

Second Workshop “Transnational Comparative Analysis” Dublin (Ireland) 12 – 15 of June 2013 Report of the workshop

Minutes

<p>Thursday, 13.06.2013</p> <p>09:30 – 9.45</p>	<p>Presentation of the project workshop aims and programme</p> <p>Gov. Ethel Gavin (Irish Prison Service)</p> <p>The presentation set out the actions and objectives of the WS 2 workshop. It prompted the engagement of all participants in making the workshop an informative and valuable forum to explore and clarify existing practices in working with high risk offenders in custody and after release in the partner jurisdictions.</p> <p>.ppt presentation is attached</p>
<p>9.45-10:15</p>	<p>Elaboration of the WS 2 questionnaire responses and key issues arising</p> <p>Gerry McNally (Probation Service)</p> <p>The presentation introduced the result of the pre-workshop information survey providing detailed information on eight stages in the Court, custodial, release and post release stages of sentence for high risk offenders in each of the partner jurisdictions. The presentation was informative and well received and provided important background data for the discussion workshops.</p> <p>.ppt presentation is attached</p>
<p>10.15-10.45</p>	<p>Who/What is a High Risk Offender: An example from Irish practice</p> <p>David Williamson (Probation Service)</p> <p>The presentation explored the issues and challenges in the identification and assessment of high risk offenders using examples from existing risk assessment and evaluation practice in Ireland. The formidable and stimulating presentation generated considerable interest and discussion which was continued in the workshop discussion groups.</p>

<p>15.00-15.30</p>	<p>JCN project Quality Plan and updating of the Tallinn Questionnaire Report.</p> <p>Prof. Dr. Frieder Dünkel (University of Greifswald)</p> <p>Dr. Ineke Pruin (University of Greifswald)</p> <p>The presentation and quality plan update comprised an outline of what research is about, the results of the Tallinn questionnaire to the associate partners with the answers of Belgium, Slovakia and Slovenia and a ppt-presentation on the overall results of the questionnaire concerning all 7 partners and associate partners.</p> <p>The presentation added significant information to the data previously gathered and presented. It informed knowledge and contributed to further discussion in the workshop discussion groups.</p> <p>An update report on the project quality plan was presented to partners and is attached.</p> <p>The .ppt presentation is attached.</p>
<p>Friday 14.06.2013 09:15- 10:40</p>	<p>Presentations on examples of interagency practice (Ireland)</p> <p>SORAM (Mark Wilson, Regional Manager, the Probation Service, Robert Templeton, National Specialist, Children and Family Services, HSE and Det. Sgt Jennifer Molony, Sex Offender Management and Intelligence Unit, NBCI)</p> <p>Presentation on the SORAM project, its operation in practice and value in the management of high risk offenders.</p> <p>The presentation was informative, attracted considerable interest and has potential for implementation in every country. SORAM was further discussed in the discussion workshops.</p> <p>.ppt presentation is attached</p> <p>Building Better Lives (Dr. Ruth Kevlin, Psychology Service, Irish Prison Service)</p> <p>Presentation on the Building Better Lives programmes as delivered in Wheatfield Prison with violent offenders as part of offence-focused work and preparation for release.</p> <p>The presentation was most informative, attracted considerable interest and showed value in working with violent high risk prisoners. Potential for dissemination was explored in the discussion workshops.</p>

<p>Thursday and Friday</p> <p>11:10 – 12:50</p>	<p>2 parallel workshops:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Transition Management Strategies and <u>systems in prisons and preparing for release</u> following the sequential timeline of the sentence from committal to release <p>Chair: Tony Hickey (Irish Prison Service)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing post –custody transition management and supervision Strategies and systems <u>in the community</u> following the sequential timeline of the sentence from in custody preparation, release and resettlement in the community <p>Chair: Brian Dack (Probation Service)</p> <p>The workshop discussion groups reviewed the steps in working with high risk offenders enabling comparison of existing practice in partner jurisdictions. Participants explored issues highlighted in the presentations and related discussions, issues arising in the background information circulated for the workshop and the general challenges and dilemmas arising in practice. The broad range of experts and experienced participants from different background stimulated discussion.</p>
<p>Thursday 14:00-15:00</p> <p>Friday 14:00 - 15:15</p>	<p>On both days Workshop discussion groups reported back to the main meeting with a brief outline of key points and issues by a rapporteur and follow up questions and discussion.</p> <p>Identifying who is high risk and how they are evaluated was an important topic of discussion following on the issues highlighted in the workshop presentation. Related to this, how the assessment is used in developing interventions, support and management actions was seen as very important. It was necessary that ‘high risk’ should not be a label but a call to action. These issues were recognised as particularly important topics to be explored further in the course of the project. In the community discussion group there was considerable interest in supervision practice in the various jurisdictions including issues such as minimum standards of contact, contract of supervision, variation of court orders, links with prison, release conditions, obligations and enforcement, Community Return (Ireland), one-to one contact, family work, liaison with addiction services.</p> <p>The role of the police in transition from prison differs greatly in the varying jurisdictions and co-operation is underpinned by legislation in Germany and Latvia. In this discussion the example of how SORAM works in facilitating co-operation between partners was viewed as promising and a positive model for practice.</p>

	<p>In prison the importance of co-operation, engagement and co-ordination between the criminal justice agencies and mainstream social service providers was highlighted as important in developing good and effective practice. It also helped in preparing the services and prisoners on release to continue engagement in a positive and less distrusting or hostile manner.</p> <p>In-reach service in prisons by community providers was acknowledged as a positive develop but not available everywhere. The contribution of ngo/ community based services working in prisons was identified as valuable in supporting/facilitating the transition phase and continuing a supportive engagement in the community after release. It was highlighted as an area that could be promoted and development in the course of this project.</p> <p>All emphasised the need for a working alliance with the offender given the care and control aspects. The aim is to provide a level of supervision based on risk and requirements of the law. It was recognised by all participants that it is essential to liaise and co-operate with partner agencies to provide treatment and social services.</p> <p>The challenge of having meaningful engagement with high risk offenders was a common theme in all jurisdictions. How to initiate and sustain real engagement with services in prisons, continue/ maintain contact in the community, motivating and encouraging desistance was discussed.</p> <p>Employment, education, Health and Safety considerations for staff were all topics aired. Putting pre-release plans into action having an agreed frequency of supervision with high risk offenders was explored. Electronic monitoring, which hardly exists in Ireland (with one few rare prison release exceptions) was talked about and the experience of the other countries was touched upon.</p> <p>Home visits are used in Ireland but this is not a universal practice. Drug testing, referral to treatment programmes such as Sex Offender treatment programmes and their success were discussed.</p> <p>There was general agreement that public protection is not just a criminal justice issue and demands a community response, which is an approach that allows for the sharing of the tasks, allowing for statutory responsibilities to be fulfilled.</p> <p>Good examples from Finland were discussed. In Germany joint working arrangements are fixed in writing together with statutory and NGOs to improve the offender's chance of reintegration. Estonia has good use of volunteers.</p>
--	---

	<p>Building better co-operation with police services was seen as a work in progress in some of the participating countries. Partnerships lead to an expansion of resources on the ground in the community and in custody. They add to a normalisation of the management, monitoring and assisting of the high risk offender in custody, on release and in the community.</p>
<p>Friday 15.40- 16.30</p>	<p>Panel discussion</p> <p>The panel comprised Kirsti Kuivajärvi, (Finland), Jörg Jesse, (Germany), Rait Kuuse, (Estonia), Prof. Dr. Frieder Duenkel, (Germany) and Tony Hickey (Ireland).</p> <p>The session involved a conversation between the panel members and the workshop participants exploring the key issues and challenges in effective interventions, release and supervision based on the presentations at the workshop and the wide experience and knowledge of participants. There was a discussion regarding different understanding of who are high risk offenders in the jurisdictions and how that might best converge or be shared.</p> <p>The discussion explored different levels of engagement by non-criminal justice service with high risk offenders and challenge to integrate service (e.g. health accommodation, employment etc.) to high risk offenders in mainstream services, the difficulties that posed and ideas from participants regarding how gaps and opportunities might be addressed.</p> <p>The discussion highlighted the need for ‘joined-up’ services, security and other providers, to maximise best outcomes. Concerns regarding data management, privacy and information sharing were also explored.</p> <p>The strengths and weaknesses in current practice were discussed contributing to agenda issues to be addressed in coming workshops.</p> <p>The panel acknowledged that the project had made significant progress to date in establishing a common awareness of shared issues in the transition management of high risk offenders, identified existing practices, opportunities for learning and room for improvement.</p> <p>It was agreed that there was evidence of good practice, knowledge and expertise among the partners to proceed to the next workshop to identify best practice.</p>

<p>Thursday 15:30 - 18:30</p>	<p>Visit to Arbour Hill Prison/Mountjoy Prison – two separate guided groups visited either Arbour Hill Prison (mainly sex offenders and very long sentence prisoners) and Mountjoy Prison (very large population of high risk prisoners) for visiting partner participants and Irish participants not already familiar with the institutions.</p> <p>Governors met participants, introduced the prisons, brought delegates through the institutions meeting staff and some prisoners and seeing a range of activities on-going in the prisons.</p> <p>The visits were appreciated by the participants who asked questions, explored issues and compared practices.</p>
-----------------------------------	--

