

# REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE “ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION”<sup>1</sup>

## BUCHAREST, ROMANIA (6-7 OCTOBER 2016)

### OPENING AND WELCOME

#### **Ms Gabriela Scutea, Secretary of State**

Ms Gabriele Scutea proudly welcomed the participants of this international Conference to the lovely country of Romania. She highlighted the importance of establishing international networks, meeting one-another and sharing knowledge and experience for creating safer societies throughout Europe. She expressed her hope for a successful and inspiring Conference.

#### **Mr Mihai Dima, General Director, Romanian National Probation Directorate**

Mr Dima, General Director, Romanian National Probation Directorate, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Ministry of Justice. He also mentioned that having this conference in Bucharest would be a good opportunity to motivate and inspire Romanian Probation officers.

Mr Dima stated that the CEP is a prestigious body and that the number of the members in this confederation were high, not only EU member states but also countries outside the EU including researchers and universities. He went on to say that it was very positive to see how the CEP was raising the profile of Probation within the field of Criminal Justice. From the very beginning, the CEP represented a Platform where professionals could share information, and today those professionals also include academics.

Last but not least he mentioned three reasons for being happy in hosting this conference. The first reason was because topics to be discussed included: security, treatment of people involved in the criminal law and recidivism. The second reason is the bringing together all types of professionals within the field of probation: managers, case workers, researchers etc. And the third and last reason was that the effectiveness of interventions would be explored.

#### **Mr Gerry McNally, CEP President**

Mr McNally, the new elected CEP President, opened the conference and welcomed the participants. He mentioned that the conference would be a good opportunity for all participants to work together. He stated that key issues would be discussed in the plenary sessions and the workshops would be a good opportunity to engage in discussions. A wonderful opportunity to meet new people and make new contacts. He thanked the Romanian Ministry of Justice, the CEP secretariat and all conference speakers, he wished all participants a fruitful two days.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this report only main ideas are included. For further and detailed information please download full presentations through the following link: <http://cep-probation.org/knowledgebase/cep-international-conference-on-alternatives-to-detention-bucharest-2016/>

## **LEGISLATIVE REFORM AND THE ROLE OF ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION**

**Ms Alina Barbu, legal adviser, Romanian Ministry of Justice and former Vice-President of the PC-CP – Council of Europe**

Ms Barbu delivered a speech about the legislative reform in Romania from the Probation perspective.

She started with some theoretical and essential questions regarding alternatives to detention and Probation: *“is probation an alternative to detention? Or better: is the probation the only alternative to detention?”* She then continued to talk about the criminal justice history in Romania as well as recent, interesting developments in Probation, and legislative reform in Romania.

Her complete speech can be found here: <http://cep-probation.org/knowledgebase/cep-international-conference-on-alternatives-to-detention-bucharest-2016/>

## **RADICALIZATION AND RESTORATION IN THE COMMUNITY**

**Mr Tim Chapman, University of Ulster (Northern Ireland)**

Mr Chapman, EFRJ Board member and lecturer in restorative practices at the University of Ulster, explained how restorative justice could be applied to the issue of radicalization and violent extremism, in particular when working with dissidents serving long sentences. At the University of Ulster they undertook a research project named *“ALTERNATIVE”*. The project included: training ex-combatants and support for the development of community based restorative justice and community education.

He talked about the work done in prison regarding loyalist prisoners serving long sentences for serious crimes. It was a three year programme (2010-2013) and 14 offenders participated. He mentioned that the main problem was resistance to rehabilitation when working with whose actions were politically motivated. His approach combined ideas from the desistance theory and restorative justice. He highlighted how they had worked with IRA prisoners and how they had helped them reintegrate to the society.

He then highlighted the importance of the rehabilitation process when working with politically motivated offenders. He suggested the following when working with political motivated offenders: attention to building a relationship, to deconstruct the ideology, test the validity and effectiveness of ideology, offer alternative narratives, test alternative behaviours through restorative justice and raise questions of victims.

During his presentation he read some real inspiring quotes from offenders (politically motivated prisoners).

Mr Chapman said that the restorative justice practice they had implemented was evaluated. Some of the identified success factors were: voluntary participation, practitioners working for independent authorities, extensive contact over two years, transparency and trust, respect, skilful facilitation, debriefing and support from colleagues, focusing or highlighting the wrongness of being violent and killing people thus engagement with other people and narratives and connecting with wider networks of support in the community.

## **EUROPEAN NORMS AND VALUES RELATED TO HUMAN RIGHTS**

### **Ms Christine Morgenstern, University of Greifswald (Germany)**

Ms Morgenstern from the University of Greifswald, Germany, delivered a speech regarding the European norms and values for offender supervision.

She started with the question “what is Europe?” She answered this question by using various different definitions of Europe. For example she mentioned: Eurovision (56 members), the UEFA (54 members), Council of Europe (47 member states), European Union (28 member states), Schengen Area (26 member states), Eurozone (19 member states) and included the 36 member states which are members of the CEP.

She then discussed the definition of offender supervision and community sanctions and measures: *“Sanctions and measures that maintain offenders in the community and involve restrictions of their liberty, controlled by the state or bodies with a mandate by the state”* and related it to the concept of humans rights as well as with the issues that interdisciplinary research should incorporate into their theorizing and research methodologies. She then ended up by reflecting upon European norms and values for offender supervision.

## **PRE-TRIAL DETENTION IN THE EU**

### **Ms Jesca Beder, European Commission (Belgium)**

Ms Beder, European Commission legal adviser, delivered a speech about the issue of Pre-trial Detention (PTD) in the EU. In June 2011 a wide public consultation was launched on the issues of pre-trial detention. 81 received were received from Member States, civil societies and NGOs. She also spoke about a European Parliament resolution of 7 December 2011 and European Parliament resolution dated 27 February 2014.

Ms Beder stated that some interventions had also been developed at EU level, such as: a study performed by the Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services (CSES) 2015/2016 and a piece of research developed by Fair Trials International (FTI) on "The Practice of Pre-Trial Detention: Monitoring Alternatives and Judicial Decision-Making".

Regarding the size of pre-trial detention, Ms. Beder mentioned that although there was a lack of reliable figures, she could mention some data: Pre-trial detainees made up a sizeable proportion of the European Union’s prisons – approximately 22% by the most recent measure, comprised of 120,539 individuals held on remand or awaiting a final sentence. The number of pre-trial detainees and the proportion they make up of overall prisoners varies widely between Member States, ranging from 6% in Poland to 39.9% in the Netherlands. (BE, EL and NL). A relatively high proportion of the EU’s pre-trial prison population are not nationals of the country holding them (26%).

She followed the presentation with a comparison on the established legal principles regarding PTD with the real application of it.

She stated that there are clear problems and issues when the PTD is used: consequences for the individual who should be presumed to be innocent, discrimination as foreigners are kept in custody more often than nationals and the effect of mutual recognition instruments (such as the European

arrest warrant –EAW). She also spoke about overcrowding regarding costs of detention and costs of compensation for unjustified detention.

She said that we need a change of mind regarding this area because we are dealing with different legal cultures and habits. She then stated that it has not going to be change it with more legislation as it's something much more complicated.

She also mentioned that there was a lack of resources with regards to the use of alternatives to pre-trial detention. She mentioned that many countries still do not use alternatives to pre-trial detention, and that this was the same with regards to Electronic Monitoring.

She went on to state that it should be obligatory to use alternatives to detention and pre-trial alternatives. She mentioned that the EU is aware of this sensitive issue and also mentioned that member states, and in particular some judges, were reluctant to implement and use alternatives to pre-trial detention. With this in mind, there was a clear role for defence lawyers to put this issue forward. She also mentioned that perhaps new technology (electronic monitoring) could be used as an alternative to pre-trial detention. She stated that the EU is interested in the idea of electronic monitoring but has an economical problem and that not all EU member states could provide an electronic bracelet. Last thing she mentioned was that legislation might not be the ultimate solution and that probably we would have to do much more.

## **HAVE COMMUNITY SANCTIONS AND MEASURES WIDENED THE NET OF THE EUROPEAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS?**

### **Mr Marcelo Aebi, University of Lausanne (Switzerland)**

Mr Aebi professor of the University of Lausanne presented his piece of research regarding the net widening effect of the Community Sanctions Measures.

Community Sanction Measures (CSM) were created to reduce the prison population and to improve offenders reintegration. Marcelo Aebi mentioned that having analysed data from 29 European countries the authors of the research wanted to determine whether CSMs are used as an alternative to prison or as supplementary measures – that is, additional community sentences. For testing this he mentioned that there were 2 ways. Form a longitudinal perspective, if the number of probationers increase the number of prisoners should decrease. And also from a comparative cross-sectional approach, inside of each country, the countries that have high number of prisoners should have lower number of probationers.

Mr Marcelo Aebi went through different charts that represented different data. He mentioned that the number of persons serving community sanctions and the number of inmates have increased in almost all European countries during the period studied (1990/91 – 2010) regardless of the trends in crime. This data showed that, in general, CSMs have been used as a supplementary measure, not as an alternative, and thus effectively contributed to widening the net of the Criminal Justice Systems. CSMs became part of a punitive approach to Criminal Policy in countries that promote control by keeping people inside the Criminal Justice System (using prison or probation measures) instead of avoiding reoffending by prioritizing socialization or rehabilitation in the community. The data also shows a wide diversity in the use of CSMs across Europe in 2010. It is difficult to say which countries are using CSMs in a reasonable way. The implementation of CSMs in Europe did not result in a visible effect on prison population rates, thus CSMs do not seem to guarantee a reduction in the prison population.

He end up his presentation by mentioning the main categories of sentenced prisoners by type of offence (median percentages in 2014): traditional theft is decreasing, theft is no longer the main type of offence for which sentenced inmates are serving custody, the rise of e-crime is not reflected in the composition of prison populations, most sentenced inmates are serving sentences for drug offences and violent offences and for these crimes inmates usually receive long sentences.

## **AN OVERVIEW ON THE FRAMEWORK DECISIONS' IMPLEMENTATION**

### **Mr Ioan Durnescu, University of Bucharest (Romania)**

Mr Durnescu, former CEP Board member and professor at the University of Bucharest gave a speech regarding the status of the implementation of Framework Decisions 829 and 947.

He presented a comparative overview of the two FDs. In general terms he mentioned that there are a lot of similarities between both FDs but that there are also a lot of differences, for instance the aim and purpose is completely different as well as the judicial time frame. He also mentioned that is a challenge for non-nationals offenders to use alternatives to provisional detention.

Mr Durnescu named several EU projects that had helped implement both FD and referred the audience to the CEP website for further information on projects, conferences, expert meetings, news and articles regarding this issue. Regarding the state of implementation of the FDs, he said that, most of EU states transposed them with some exceptions that he didn't mention. He said that there isn't a system to collect data regarding the implementation of FDs across Europe, thus a system should be developed.

He presented a case study regarding an offender that was transferred from "Roritania" and "Auritania" under the FD 947. Regarding this case study some of the remarked conclusions were: the procedure was still unknown by some judiciary and probation services, the procedure was still taking a long time and was sometimes too bureaucratic, too many competent authorities and that the FD 947 covered mainly the judicial procedures but not the supervision intervention process.

He finished up by mentioning some of the conclusions made about FDs 829 and 947 at the expert meeting organized by the CEP in Brussels last September 2016.

## **THE FUTURE OF PROBATION IN EUROPE: PRACTICE, RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE**

### **Mr Fergus McNeill, University of Glasgow, UK Scotland**

Mr McNeill, Board member of CEP and professor at University of Glasgow presented some of the conclusions of the COST Action's work. The talk explored the work of the Action and its implications for the future of probation, exploring the (mutual) development of research and practice through knowledge exchange, drawing on the experience and expertise of supervisees, supervisors and researchers, as well as policymakers and professional leaders.

During his speech he also presented two different stories of how offenders feel and think probation, inspired by images.

For access to the full content of the presentation of Fergus McNeill the audio recording can be downloaded here: <http://www.offendersupervision.eu/blog-post/the-future-of-probation-practice-research-and-knowledge-exchange>

## **PANEL SESSION - ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION**

**Ms Danijela Mhrar Prelic (Slovenia), Ms Ramona Balaita (Romania), Ms Linda Paap (Estonia), Ms Annette Esdorf (Denmark), Ms Sonia Crozier (United Kingdom)**

***Chair: Mr Gerry McNally***

During the panel session five expert professionals in the field of probation were asked to present their ideas and/or main developments regarding probation in their countries. Some of the subjects discussed are presented below.

**Ms Annette Esdorf:** She stated that in Denmark they were working to improve the use of CSM as well as to increase the use of electronic monitoring. In Denmark they had managed to close two detention centres, but unfortunately not permanently. She continued by mentioning that the most important reason for the increase in the use of CSM was because of a high level of communication between judges, prosecutors and the media. She stated that it was very important to state that CSM are effective and that the imprisonment doesn't work at all. The only argument that is valid when communicating with the media is that the alternative measures are effective, that they reduce crime and reduce victims. This is the main reason to use alternative measures. And of course it has to be mentioned and highlighted that CSM or alternative measures they are not necessarily soft, if the sentenced person doesn't follow the conditions there will be consequences.

**Ms Sonia Crozier:** She gave an overview regarding the effectiveness and the consequences of working for the Probation services coordinated with other agencies (multiagency cooperation). She mentioned that the Probation services and police services could work together and cooperate in an intensive way. She also stated that offender management was a way of working to support communities and protect victims from future crimes.

**Ms Linda Paap:** She spoke about her experience with electronic Monitoring. She mentioned that she was in favour of Electronic Monitoring and that it should be integrated in a structured supervision plan to gain maximum effect. She also mentioned that in Estonia EM was used as a real alternative to imprisonment. In Estonia the length of EM is very different; it can go from 3 months to one year. She considered that the optimal length of time was an average of 3 months. She also highlighted that supervision only or just control don't help either, for that reason different types of interventions and treatment programs needed to be considered and put into place together with EM to offer the offender all the possibilities of rehabilitation and reintegration.

**Ms Ramona Balaita:** She talked about case management. She mentioned that in most countries case management include, more or less, the same activities: coordination of activities to ensure cooperation between the person and their family during the probation process, monitoring cases, assessing the evolution of the case, inform the judge and make the final assessment. She also mentioned differences within the Romanian system, for example: the adaption of intervention to the changes that happen

during the rehabilitation process. If the obligation or the activities are not suitable for the offender the CM could ask the court to make appropriate changes. When there is an administrative decision CM can refer the case to a community institution in order to follow a treatment programme or to perform community work. In terms of challenges for the future she said that Romania should develop electronic monitoring in order to keep offenders in the community. She ended up with an example of how case management was regarded by a Romanian judge (*appeal court*), a chief probation officer and by two ex-probationers.

**Ms Danijela Mhrar Prelic:** She spoke about how Slovenia was developing their probation service. She started by telling the story of how a baby was born. She said that Slovenia was the only EU country that didn't have a Probation Service, they had probation activities but their Probation Service was not established by law, and organized in an institutional way.

She also mentioned that to create a Probation Service an analysis of context was needed. The criminal code was then looked at regarding changes to improve legislation. She mentioned that legislation in Slovenia worked well but that there was no institution to develop sentences, thus an action plan was developed to create a Probation Services. She stated that the government had helped and accepted the proposed activity plan. She went on to say that Slovenia wished to take into consideration the knowledge from more experiences countries with regards to developing their probations service.

She also remarked that the imprisonment rate in Slovenia is very low: *"most of our sanctions are conditional sanctions only with one condition, not to commit a crime. Other are prisons and community sanctions."*

She also mentioned that they would like to train Social workers, Probation officers and would like to develop rehabilitation programmes. In Slovenia they would like to achieve a higher level of humanity although they already have a low level of incarceration and a really open prison system. She ended up to say that Probation is not only supervision, is also support.

## **CLOSING WORDS**

### **Mr Marc Cerón, former President of CEP, Catalonia**

Mr Cerón started mentioning that the ones who know him know that he loves art. He said that he got very impressed by all conference speakers but how Ioan Durnescu and his team showed the audience the 20 minutes film was a good opportunity to understand what probation is.

Then he introduced the painting *School of Athens* by Raphael. He said that he had the opportunity to sit in front of it because he attended a CEP board meeting in Roma when there were no Skype facilities. He went through the painting and talked about it. He mentioned that Plato and Aristotle are in it and both man are using a book and raising a finger. Raphael wanted to indicate that for Plato the most important thing was the true and for Aristotle the most important thing was to know how the true was transformed in action. He went on to say that there is no meaning for ethical construction if there is no capacity of transforming it in something practical for the happiness and welfare of people. He ended up his speech saying that during those days we talked a lot but that we also would have to put this

knowledge in the service of the ethics and to have a better society, and this is also the aim of Probation at the end.

**Mr Willem van der Brugge, CEP, Netherlands**

Mr van der Brugge, Secretary General of CEP closed the conference by thanking the Probation Romanian office and to and Ms Iuliana Carbutaru and Ms Andrea Scutaru. He also thanked the CEP Board, the former Vice-presidents Ms. Sue Hall and Mr. Gerhard Ploeg and former Board member Mr Ioan Durnescu. He also thanked the CEP Secretariat, Ms Marine Herschel, Ms Mirjam van de Kooij, Ms Esther Adam and Ms Anna Esquerrà, and also thanked the participants to the Conference. He informed the audience regarding the future CEP conferences, and went on to say that he hoped that participants would carry home beautiful souvenirs form Bucharest.

On behalf of the CEP the Secretary General closed that conference and wished everybody a safe way home.

## **WORKSHOPS – Six workshops were held during the conference**

[To see the workshop notes please go to annex 1]

### **WORKSHOP SESSIONS I**

#### **(A) DRUG COURTS AND DRUG TREATMENT - Chair: Mr Gerhard Ploeg**

Ms Ingunn Seim (Norwegian Correctional Services) - Drug Courts Ms Elly Westerbeek (SVG, Dutch Probation Service for addicted offenders) , Ms Heleen Rutgers (Prosecution, the Netherlands) and Ms Ellen Verbeem (Prosecution, the Netherlands) - Early interventions for addicted offenders in the process of criminal justice.

#### **(B) TECHNOLOGY IN THE PROCESS OF ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION - Chair: Mr Imants Jurevicius**

Ms Gail McGreevy (Probation Board for Northern Ireland)  
Ms Anna Simonsson and Ms. Lena Lundholm (Swedish Prison and Probation Service)  
Ms Maartje van Keulen and Mr Bart Hagtingius (Dutch Probation Service)

#### **(C) PROBATION & PROFESSION - Chair: Ms Annie Devos**

Ms Mihaela Tomita (University of Timisoara, Romania) - Resilience  
Ms Angèle Geerts and Mr Frank Philippart (AVANS University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands) - Criminal Justice Social Work

### **WORKSHOP SESSIONS II**

#### **(D) WOMEN - Chair: Ms Sue Hall**

Ms Katie Moynihan (Manchester City and Salford Magistrates Court, UK) – Women’s Problem Solving Court, Mr Anton Elizalde Tristan (APIP, Spain), Ms. Laila Rauet Frentjen (IRES, Spain) and Ms Laura López Roldan (INTRESS, Spain)

#### **(E) MENTAL HEALTH - Chair: Ms Iuliana Carburaru**

Ms Laura Cotter (Irish Probation Service) - Are the Needs of Adult Offenders with Mental Health Difficulties being met in Prison and Probation?  
Ms Jana Spero (Croatian Probation Service) - Working with Offenders having Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

#### **(F): RADICALISATION - Chair: Mr William Rentzmann**

Ms Emilie Petit (EFUS, European Forum for Urban Security) – LIAISE II project & partnership between professionals in the field of justice and local authorities  
Mr Ramin Farinpour (ERA - Academy of European Law, Germany) - Enhancing Cross-border Mutual Legal Assistance and Recognition of Decisions in Countering Terrorism and Preventing Radicalisation in Prisons

## **ANNEX 1 – WORKSHOP SUMMARIES**

### **Summary of Workshop A:**

#### **DRUG COURTS AND DRUG TREATMENT**

**Workshop Presenters:** (1) Ingunn Seim (Norway)

(2) Heleen Rutgers, Elly Westerbeek, Ellen Verbeem (The Netherlands)

**Workshop Chairperson:** Gerhard Ploeg (Norway)

#### **What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

- Cooperation between practitioners (Probation) and judicial authorities.
- Looking beyond the case – use the margins that are allowed by the system in a professional way

#### **What were the main questions and areas of discussion?**

- Clarification of elements in the presentation.

#### **What were the key points and conclusions arrived at in the session?**

That what it says above is a positive result leading to a better handling of individual cases.

**Notes:** Gerhard Ploeg

**Summary of Workshop B:**  
**TECHNOLOGY IN THE PROCESS OF ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION**

**Workshop presenters:**

- (1) Gail McGreevy (Northern Ireland, Great Britain)
- (2) Maartje van Keulen, Bart Hagtingius (Netherlands)
- (3) Lena Lundholm, Anna Simonsson (Sweden)

**Workshop chairperson:** Imants Jurevičius (Latvia)

**What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

Experience of 3 different jurisdictions – Netherlands, Northern Ireland and Sweden – were presented and discussed regarding development and implementation within probation practice of web and smartphones based applications that improve quality of communication with probation clients and their capacity to maintain crime free lifestyle:

- Netherlands – project “probation online” and 3 web based applications developed: (1) Sociogram, (2) Personal timeline and (3) Personal risk management plan;
- Northern Ireland – application “Changing Lives” assisting those on probation supervision on their journey from desistance of crime towards rehabilitation and resettlement in communities;
- Sweden – application containing cognitive behavioural treatment components and reminders for exercises and scheduled visits.

**What were the main questions and areas of discussion?**

- IT solutions for data security
- Accessibility of application
- Resistance to such innovations mainly comes from professionals, not offenders - it might be true that offenders in general are better skilled to use modern technologies than their probation officers;
- Development of 2-way communication: so that offenders can communicate with probation officer via application.
- How to motivate offenders to use applications

**What were the key points and conclusions arrived at in the session?**

Application developers from all jurisdictions expressed a willingness to stimulate further experience exchange and join forces to continue development of their applications to establish this innovation within European probation practice. It might be done under gentle guidance of CEP and Professor Fergus McNeill (Scotland) to strengthen development of practical applications for desistance theory

**Notes:** Imants Jurevicius

**Summary of Workshop C:**  
**PROBATION AND PROFESSION**

**Workshop Presenters:** (1) Iosif Csatlos Dima (Romania)

(2) Angèle Geerts, Frank Philippart (The Netherlands)

**Workshop Chairperson:** Annie Devos (Belgium)

**What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

- Workload for the practitioners on the field
- Recommendation Bas Vogelvang to cope with stressful job of probation officer
- Presentation of the AVANS University project regarding Criminal Justice Social Work

**What were the main questions and areas of discussion?**

- Recognize the weight of the reality of caseload
- Key role of the value/shared values
- Need of methodological support
- Difficulty to make the political level aware of the reality in the Probation field.

**What were the key points and conclusions arrived at in the session?**

- Need to be in a learning organization
- Need to have strong shared values to allow peer support between Probation officers.
- Need to foresee tools/attention to the management and middle management

**Notes:** Annie Devos

**Summary of Workshop D:  
Community Alternatives for Women**

**Workshop Presenters:** (1) Katie Moynihan (UK)

(2) Laura Lopez Roldan, Antonio Elizalde, Laila Rauet Frontjen (Catalonia)

**Workshop Chairperson:** Sue Hall (United Kingdom)

**What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

- Women are a minority in the criminal justice system. They have a different profile of offending to men – more likely to commit acquisitive crime, less likely to commit violence.
- They also have more complex needs – more likely to have been victims of sexual, physical and emotional abuse; more likely to have mental health problems; more likely to be carers for children or others.
- They therefore need gender-specific interventions, as shown in the two presentations.
- The first presentation (Katie) described the establishment of a women's problem solving court in Manchester and gave 1 case study.
- The second presentation looked at community interventions for women focusing on 2 case studies. They described a women's violence programme running in Catalonia.

**What were the main questions and areas of discussion?**

- Delegates described the position in their own countries – Finland, UK, Romania
- At lot of those attending were from Romania where there is no bespoke provision for women at the moment – no specific programmes.
- We broke into small groups to discuss the key question – what are the key issues in working with women?

**What were the key points and conclusions arrived at in the session?**

- Women should not be slotted into services designed for men – a more thoughtful approach is needed which takes account of their needs, and which provides a safe space.
- A holistic approach is needed when working with women, in which different partners work closely together.
- Women need to be involved in developing the package of support around them – to take responsibility.
- Services should support women's ability to care for their families

A questionnaire was circulated in which delegates were asked to share their knowledge about resources they had found useful in working with women. (Anna has copies of these).

**Notes:** Sue Hall

## **Summary of Workshop E:**

### **MENTAL HEALTH**

**Workshop Presenters:** (1) Laura Cotter (Ireland)

(2) Jana Spero (Croatia)

**Workshop Chairperson:** Iuliana Carbutaru (Romania)

#### **What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

- Prevalence of mental illness among offenders and the treatment offered by probation.
- Proposals regarding the policies delivered by probation in this area
- Practices of the probation services in cases of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)

#### **What were the main questions and areas of discussion? (Working groups)**

- Challenges faced by the probation services in cases of offenders with mental health issues including PTSD
- What is the support network in these type of cases
- How the refusal process works

#### **What were the key points and conclusions arrived at in the session?**

- The need to develop protocols of intervention of probation staff
- The need to develop effective community supervision of offenders with mental illness including PTSD

**Notes:** Iuliana Carbutaru

## **Summary of Workshop F:**

### **RADICALIZATION**

**Workshop Presenters:** (1) Emilie Petit (France)

(2) Ramin Farinpour (Austria)

**Workshop Chairperson:** William Rentzmann (Denmark)

#### **What were the key themes and issues raised by the presenters?**

- Shared understanding of Radicalisation
- Improving cooperation between judicial actors and local authorities
- Necessity to include new actors in the partnership (intelligence services, religious representatives, etc.)
- Use refugees as credible voices
- Realize that rehabilitation might be harder than we are used to

#### **What were the main questions and areas of discussion? (Working groups)**

- One group chose to focus on a definition of (religious) radicalization
- Another on inclusion of vulnerable persons and the necessity of educating prison and probation staff in Islamic values and ways of thinking
- A third focused on including new actors in countering radicalization among probationers
- The need for working with relationship and engagement with vulnerable clients

**Notes:** William Rentzmann