered by HALT, a Youth Care institution that has a nationwide network of offices (linked to police regions).

1. **New Perspectives (Nieuwe Perspectieven)**

| CONTEXT | New Perspectives is aimed at different groups of young women and men between 12 (sometimes 10) to 23 years of age who show what is considered to be socially unacceptable or delinquent behaviour and have problems in different areas of life (e.g. within the family, school or free time). Youth who are considered ‘hard core’ criminals are not a target group of the New Perspectives initiative. New Perspectives aims to provide young people new opportunities via a short-track mobile trajectory during which the young person learns to draw on ‘positive contacts’ within her/his social network.

New Perspectives is an accredited programme that has been positively evaluated and is included in the Netherlands Youth Institute data bank on effective interventions. |
| GOALS | On the assumption that the future perspectives of young delinquents or young people that are seen to display socially unacceptable behaviour are sub-optimal, the initiative strives to change the behaviour and circumstances of these young people by supporting them to develop new perspectives.

The goal of the initiative is to work towards a situation whereby young people at risk are or continue to be actively involved in society, get their life ‘back on track’, and offer them new social perspectives. More |
concretely, the primary goal of the initiative can be described as the prevention of criminal and risky behaviour, as well as the prevention of repeat criminal behaviour.

The programme strives to achieve this goal by giving young people “new perspectives” in different areas of life in which they have problems, such as housing, health, family life and friends, or budget control. Solving problems in these different areas can be understood as the sub-goals of the programme.

Where possible, parents and caregivers are included as much as possible. New Perspectives is not designed to resolve all of a young person’s problems in the space of three months but rather strives to serve as a bridge to regular care and support institutions and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The initiative consists of 3 phases:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Meeting, enlisting and intake, resulting in a ‘social environment’ analysis and a plan of action for different areas of life identified as problematic. The young person and intervention worker commit to the action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working on solutions. The young person is provided intensive, individual support to realize the various sub-goals identified. In addition, the young person is given support to build her/his social network that s/he can draw on after the intervention has been rounded off. New Perspectives also serves as a bridge between the young person and follow-up trajectories and (regular) support services, for example with regard to employment, education, training and care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After care. During a period of three months contact is maintained between the young person, the intervention worker and other members of the social network. If necessary support is given to the young person to resolve (new) issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The youth care organisation ‘Spirit’, which also offers NP gives a figure of roughly €5.000 per young person (Municipality of Amsterdam, 2007).

Spirit reports that only 6% of young people that have taken parting the New Perspectives trajectory moves into hard-core crime in a two-year period (Municipality of Amsterdam, 2007).

Young person
Youth care worker
‘Very Important Persons’ identified by young person and professional (youth care worker) within social network of young person

Government (Municipal level)
Police
Youth care institutions
Justice system

Bureau Van Montfoort
T.(0348) 481 200
E. info@vanmontfoort.nl


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.B. The results reported above are based on a review of three evaluation studies that were reviewed by the NJI accreditation commission in 2009 (see: http://www.nji.nl/nl/Kennis/Databanken/Databank-Effectieve-Jeugdinterventies/Nieuwe-Perspectieven). It should be noted that according to the NJI the methodological approach of the three studies may not be sufficiently robust to give definitive answers (e.g. as to programme impact).

**Peer Mediation**

<p>| CONTEXT | Peer mediation is a form of conflict mediation in which pupils learn to find a solution under the supervision of one or two other students. Where people work together and live together differences of opinion, conflicts and arguments will arise. While conflicts are part of daily life, they can sometimes it gets out of hand and affect the atmosphere in a group, class or even the entire school. Schools cannot avoid conflicts but they can strive to manage them and work towards resolving them. Peer mediation can make a positive difference in this respect. Practice has shown that pupils are more inclined to listen to their peers. Children of the same age group find it easier to communicate with one another as they do not have to adapt their language and can just be who they are. |
| Which short, mid, long-term objectives? Why? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>How is organised the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>Which amount? Comparison with other programmes? Who pays?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOMES</td>
<td>Data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED</td>
<td>Who works?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS</td>
<td>Who supports?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CONTACT | Halt Noord Nederland  
+31 (0)50 313 81 65  
info@haltnoordnederland.nl |
**ITALY**

**Good Practice Fiche**

Invisible City Foundation – Life School ‘Falcone-Borsellino’ (Fondazione La città invisibile – Scuola di vita ‘Falcone-Borsellino’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT (Catania, Sicily)</th>
<th>Areas at risk in Catania, province of Catania and Syracuse, in Sicily, historically characterized by a strong presence of organized crime. As confirmed by the President of this Foundation, born in a small village close to Catania and working in those areas for long time, poverty rates and crime rates related to organized crime – even juvenile delinquency – flourish because of lack of public services and because of high unemployment (both among juveniles and adults). The social disadvantage these children experiment, influence very much their rules compliance, self-esteem and interpersonal relationships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GOALS | **General objective**: to divert the children and juveniles’ path into school dropout and illicit activities on behalf of organized crime, through a high educative and cultural offer  
**Long-term objective**: to boost children’s self-esteem and to raise their awareness of themselves, committing towards the others, through peer-tutoring with the new incomers and conducting  
**Mid-term objective**: creating a group to engage children with a group identity feeling and to increase their sense of legality, through their commitment as a group, as an orchestra, performing concerts and/or theatre shows  
**Short term objective**: teaching children how to build positive relationships with the others, with respect, through music classes based on different instruments’ types, and through collective classes on legality |
| DESCRIPTION | The programme of the Music-Life School ‘Falcone-Borsellino’ develops in 4 step:  
1)Welcoming and introduction to an instrument, through group practical classes |
| **BUDGET** | 20,000 euro per year for the music school, for 120 pupils, with an expense of 165 euro per child per year. Funds come from fund raising activities (80%) and small public funds (20%) |
| **OUTCOMES** | The music/life school ‘Falcone-Borsellino’ at the ‘Invisible City Foundation’ had trained from 2011 up to date about 530 children and reached 5011 in diversified cultural and educational activities. The main result is that 120 children nowadays play in the “Child symphonic orchestra Falcone-Borsellino”, and they had performed 54 concerts. 12% of these children completed the tutor-stage. None of them registered problems in school attendance. The main constraint remains the self-esteem improvement, which requires still more work. At this purpose, some activities have been introduced lately, such as theatre and psycho-drama. Monitoring is devolved upon teachers of:  
- Behaviour and group discipline  
- Attitude towards the others  
- Critical awareness  
The assessment of each child situation take into account also his/her specific history, so to assess progresses not in absolute terms but in relation to their starting point. For many of them, the context of origin is seriously compromised and disadvantaged, so it is extremely important to take it into account in their entire path |
| **PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED** | Music teachers using the ‘Abreu’ method, life-coaching experts, poets, theatre actors, journalists |
INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS
Moral involvement of the Senate of the Italian Republic, Regional Sicilian Assembly, Regional Province of Catania.
Private support from ANLAI Ass. Artistic Italian Lute Making (LiuteriaArtisticaItaliana), with donations of instruments for the children

CONTACT
AlfiaMilazzo (President of the Foundation)
Phone: +39 329 3682557
Address: Via Genova 13, 95033 Biancavilla (CT)
Website: www.fondazionelacittainvisibile.it
E-mail: fondazione.lci@gmail.com

Practice Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
<td>This educational model proved sustainability especially short-term (about 1-2 years) and this social integration model is transferable in different contexts, at moderate costs. The main aspect which deems this to be a good practice and which can be translated in a recommendation, is to use the culture and to represent very positive life-models (in this case Falcone and Borsellino, two magistrates killed by mafia in the early ‘90s) to create a symbolic framework on which children and youths can find the right motivation. Other specific aspects/recommendations are the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Using and teaching to the children and youths the principles of the music orchestra, where many and very different instruments play together aiming at the same goal and with a harmonious outcome; and adapting them to the daily life and social interaction.

- Guaranteeing other complementary activities which support the cultural development of the child, enriching his/her perspective: museums and theatres visits, walks in the nature, meeting and events with artists, musicians, writers, ..., teaching various and autonomous modalities of expression with collective classes, involvement of children and youths in marches and demonstrations for legality and human rights, ....
# CivicoZero Project

| CONTEXT (Rome) | The context of this project is the city of Rome, in particular the centre of the city. The phenomenon analysed and targeted is a significant presence on the territory of migrant children. They are often unaccompanied, or come with families who live in very disadvantage conditions and poverty, or are victims of trafficking. In 2008, when the project ‘CivicoZero’ dates back, migrant children in the local care centres were 1.049 and also within the Justice system a significant presence of migrant children is reported (at a national level, in 2008, 47% of children entering the first care centres – CPA – are migrants). In the project drafting and planning phase, an important work of sharing with the other institutional and private agencies working in the child protection system had been conducted. Critical vulnerabilities of this specific children’s population had been discussed, resulting in an updated mapping of the phenomenon. An evaluation of already implemented projects and the local resources had also been made, in order to avoid duplications and identify where to specifically intervene. |
| GOALS | The **general objective** is achieving juvenile delinquency prevention through child protection. The **specific objective** is to guarantee child protection through an overall presence on the territory, from the streets to the juvenile justice system services, the day-care centre and support for the ones who enter in contact with the social services. |
| DESCRIPTION | The project started at the end of 2008 in Rome, after the closure of a previous Save the Children project (‘Orizzonti a colori’) which was addressing migrant children within the juvenile justice system. The first phase lasted 1 year, until the end of 2009, which the first report and this present study refers to. It comes from the observation that in Rome a diurnal youths centre |
was absent, to provide youths with support, protection and orientation towards the school and/or work environment.

**Beneficiaries:** children of every nationality, with a specific focus on unaccompanied minors who live in the streets, who are reported by the Court or by social services, or who go spontaneously into the day care centre. In particular, the project addresses migrant boys and girls (and their families when present) in disadvantaged situations, juveniles within the justice system, at risk of trafficking, abuse and commit crime, to improve their life conditions and their rights.

To achieve its scope, this project intervenes on different dimensions. In each of the different dimensions it implements different activities and interventions:

- **The street:** children and youths involved in prostitution, criminal activities and begging. A Mobile Unit – daytime and night-time – provides them with help, for monitoring, reducing the risk, street education and orientation

- **Penal/criminal area:** children and youths in the First care centres for pre-trial detention measures, in the juvenile facilities or in social services’ custody. Various activities are put in place: daytime interventions, social mediation with the families and the communities, peer education, entertainment, linguistic and cultural mediation, legal counselling

- **Spontaneous Roma Settlements:** children and youths at risk of social exclusion and marginalization. A daytime Mobile Unit intervenes with social mediation activities, entertainment, peer education, workshops, health education and other various support activities

- **Day care centre ‘CivicoZero’:** for children and youths under aged and young adults. Many activities run in the centre ‘CivicoZero’: daycare and basic services; children potentialities
and vulnerabilities’ analysis and referral; information about their rights, gathering information on violations and activating specific interventions; educational and recreational activities; workshops; peer activities; legal counselling; work and education counselling; medical screening and health education/counselling.

Children had been immediately involved in the activities’ planning and management, through consultations, peer education, programming new activities.

- Local network of services and actors: for children and youths under aged and young adults. Operational connections with private and institutional services and actors present on the territory and working on child protection, to realized joint and integrated actions, such as educative, recreational and work/school counselling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>430.000 euro per year plus salaries for two social mediators. All private funding (Save the Children fund rising)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOMES</td>
<td>All the data from the activities are collected in a ‘project database’, which gathers qualitative and quantitative information on the mobile units’ interventions, CPAs, legal interventions, external interventions, activities internal to the CivicoZeroday-care centre. This information is gathered through reporting schedules about each dimension and location. Some data to follow, regarding the first year of activity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- With the ‘street-intervention’ (outreach activity) 149 youths among 6 and 18 have been reached, mainly from Afghanistan, Romania, Egypt, Italy (with children of Bosnian and Roma ethnic origin but born in Italy), and from sub-Saharan Africa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Within the justice system, youths inside the CPAs who entered in contact with the project team were about 200, with half of foreigner origins (former Yugoslavia, Roma, Romanian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the CPAs, twice a week a workshop on communication-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expression was established, to integrate the CPA’s educators’ interventions and introduce the children to the possibility of attending the day-care Centre as alternative to the street. This workshop involved 150 children and youths

- The day-care Centre ‘CivicoZero’, from February to October 2009, received 534 children (506 males and 28 female), plus 35 entries in the daytime ‘help-desk’, established in another area of the city

- The Centre offered some basic services (showering, meals, laundry, clothes changing), to prevent health issues related to street-life. In particular, fruition was the following: 170 showers, 80 meals, 190 for the gym, 120 laundries, 600 accesses to the Internet Point, 55 continuative attendance of vocational trainings (painting, writing, photography, carpentry, percussions)

- Most represented countries among the children in the Centre were Afghanistan, Egypt, Bangladesh and Romania

- At their first access to the Centre, a significant number (160) of children/youths was living in the streets, 151 in communities managed by the municipality, 50 in House-Family (communities called ‘Case-Famiglia’), 41 in Roma camps, 22 in spontaneous settlements.

- A vast number of these children (239) learnt about the Centre through other children/friends who had already been in contact with it. It is an important indicator of the efficacy of ‘peer’s motivation’ and also of the trust created in the children who benefit from the Centre’s activities, being its main ‘promoters’

- Between September 2008 and October 2009, 71 legal counselling and take on responsibility were registered

- Between April and October 2009, 25 children and 4 new young adults benefited from medical first-screening visits and
### PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED

The project-team is made by educators, a psychologist/educator, three cultural mediator (Egyptian, Afghani and Roma), social operators, legal counsellors, and by a group of peer educators. Furthermore, operators from the local services are mobilized and collaborate to the implementations of some project’s activities (doctors, operators for vocational trainings, ...)

### INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS

- **Centre for Juvenile Justice (Centro di Giustizia Minorile) in Lazio, both at central level and at local level with the Juvenile Social Services Offices (USSM), the First care centre (CPA) and the Juvenile Facility (IPM)**
  - Municipality of Rome – V Department Minors and Families: juveniles’ communities in Rome and in the Province, opening of public care for unaccompanied or vulnerable children, coordination of educational projects of social integration for under aged people. The agreement with the municipality of Rome related mostly to the procedures of communities’ placement for children collected from the streets, their introduction to the ‘CivicoZero’ staff and the unaccompanied children attendance of the centre during the day, the reporting of some children for work-scholarships.
  - Centre “Borgo Ragazzi Don Bosco”: orientation courses to the school and to professions, and the offer of 12 traineeships with work-scholarship.
  - International Centre on Education and Development (CIES), for the service of linguistical-cultural mediation.
  - National institute for the promotion of health of migrant population and contrast of diseases and poverty: health on the street and weekly medical unit in the Centre ‘Civicozero’.
  - Association “Virtus Pontemammolo”: for the victims of trafficking and prostitution and the realization of combined street units.
## CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vito Savasta, social mediator (interviewed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> Via deiBruzzi, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00185 Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website:</strong> <a href="http://www.civicozero.eu/">http://www.civicozero.eu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> <a href="mailto:civicozero@civicozero.eu">civicozero@civicozero.eu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Practice Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
<td>The previous analysis of the targeted phenomenon and of the specific needs of the targeted population, in continuity with a previous project, guarantee the sustainability. Costs are moderate and funds are private and more reliable/secure, also being Save the children a highly committed organisation in child protection. The principles at the basis of the programme and variety of activities implemented are participation, non-discrimination, reciprocal respect, care and peer motivation. Hence, easily and effectively transferrable in other geographical realities and for other vulnerable children, given the appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Local Observatory on bullying (Osservatorioterritorialesulbullismo)**

| CONTEXT (Nuoro, Sardinia) | The context is characterised by high rates of juvenile delinquency and school drops out, within a cultural framework where the State law opposes a parallel set of laws and rules of conduct established by the agro-pastoral community. This normative framework (so called ‘barbaricino-code’, ‘codicebarbaricino’), regulates the communities life in the Province of Nuoro and strongly influence youths education. *(Delinquency rates have been gathered from the databases at the central police station – Ministry of Interior for the province’s territory)*

For these reasons in this context, the central police station promoted the establishment of a local observatory on bullying in 2007.

Bullying is in fact very often a good indicator and ground-breaking for anti-social and delinquent behaviours during adolescence and crime when adults. This phenomenon has specific characteristics in this particular territory – in the province of Nuoro and internal areas of Sardinia – and it presents peculiar features that need to be analysed from a qualitative and quantitative perspective to be faced. |
|---|

| GOALS | The general objective is to facilitate and support with appropriate tools and skills any actor who is willing to face and tackle bullying with responsiveness, professionalism and effectiveness.

The specific objectives of the Observatory are:

- Qualitative and quantitative research of the phenomenon
- Counselling
- Training |
|---|

| DESCRIPTION | The Observatory offers services for research, counselling, information and education for whoever is willing to know more about bullying in order to contrast it in an effective way. It provides people and local operators with education and training, and any public or private entity on the territory can be part of the Observatory.

Its members agreed on the alternation of education-counselling and research activities on a yearly basis, so to adapt, from time to time, the trainings to emerging data and trends of bullying on the territory. |
The Observatory is financed by the constituent members and works with a yearly budget of 11,000-euro average. The entire budget is devolved to the education/training and research activities.

During the years, the Observatory carried out 3 researches on the ground regarding the extent and characteristics of bullying in primary, secondary and high schools. Over 1000 children in the schools have been trained, 200 teachers and hundreds of parents. The research activities themselves are good indicators of the good functioning of the Observatory, to better address its executive action. The executive body of the Observatory has a monthly meeting at the Central police office (Questura) which has, by constitution, a coordination role.

Psychologists, sociologists, social workers, teachers, educational operators, law enforcement officers.

Province of Nuoro, Province of Ogliastra, Municipality of Nuoro, Health Local Unit of Nuoro, Social cooperative ‘Lariso’ in Nuoro, Provincial School Office, Provincia Juvenile Justice Office

Dott. Fabrizio Mustaro – Vice Questore Aggiunto Polizia di Stato, Observatory’s Coordinator
Website: http://www.otbnuoro.org/otb/
Email: fabriziomustaro@gmail.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices | • Establishing a network of social actors and agencies, to prevent and contrast multi-dimensions phenomena, such as bullying  
• Sharing with other institutions and private actors the operational outcomes and findings coming from the research, training and counselling activities  
• - Having a coordination body which has a leadership role in reading and interpreting a specific phenomenon (like an Observatory), in order to address the action and activities of public institutions and private actors on the territory |

### Project ‘Prisma’ – Province of Caltanissetta

**CONTEXT**

The context of the broader programme – ‘Prisma’, is Sicily (provinces of Palermo, Catania, Messina, Syracuse, Trapani and Caltanissetta). The specific part of the project here analysed develops in the province of Caltanissetta.

Both the broader and specific contexts had been analysed prior the action and the indicators used are:

- Incidence of children/youths in the juvenile justice services  
- Incidence of children/youths in disadvantaged areas  
- Incidence of unemployment and juvenile unemployment  
- Poverty rates  
- Organised crime incidence  
- Scholastic performance and dropouts’ rate  
- Drug/alcohol abuse  
- Social services on the territory  
- Presence/absence of juvenile centres, educative proposals and recreational activities offered by the local services

**GOALS**

The **general objective** of the project: to redevelop/upgrade a ‘Young territory’, in the province of Caltanissetta, through juvenile participation,
in order to facilitate and support social integration and to prevent deviance and disadvantage risks.

**Long-Mid-term objectives:**

1. Supporting social integration among youths, stimulating and facilitating activities aimed at developing group identity and collaboration attitude, which rarely find appropriate space for social and cultural expression in the local context
2. Increasing productivity of the potential beneficiaries, providing them with training courses aimed at obtaining skills requested in the job market
3. Boosting youths’ creativity and arts’ education
4. Local entertaining
5. Realization of a local Radio and newspaper
6. Training youths to the culture of active participation to social life, through cultural and formative initiatives about civil values and rules
7.a: Ameliorating interpersonal relationships among youths of the same municipality and with youths of other local realities
7.b Improving youths’ life conditions through an effective management of leisure time
7.c Educating youths to the appropriate expression of ‘entertainment’ and ‘pleasure’
7.d Promoting values of friendship, solidarity and group identity, through sport and common goals
7.e Facilitating physical wellbeing through education to healthy lifestyles, respectful for their own person and body
8. Promoting personal psycho-physical wellbeing and increasing risk-assessment skills through the development and valorisation of individual resources, creating environments health-friendly, empowering communities and socio-sanitary services
9. Re-discovering and valorisation of historical and architectonical assets in the province territory
**Short-term objectives:**
- Training youths to the entrepreneurial culture
- Educating youths against all forms of juveniles’ violence and bullying
- Re-discovering of the territory and sensitisation on different forms of garbage reuse
- Educating on psycho-physical and social wellbeing
- Working on the intergenerational gap
- Divulgation of the outcomes of the activities

**DESCRIPTION**

Duration: 2 YEARS, from September 2010 to February 2013

Beneficiaries: Municipalities associated and partner associations (CeFoCuS, TAM TAM e L’ARCA), which divided the activities to be implemented according to their population (the municipalities) and their previous experience (the associations). Municipality of San Cataldo was the leader authority, which coordinated the implementation of the activities, being the most populated among the 3 municipalities associated.

Children and youths reported by the Juvenile Court or by the social services, and any other child and youth who wants spontaneously to participate to the activities.

The project implementation was divided into 4 main ACTIONS:
- **Action 1** – ‘Growing-up together. Youths protagonists of their territory’ (“Crescereinsieme. ‘Giovani protagonisti del territorio’”). It is divided into 6 macro-activities aimed at promoting youths’ creativity to support a greater social participation
  - Creating a youth centre and initiating various activities-trainings
  - Cinema and theatre exhibition
  - Creating an info-network for young people in the province of Caltanissetta, ‘Info-youths from Caltanissetta’ (‘Info-giovaninisseni’)
  - Cataloguing historical and artistic assets in the local territory
**- Territorial entertaining**  
**- Realizing a local radio**

**- Action 2 – ‘Promoting healthy life-styles and positive behaviours: Educating to legality’**  
**- Project ‘Against-Bully’, educative action against bullying (‘Progettocontrobbullo’)**  
**- Environmental education: projects ‘Land...beloved land’ and ‘Waste?...no, reuse’ (‘Terra... amata terra’ and ‘Rifiuto...? no... riciclo’)**  
**- Social and civil ethics and road safety in the schools (‘Laboratoriostradafacendo!’)**

**- Action 3 – ‘Healthy life-styles and positive behaviours – Health and wellbeing: life belongs to me’**  
**- Playful and recreational meetings: project ‘Sport village’”**  
**- Educational meetings on psycho-physical and social health**  
**- Educational meetings on mental health (Project ‘Salute-mente’)**

**- Action 4 – Support to the intergenerational family relationships: family and youths**  
**- Intergenerational workshops**  
**- Educational parental meetings**

| BUDGET | € 790,910,00 Total  
€ 632,728,00 Public financing requested  
€ 158,182,00 Co-financed budget |

| OUTCOMES | **MONITORING AND EVALUATION**: every year together with the budget, a report of the activities implemented had been delivered. Project evaluation was carried out through an annual meeting with all the provincial referent people and all the actors involved in all the provinces participating to the project in Sicily.  
A monitoring body has been established with the function of a biannual evaluation of all the project phases and activities implemented by the municipalities associated and by the local associations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 local entities (municipalities) (Associate Partners): San Cataldo, Marianopoli and Santa Caterina Villarmosa (Province of Caltanissetta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Associations (Associate Partners): ‘TAM TAM La porta del sole’, ‘CeFoCuS’ and ‘L’Arca’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals involved: social workers, teachers (music/instrument teachers and professionals for the different workshops implemented), social workers, psychologists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region Sicily, financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with the Ministry of Justice – Department of Juvenile Justice and Office of study, research and international activities (Dott.ssa Mastropasqua)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘TAM TAM La porta del Sole’ Association (San Cataldo): <a href="mailto:laportadelsole@tiscali.it">laportadelsole@tiscali.it</a>; <a href="mailto:vinicio82@virgilio.it">vinicio82@virgilio.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ‘Prisma’: Don Calabria Institute, Termini Imerese (Palermo) premise. Reference person: Alessandro Padovani. <a href="mailto:mediazione@doncalabria.it">mediazione@doncalabria.it</a>; <a href="http://www.centrodoncalabria.it/">http://www.centrodoncalabria.it/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The negative aspect is the lack of sustainability: because of lack of funding, the project cannot be replicated, failing so in guaranteeing complete efficiency and effectiveness. In this way, young beneficiaries who participated cannot complete the whole path, or those ones who completed it cannot continue to participate to the activities of the Youths Centre, because of the lack of funding.
## Net for U

### Good Practice Fiche

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>Which National, local context. Which is the issue and it extend? Which indicators? Is the issue studied?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The context is institutions that organize youth in Sweden, such as schools, after-school programs, sports clubs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The issue is gender-based violence, including other forms of violence than physical violence, i.e. verbal, psychological, sexual abuse etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>Which short, mid, long-term objectives? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The long-term objective is to reduce gender-based violence, including sexual, homophobic and dating violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The mid-term objective is to break the culture of passiveness and silence around violence and replace it by social norms of caring, responsibility and leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The short-term objective is to increase the readiness for and the frequency of bystander interventions among youth and adults working with youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>How is organised the programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The universal and primary violence prevention program Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) is implemented by staff and youth within the institution/organization itself. Guidance, training and support are provided by Freedom from Violence, a branch of Men for Gender Equality Sweden. The core of the program consists of 7 sessions with groups of youth, providing training in 1. the identification different forms and degrees of gender-based violence and 2. skills in bystander intervention. The bystander approach has been found to be exceptionally useful in primary prevention due its capacity to reduce defensiveness– everyone is addressed as a potential change agent. The groups sessions are supplemented by policy development, campaigns, staff training etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BUDGET**

*Which amount? Comparison with other programmes? Who pays?*

The schools pay for the training services but implement the program within their existing budget.

---

**OUTCOMES**

*Data?*

The effect of MVP has been studied and documented in several published articles in the United States. The results have in part been reproduced in the Swedish context.

---

**PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED**

*Who works?*

School staff, coaches, after-school program staff and experts from Freedom from Violence.

---

**INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS**

*Who supports?*

The development of the program in Sweden has been funded by The Swedish Inheritance Fund.

---

**CONTACT**

*Names, emails, web*

Klas Hyllander, klas.hyllander@mfj.se, www.ffv.me and www.mfj.se

Info address: info@ffv.me

---

### Practice Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CONTEXT | Which National, local context. Which is the issue and it extend? Which indicators? Is the issue studied?  
Young KRIS is available all over Sweden and helps kids/young adults up to 26 years old not to start taking drugs or engaging in criminal activities. For those already having experience in drugs and criminality, Young KRIS offers them a way out. |
| GOALS | Which short, mid, long-term objectives? Why?  
The short-term objective is to motivate and encourage the youth not to start or continue with a criminal lifestyle.  
The mid-term objective is to offer the members a possibility to be honest citizens that can support themselves.  
The long-term objective is to decrease criminality and adduction rates in Sweden among youth 13-26 years of age. |
| DESCRIPTION | How is organised the programme?  
The programme has several branches and is developed in the following principles:  
- Offer the youth a new social network and meeting place free from drugs and criminality  
- Thanks to their project early action, the youth are offered early interventions for motivation discussions and follow-ups (in cooperation with the police, social services…)  
- Thanks to the project Young Kris power, the participants can now enter a individually designed program to support them in their search for job or to start studying again |
| BUDGET | Which amount? Comparison with other programmes? Who pays?  
Unga KRIS is now an independent organisation and receives support from the start for driving the organisation. The project |
Early intervention is now ended and continues thanks to the contribution of mostly the social services that pay for the service. Young KRIS power started last year with the support from the Swedish Inheritance fund and plans to be self-financed latest by 2016.

**OUTCOMES**

Data?
The socio-economical evaluation of the project showed that the society saved 3 673 000 Swedish crowns (SEK) per rehabilitated participant. The total saving for the society when Young KRIS helped 595 participants, within 3 years, is 2 185 435 000 SEK. In other words for every Swedish crown that the Swedish Inheritance fund invested in the project, it get back 85 SEK.

**PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED**
The programme has been developed by the youth themselves and is also conducted by them. Professionals have evaluated the project.

**INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS**
The programme is fully implemented in 14 cities around Sweden with support from the probation services, the social services, the communes, the police, the unemployment agency.

**CONTACT**

www.ungakris.se

Chairman of the board:
Kristoffer Johansson
076-028 64 08
kristoffer.johansson@ungakris.se

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme relevance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme transferability</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating evaluation findings into</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statements of good practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LITHUANIA

**Good Practice Fiche - “Second Step”**

| CONTEXT | During the past decade, the level of abuse among Lithuanian school children has risen significantly. These days it is no surprise that children use violence in schools. Also, the number of younger kids using abuse and violence in schools has increased. Constant bullying, racketeering, physical abuse, and group punishments show that children have difficulties with self-knowledge, anger management and controlling impulses – necessary skills that could keep them away from using the abuse.  
It has been observed that today schools are witnessing bullying (27% of the school children fall prey to bullying 2–3 times or even more often a month) and behavioral and emotional problems among the children. It can be related to even bigger difficulties and more aggressive conduct among them.  
In Lithuania, 22% of the kids were subjected to abuse in school, 19% of them were ripped off money, personal belongings, or food. Another study showed that 58% of the children think that some kids feel alienated in classroom, 69% - that children very often sneer at each other.  
Social skills are one of the factors that has an impact on bad behavior or its prevention. The “Second Step” program helps to develop and reinforce social and emotional skills among the children. |
| GOALS | To reduce aggressive conduct among the children by developing and reinforcing social and emotional skills:  
- teaching children to recognize and express their feelings in appropriate ways;  
- resisting impulsive behavior;  
- dealing with conflicts and problems and understanding the consequences of one's behavior. |
| DESCRIPTION | In Lithuania, this program is applied in elementary schools for 1–4th grade school children.  
The program is used in the classroom. The *Second Step* classes that take |
place once a week are easily integrated into the core curriculum. All children participate in the class led by a head teacher. Teachers are provided with the teaching material – teacher’s book, videos, posters, which are important in teaching children about their feelings and how to deal with the problems, and A3 format photo cards with the text on the back for teachers.

The program has few teaching components. First, children are introduced to the theme. Later, they hear a real story, and the teacher models the skill he wants the children to teach. After that children play role-playing games. They also do homework related to the theme they covered in class – how could they use social skills they have been taught in their everyday life.

The program consists of three parts: empathy, impulse control, and anger management.

Children are encouraged to use newly acquired skills during the day. Parents are invited to be active participants of the teaching process and positively reinforce new skills at home.

The Children Support Center specialists, responsible for program’s quality, train elementary school teachers to work with the program, provide all the necessary information, and advise them during the program’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>The cost of the package of the <em>Second Step</em> teaching material is 700 litas (200 euros). Schools that want to participate in the program can purchase the package. The trainings are supported by Lithuania’s Ministry of Education and Science; they can also be supported with the money from the European Union, or the school itself can pay for it. The teaching material can be used by several teachers of the school. Knowledge gained during a 24 credit hour training course is sufficient to teach the <em>Second Step</em> program for a year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| OUTCOMES | Studies conducted in Lithuania and abroad show that children who take part in the program are less likely to use abuse, they demonstrate better behavior and social skills. Teachers also see positive changes – they observed that changes are especially visible in children who have serious behavioral problems and emotional difficulties. |
Program “Second Step” is a program that develops and reinforces children social and emotional skills. The main goal of the program is to reduce a number of problems that children face interacting with each other, lower the level of their anger, teach them to cope with the feelings, deal with the impulsive behavior and understand the consequences of such behavior, and learn to solve behavioral problems.
“Second Step” In the World

The program was created in 1986 by the Committee for Children, team of professional educators and physical health specialists. Today the program is accessible to every country in the world. It was translated into many languages and adapted for different cultures. Third edition of the “Second Step” violence prevention program (2002) is used in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, Japan, Lithuania, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Kurdistan (Iraq), United Kingdom, Chile, Turkey, Venezuela, US, and other countries.

All these countries signed a contract with the Committee for Children, translated and adapted program’s material to its needs, ran a test, and now propagate it within the country. In some countries, the program became an integral part of their educational system curriculum.

“Second Step” In Lithuania

In Lithuania, the program has been administered by Children Support Center since 2004. To make sure it works for Lithuanian schools, in 2004, the Center ran the program in 16 Vilnius city classrooms. Since the results were very positive, in 2007, the Center signed a contract with the Committee for Children and was granted the right to carry out the program in Lithuania. All Lithuania’s schools can participate in the program.

The program works as a violence reduction and prevention tool. In 2008, The Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania supported the implementation of the program in Lithuanian schools. The program became an effective tool for teachers to work with, for children – a real opportunity to become successful and healthy. It is important for parents too, because they know that their children are given strong mental foundation that will be useful in their future lives. Today the “Second Step” program is used by more than 1,300 Lithuanian teachers.

Theoretical Reasoning

The main focus of the program is social skills that play crucial role in helping children to succeed while interacting with peers without using aggression. The program is devised in such a way that it addresses one of the three child's social responses: emotional, cognitive, and behavioral.

Children try to use their behavioral skills in complicated social situations (Hirschstein, 2002). Lack of social skills can lead to inaccurate interpretation of social signs and one's intentions and cause
inadequate social response. Studies show that lack of social skills is related to child's adjustment in the classroom, social status, and effective relationship with his peers.

The child who was rejected is less likely to show socially positive and cooperative behavior and has more difficulties to become part of the group. Children with high social status show higher degree of social and cooperative behavior than the rejected ones (Walker, 2004). The problems that arise while interacting with the peers can become the reason of aggressive behavior and encourage such behavior (Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983, cited in: Walker, 2004). Boys who were rejected or isolated most often would demonstrate inadequate behavior and physical aggression. To the contrary, the boys who are popular in the class are less likely to behave aggressively and antisocially (Dodge, 1983).

Poor social skills and communication difficulties are related to behavioral disorders (Gaffney, McFall, 1981, Spence, 1981, cited in: Spence, 2003). If the child cannot recognize difficult social situation and think of possible ways to deal with it, as well as foresee and evaluate possible implications, he would less often show socially adequate response (Lochman, Dodge, 1994, Spence, Sheffield, Donovan, 2002, cited in: Spence, 2003).

Social skills act as a very important preventive factor. Children with poor communication skills have higher risk to adjust themselves in the future than children who are socially competent (Cowen, and etc., 1973, cited in: Goldstein). Bernard distinguishes 4 important factors of strength. Two of them are social and emotional factors: 1) social competence (communication skills, empathy, responsibility, and caring); and 2) problem-solving (planning, flexibility, and decision making) (Bernard, 2004). Social and emotional education has significant impact on the factors that lead to harmful behavior or is related to person's health – drug and violence abuse (Fredericks, 2003).

By developing children social skills in school we secure safer environment with less possibility of violence and crime (Skiba, Boone, and etc., 2000).

Assessing the Program

Grossman (1997) (cited in: Frey, Hirschstein, Guzzo, 2000) conducted a test with 12 schools. The focus group for 4–5 months participated in the “Second Step” program. The method used – parents and teachers' assessment and direct observation of children behavior. The study showed that physical aggression and calling names declined in the focus group. The changes were more visible in less structured environment – on the playground and in school cafeteria. The level of
friendly, social, and neutral conduct increased in the “Second Step” classrooms. Even after 6 months, school children showed lower level of aggression and higher level of positive interactions. According to studies conducted by Beland (1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, cited in: Frey, Hirschstein, Guzzo, 2000), the level of verbal understanding of others' viewpoint and social problem-solving abilities in focus group increased significantly. Meanwhile, the children from control group did not show such changes. Also, it was observed that children who participated in the program showed better knowledge of social skills (for example, how to calm yourself down when one gets angry).

The study conducted by Beland and Frey (2002) showed that children's, who participated in the “Second Step” program, attitude towards aggression and understanding of social skills have changed. They are less likely to approve of aggressive actions and tolerate physical aggression, aggression in the relationship, and alienation than the control group (Beland and Frey, 2002).

The study conducted for 3 years with 6–9 years old children who took part in the “Second Step” program found that parents saw significant changes in their children behavior – it changed outside the school (Schick, Cierpka, 2005).

The study on the effectiveness of the program in which more than 100 first grade school children took part was conducted in Lithuania. The goal of the study was to assess children knowledge of social skills and behavior before and after the program. The study showed that after the program the social skills, especially in anger management, of the focus group increased significantly. To the contrary to children who did not take part in the program, even after a year children who participated in the “Second Step” showed better social skills. It was also noted that the program had stronger impact on children with bigger emotional and behavioral problems (Kuraite, 2008).
| CONTEXT | A continuous unstable social and economic situation that has been haunting Lithuania for the past few years put many families raising little children into difficult and critical situations. Such families face unemployment, conflicts in the family, divorce, migration, and etc.

During the past three years, the number of divorces has increased* (in 2010, there were 10,006, in 2012, 10,399 divorces). After the divorce children stay with one of the parents (in 2012, there were 7,809 children living with one parent). There is also a high level of unemployment (in 2012, there were 195,200 unemployed people in Lithuania). Parents who raise little children and face different crisis sometimes try to deal with them in inadequate ways.

The number of families that cannot effectively deal with family crises and are listed as families at social risk (in 2011, there were 10,608 such families in Lithuania) is growing. There are many children in Lithuania whose parents lost the right to raise their children**: every year the number of such kids reaches 2,000.

Lithuania is on top of the list among the European countries that suffers from emigration. The intensity of migration seen in Lithuania parts and separates thousands of families (for example, in 2011, 40,740 people of a productive age emigrated from Lithuania). Children are left behind without one or both parents. They are left to be looked after by their distant relatives or complete strangers. Such children lack positive examples, stability, and steadiness in their lives. And that undermines children physical, emotional, and social well-being.

* Statistics Lithuania
**Ministry of Social Security and Labor of the Republic of Lithuania and State Child Rights Protection and Adoption Service under the Ministry of Social Security and Labor.**

| GOALS | The goals of the program „Big Brothers Big Sisters of Lithuania“ is to organize and implement personal help by an adult volunteer intended for a kid living in Vilnius and expand it throughout Lithuania.  

BBBS program:  
organizes a long-term relationship between the child undergoing psychological difficulties and the volunteer, ensuring psychological support and professional supervision to both parties.  
Prepares program coordinators and provides help establishing programs in other cities of Lithuania. |
| --- | --- |
| DESCRIPTION | The main idea of BBBS is voluntary and personal help intended for children and provided by the selected and trained volunteer who interacts with the chosen child aged 7–17 and helps him to overcome various, but not very serious psychological difficulties. The interaction between the child and the volunteer is supervised by specialists (psychologists, social workers, and etc.).  
The interaction takes place between **one child** and **one volunteer**. Male volunteers interact with the boys, female volunteers – with the girls.  
The friendship starts with the introduction and signing of the **Contract of Friendship**.  
The friendship lasts **one year**. After a year, the friendship is terminated by mutual agreement of the child, volunteer and program coordinators or is renewed for another year.  
The Big Friend and the Little Friend meet once a week and spend together no less than two hours. The time spent together is dedicated for interaction, educational activities, |
leisure, and hobbies.
Friendships are supervised and facilitated by program coordinators.
The child and the volunteer follow program's rules.

### BUDGET
Children participate in the program free of charge.
The cost of one friendship is approximately 1,700 litas a year.
The program is supported by businesses, foundations and residents of Lithuania who donate 2% of their income taxes.

### OUTCOMES
The results of the studies conducted in Lithuania and the US show that **personal relationship between the child and the volunteer** has a positive effect on child's emotional state, self-confidence, ability to make decisions, his relationships with peers and adults, and has an impact on better results at school and school attendance.

### PROFESSIONALS INVOLVED
Psychologists, case managers, social workers, an accountant and administrator.

### INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS
Separate projects are funded by city's municipality and businesses. In search of children and volunteers for the program, BBBS also partners with schools, Child Development Center, day centers, children homes, and municipal child rights protection agencies.

### CONTACT INFORMATION
„Big Brothers Big Sisters“
phone: 8 611 22612, 8 5 271 59 80
e-mail: jurate@pvc.lt
Address: Latvius st. 19A, Vilnius
Jūratė Baltuškienė, director
www.pvc.lt/big-brothers-big-sisters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Evaluation</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program relevance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program efficiency and effectiveness +
Program impact +
Program sustainability +
Program transferability +
Translating evaluation findings into statements of good practices +

Big Brothers Big Sisters and Its Mission

BBBS is one of the oldest, well known and the most effective programs in the world for children. It is the unique program which success is ensured by the friendship between the child and the volunteer. The volunteers are specially trained and their friendship with children is professionally supervised.

The mission of BBBS carried out by the NGO Children Support Center is to spread the word in Lithuania about personal and voluntary help by the adult volunteer for children.

Big Brothers Big Sisters, the program based on the principles of mentorship, serves as a tool for prevention and early intervention. Its main idea is personal and voluntary help for children where carefully selected and trained volunteer interacts one on one with the child aged 7–17 and helps him to deal with uncomplicated psychological problems. The relationship between the volunteer and the child is supervised and facilitated by specialists (psychologists, social workers, and etc.).

The volunteer (Big Friend) and the child (Little Friend) meet once a week and spend together no less that two hours. At the beginning of the friendship, they sign a Contract of Friendship that lasts a year. After one year, the contract is terminated or renewed for another year by mutual agreement of the child, volunteer, child’s parents or foster-parents and program coordinators.
The friendship between the child and the volunteer follows certain rules. It is supervised and facilitated by the professional BBBS coordinators and/or case managers.

**Target Audience – Children**

The age of children participating in the program is 7–14; they can continue to be in the program until they reach 18 years. Children are selected to the program for several reasons:

There is only one parent in the family who takes care of the child/children;
Parents are divorced or they quarrel all the time;
There are 3 or more kids in the family;
Child lives with his foster-parents or at children home;
Mother or father lost his/her job;
Family barely meets the ends;
Child does not socialize, he has no friends;
After the school, the child spends a lot of time alone, without adult's supervision or he is lonely;
Child has problems fitting in school or is bullied;
Child was abused;
One of the parents is dead, in jail, or missing;
Child has problems, although not very serious with the police;
Child has a developmental, mental, or physical disorder.

The program helps children who lack direct attention and long-term support, do not socialize, and have no positive adult role model to follow. The program is useful to children who were emotionally, physically, or sexually abused, were neglected, experienced alienation and sneering by the peers; whose parents are divorced or they lost close member(s) of the family, whose family members abuse alcohol or drugs, or they live in the family were a physical punishment is a norm.

**How do children get into the program?**

Children are directed to the program by their teachers, psychologists, or social workers. Also, parents find out about the program on internet, hear about it from friends and acquaintances. There are cases when children ask to be accepted into the program because their brothers, sisters, or friends had Big Friends.
All children who want to participate in the program undergo psychological evaluation where child's needs and difficulties are weighted, family's situation is looked into. The person who does the evaluation tries to establish whether the child needs any help. Once the evaluation takes place, family members or foster-parents receive recommendations regarding further help. It could be a suggestion for the child to have a Big Friend or recommendation to seek another type of help (such as psychological, mental, or provided by social workers).

„Safety Classes“ for Children
All children participating in BBBS have to take a „Safety Class“. Multiple studies show that abuse against children is widely spread and that children are often abused at or near home. For many different reasons children who were abused do not seek help – they are afraid or do not know that such behavior is inappropriate, or they do not know who to turn to.
The main goal of the „Safety Class“ is to minimize the abuse against children and develop children skills in safe behavior. They are told about child rights, abuse and its forms, are taught how to protect oneself from being abused and where to seek help. „Safety Class“ also strengthens children's self-understanding and knowledge of other people, it teaches them to understand various risks.

The „Safety Class“ is a two hour class. The teaching methods are chosen according to children age, stage of development, and cognitive skills. They help to reinforce the necessary children's skills in safe conduct. The „Safety Class“ is created and adapted for children of different age (7–10 and 11–14 years old). The content of the class consists of various games, stories meant for discussions, drawings, emotional cards, and handouts.

During the class children are taught the most essential things – how to recognize inappropriate behavior against them and how to avoid it. First, children learn to recognize and trust their own feelings, and then to decide whether the situation or other person's behavior is dangerous to him. Children learn about their rights and forms of abuse, are introduced to the term of sexual abuse. During the „Safety Class“, children learn to name their intimate body parts, they are taught the rules of safe touch. They find out what are good and bad secrets and what to do if you have bad secrets (related to abuse). They learn how to deal with dangerous and risky situations in which
children can be abused. “Safety Classes” also encourage children to say “no” in dangerous situations and ask for help if the abuse has taken place.

Help Providers – Volunteers

To become a BBBS volunteer can any motivated and responsible person of 18 years or older who wants and can understand children and their needs, and would like to be friends with the child. This work is free and voluntary intended to help the child to become psychologically stronger and teach him to live differently. The volunteers can be people of any profession. But first they have to undergo screening and take a special training.

Screening and Training

People who want to participate in the program and become volunteers have to be screened. At the first screening, a volunteer-to-be fills out an application, submits two recommendations and a copy of his ID. The purpose of the conversation with the volunteer is to evaluate his psychological state. It is important to see what is volunteer's motivation to participate in the program, what is his personality and life story, what traumatic experiences one has had and how they were dealt with. The conversation allows to examine volunteer's ability to be stable and consistent, whether he can keep one's promises and pursue goals. Volunteer's values and the ability to be a role model for the child are taken into account as well. The volunteers who make through the first screening are invited to participate in a ten week (total of 20 hours) training, the second part of the screening routine.

The goals of the training:

Education – the purpose of the training is to introduce volunteers to child's psychology, the specifics of interaction with the child, crisis and forms of abuse, and how to help the child who finds himself in trouble. Volunteers also learn about BBBS rules and principles while working with the child.

Selection – during the training, the program coordinators get to know better volunteers, further evaluate the level of their motivation, the ability to interact and follow one's commitments. This also helps to select right people to the program.
Making a decision – The length and subjects covered during the training allow people to decide whether BBBS is the right place for them.

Program Effectiveness

Why is friendship useful to children?
Friendship with the trained volunteer helps the child to start trusting himself and others, deal with difficulties and overcome the isolation, open up, interact with others in a friendlier manner, and learn how to take care of himself and others. The Big Friend becomes a role model to the child. Volunteers encourage children in difficult moments of their lives, and teaches them to tell good from bad. The volunteers, students or people of different professions, show children the importance of learning and education, and introduce them to their profession and work. The Big Friends have a positive impact on children's independence, they teach them various practical things (for example, how to take public transportation or plan one's day).
Tolerant volunteers try to understand and listen to children. This encourages children to open up and tell about their problems. The volunteers do not avoid difficult questions, instead, they teach children to know and understand themselves better, and to help themselves or others.
Friendship with the Big Friend teaches the Little Friend how to make friends with others. The child becomes more courageous, and starts feeling more confident about himself and others.

In 2000, a study, conducted in the US (http://www.bbbs.org/site/c.9iILJ3NGKhK6F/b.5961035/k.A153/Big_impact8212proven_results.htm), found that after 18 months of friendship with the Big Friends the Little Friends, compared to children who did not take part in the program, were:
46% less likely to begin using illegal drugs;
27% less likely to begin using alcohol;
52% less likely to skip school;
33% less likely to hit someone.
The study also found that children in the program were more confident of their performance at schoolwork and getting better along with their families.
In 2005, a study was conducted in which 200 respondents (children, volunteers, and parents or foster-parents) were asked questions about the effectiveness of the BBBS program in Vilnius. The study found that 89% of children, 95% of parents, and 96% of volunteers noticed positive impact on children. Both the volunteers and parents agreed that children started more to trust themselves and others, became more confident and independent. They made more friendships with their peers, became more attentive and responsible, learned better to express their feelings, and improved their relationship with parents and friends of their own age.

Adults noticed positive changes in children's abilities: children got better at expressing opinion (18% - very improved; 48% - improved); to care more about their looks and personal hygiene (18% - very improved; 62% - improved); to make decisions (15% - very improved; 56% - improved); to trust themselves (14% - very improved; 64% - improved); to express their feelings (11% - very improved, 62% - improved); and they got better at controlling their emotions (8% - very improved, 39% - improved).

Children's answers show that many of them feel that friendship with the Big Friends improved their skills of interaction with others, and their relationships with peers, parents, and teachers: with school buddies (21% - very improved, 33% - improved); with other peers (12% - very improved, 50% - improved); with teachers (9% - very improved, 32% - improved); and with parents (3% - very improved, 42% - improved).

Parents noticed a positive impact on children's achievements: attending extracurricular activities (12% - very improved, 21% - improved); at school (11% - very improved, 30% - improved); school attendance (8% - very improved, 6% - improved); and doing their homework (6% - very positive, 21% - improved).

The study shows that children's participation in the program is important for several reasons. Children:

**found a true friend:** “I found a friend whom I can talk to; now it's more fun.”

**expanded their horizons; they spend their leisure time in a more creative way; found new hobbies:** “I discovered a bigger world, started to interact more with others, and I think more before..."
I act;” “[A child] could go where grandma couldn’t go; [he/she] got a chance to go to the summer camp.”

gained more confidence, became more independent; also, started to understand better himself and others, became friendlier: “It gave me more confidence, I am more relaxed while interacting with others. I have more useful and interesting time, long walks are good for exercising my legs;” “[he/she] gained more confidence in himself/herself, found new friends, has better relationships with peers;” “[he/she] understands better what other people need.”

Parents and foster-parents said that the chance for their children to participate in the program is a huge help to them because:

it makes them feel calmer: “Our relationship with children improved; the friendship between two people has a very important impact on trust and attitude towards the others in future life [of the child];” “I became calmer, because now my daughter has a friend whom she can open up to. I feel a very positive impact the program has [on us].”

children became more independent and confident, they interact in a more open way: “I like the changes in my son: he gained more confidence, started a friendship with the Big Friend;” “My child didn’t feel restrained, somehow his Big Friend knew how to achieve it.”

children started spending their time in a more interesting way; their horizons expanded; they enriched their experiences: “I am happy that my daughter has a new good friend, [that] she experiences new things, and her leisure time is more interesting;” “The Big Friend expanded my daughter’s horizon, she is more confident about herself, and I am very happy about this friendship.”

In what ways is participation in the program useful to volunteers?

Every volunteer who helps the child gains new experience and skills, gets a better understanding about care and friendship with younger people, learns to understand families and kids with different life experience, expands his horizons, becomes more mature, and has a good time with the child.

In the 2005 study, the Bigs stressed that the participation in the program:

gave them an opportunity to better understand children and adolescent world, gain more experience: “It allowed me better to know and understand children, things that are important and
not so important to them, subtleties of certain children age;” “[the program] taught me patience and tolerance. [Also, it] taught me to give more than gain. I am happy being able to donate my time.”

**gained more confidence, felt that he can be useful; felt a bigger sense of responsibility:** “I have more confidence about myself, I can more openly express my opinion, I have noticed this in my Little Friend as well. I became more active;” “I tested my sense of responsibility and patience. I learned to compromise and found little person who is very dear to me;” “I understood that I can help others; despite how I feel, I learned how to listen, control my emotions, and how to advise and help others to make decision.”

**allowed them to go back to the childhood; to experience new things and have fun time:** “I understand that I have forgotten what important problems I had when I was her [Little Friend's] age. I learned to look at the world through the eyes I saw it 10 years ago;” “We have fun time together. My friend is very kind, smart, and reliable, I could call her my sister. It's very nice to be a role model.”

A number of Big Friends **could apply their knowledge and social skills:** “[I was able] directly to see the results and reaction to the knowledge I gained at the university. I myself became more patient, more consistent, and flexible.”

To motivate volunteers, various international projects and Volunteer Clubs are organized for them. On such events, they not only share their experience but have a chance to meet other volunteers, peers, and gain new experience.

### Financial Support of the Program

The BBBS program administered by the NGO Children Support Center is supported by various entities. The program is supported by businesses, foreign foundations, and Lithuanian people who donate 2% of their income taxes.

Projects meant for BBBS participants (summer camps and other events), scouting for volunteers, training of children and volunteers, and program's advertising are supported by various ministries of the Republic of Lithuania and Vilnius city municipality. In these cases, the program is supported as part of the services to children who were abused or went through various crises.
BBBS at School

The BBBS program applied in schools prevents and intervenes. It helps to minimize isolation and aggressiveness among children in Lithuanian schools. The main goal of the program is to form a friendship at school between younger and older school kids where the older children become the Big Friends for younger kids. The friendships are professionally supervised by trained school teachers.

Why BBBS is useful in schools?
In the past decade, there have been significant changes of the rate of abuse among school children in Lithuania. It increased, and became almost the norm. Moreover, the number of younger children abusing each other has increased. Constant sneering, racketeering, physical abuse, and group punishments show that children have difficulties getting to know themselves, controlling anger and impulses, they lack ideals and values that can keep them away from using abuse. It is necessary to correct the situation, and good news is that it can be done. The school could contribute to minimize the rate of abuse among children and provide support for them using its own resources – older school children who are mature and focused and want to help younger children.

Volunteers in school
The older children can play a very important role at abuse prevention and intervention in their schools. 9–12th grade adolescents are active in school's life, they take part in useful school's projects, gain experience and practical communication skills while working voluntary with younger peers; they creatively influence their opinions, learn how to pass this social experience to others, feel their usefulness and purpose, and perform social activities.

The older children can be a positive role model to younger kids – they act as their support, and the source of information. They help them to get a sense of and understand school subjects, to keep relationships, choose right friends, and raise younger kids' self-confidence and self-esteem.
How does the friendship develop in school?

The friendship takes place in school at an appointed time and place. The activities of the Little Friend and the Big Friend are foreseen by the coordinator. The case manager regularly consults and professionally supervises the couple, and assesses the results.

The coordinator of the BBBS in school

In schools, the coordinator of BBBS can be a schoolteacher, social educator, psychologist, or any other school staff member who has a university diploma, completed BBBS in School training course and has a certificate to prove it. These courses are organized by the NGO Children Support Center.

BBBS in Lithuania

The Big Brothers Big Sisters Association of Lithuania, established in 1999, unites BBBS programs in all Lithuania. The mission of the NGO Children Support Center is to spread the BBBS program in Vilnius city and the whole country.

Today the program is successfully implemented in nine Lithuanian cities and towns: Vilnius, Kaunas, Šiauliai, Klaipėda, Alytus, Joniškis, Kretinga, Molėtai, and Utena. In these places they are administered by pedagogical-psychological services, youth and day centers, and NGOs, schools.