



eduPRIS



CROSS-SYSTEM COLLABORATION IN JUVENILE JUSTICE

*A POLICY RECOMMENDATION EXERCISE
FROM A GRASS-ROOT LEVEL APPROACH*

The EDUPRIS Method



uniss
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SASSARI




Uniwersytet Papieski
Jana Pawła II
w Krakowie


ICPA
International Corrections
& Prisons Association


aproximar
COOPERATIVA DE SOLIDARIEDADE SOCIAL, CRL

merseyside
**EXPANDING
HORIZONS**



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission support for the production of this publication under the project EDUPRIS 612205-EPP-1-2019-1-RO-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

CROSS-SYSTEM COLLABORATION IN JUVENILE JUSTICE

INTRODUCTION

The EDUPRIS project organized a conference on 22nd and 23rd February 2023, bringing together stakeholders and experts in the field of juvenile justice from across Europe. The conference aimed to address the complex challenges and issues surrounding education in the juvenile justice system, with a focus on promoting evidence-based policy reforms and improving the experiences of children and youth involved in the system.

The working group activity highlighted the lack of a unified European juvenile justice system, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive approach to address the diverse policy, practice, and funding landscape that exists at state and local levels. The involvement of various decision-makers and service providers further complicates the system, requiring collaborative efforts at both the state and local levels to bring about meaningful reform.

Key stakeholders, including professionals from the fields of education, welfare, health, justice, and community, were actively engaged in the EDUPRIS project. Their involvement was crucial in recognizing the importance of collecting and sharing data transparently, as well as establishing effective communication channels. By fostering collaboration and knowledge exchange among these stakeholders, the project aimed to bridge the gap between policy development and evidence-based practices. We had participants from Romania, Poland, Portugal, Italy, UK, Latvia, Norway, Spain, North Macedonia, Netherlands, Turkey, Czechia, France, and Belgium. As institutions we had civil society, university, special needs education schools and teachers, probation services, prisons and prison administrations, trade unions, police, school counselling offices, youth associations, companies.

Education within the juvenile justice context was explored, acknowledging the variations in its meaning and scope across different countries. The workshop identified three broad categories: general education, vocational education and training, and non-formal learning. Understanding these distinctions and their implications for effective education delivery was crucial for addressing the needs of young offenders.

The conference also highlighted the complexity of the institutional framework and the allocation of responsibilities in delivering education to children and young people in the juvenile justice system. The involvement of multiple entities, such as the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Education, regional and local authorities, prisons, education and training providers (both public and private sectors), third sector organizations, and the church, further underscored the need for coordination and a common ground among these actors.

The agreed context described by all the participants has a number of common characteristics all over Europe and was a major topic of discussion.

In the complex ecosystem connecting school and juvenile justice, it is crucial to address the educational needs of children and youth involved in the juvenile justice systems and criminal correctional settings. This essay aims to shed light on the multifaceted challenges faced by this

vulnerable population and propose policy recommendations to improve their educational outcomes. By examining available statistics and research findings, it becomes evident that the current state of juvenile justice statistics in Europe lacks comparability and reliability. Additionally, the essay explores the intersection of risk factors that contribute to poor educational experiences for these children, emphasizing the need for comprehensive and coordinated interventions. Based on this analysis, a clear call for action is presented to ensure that these children receive the quality education they deserve.

1. Lack of Comparable Statistics:

Comprehensive juvenile justice statistics are seldom available, and existing data across European countries are hardly comparable. The absence of standardized definitions, inconsistent statistical construction rules, variations in legal procedures, and differences in imposed sanctions hinder the comparability of European juvenile justice statistics (European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics). Consequently, these statistics fail to provide valid and comparable information on the extent of juvenile delinquency and the social reaction to it.

2. Emerging Adults: A Distinct Group:

European legislators are increasingly recognizing emerging adults, aged 18-25, as a developmentally distinct group requiring specialized treatment within the justice system. Although they represent a significant proportion of criminal convictions and have high recidivism rates, most individuals in this age group outgrow criminal offending by their mid-20s. Addressing the needs of emerging adults is crucial for reducing crime rates (European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics).

3. Educational Challenges and Risk Factors:

Children and youth involved in juvenile justice systems face a multitude of risk factors that hinder their educational progress. These risk factors include learning difficulties, hyperactivity/impulsivity, abuse, neglect, parental breakdown, bullying, truancy, racial discrimination, and association with deviant peer groups. These factors intertwine, exacerbating one another and resulting in poor educational outcomes. Furthermore, experiences in school settings, such as enrollment issues, inappropriate placements, and a lack of coordination among agencies, contribute to their educational disadvantage.

4. Importance of Proactive Interventions:

To address the needs of children in juvenile justice systems effectively, a comprehensive and coordinated approach is required. Interventions must focus on enriching social and cognitive skills, fostering pro-social values and attitudes, and developing coping skills. Additionally, strong attachments to parents, siblings, pro-social peers, adults, and the local community are essential for their positive development. An inclusive and caring school environment that promotes success for all students should be prioritized.

5. Bridging Conceptual Differences:

Professionals working in juvenile correctional settings often have different conceptual frameworks and treatment approaches, leading to varied responses to troubled youth. Bridging these differences and developing consistent priorities, goals, and strategies is a significant challenge in providing effective services.

6. Substandard Education in Correctional Facilities:

While special education services are implemented in correctional facilities, the educational programs provided often fall short of minimum professional standards. These programs may deviate from effective instructional practices and fail to incorporate educational reforms and evidence-based strategies. The substandard education received by youth in correctional settings perpetuates their academic deficiencies and increases the likelihood of school dropout.

7. Hidden Students, Neglected Education:

Children and youngsters involved in the juvenile justice system often become "hidden" from public educational systems, leading to diffused responsibility and neglect of their academic outcomes. Schools in these communities tend to lack resources, skilled teachers, effective leadership, consistent instruction, and support for students with learning difficulties. Consequently, these students face inadequate educational opportunities.

To address the complexity of the ecosystem connecting school and juvenile justice, concerted efforts are required to improve the educational outcomes of children and youth involved in the juvenile justice systems. Policy recommendations include standardizing juvenile justice statistics, recognizing the distinct needs of emerging adults, implementing comprehensive interventions, bridging conceptual differences among professionals, improving education standards in correctional facilities, and prioritizing the education of hidden students. By taking these actions, we can provide these children with the quality education they deserve, empowering them to become productive adults and reducing the prevalence of juvenile delinquency. It is imperative that policymakers, educators, and society as a whole recognize the urgency of these issues and commit to implementing the proposed recommendations for a brighter future for these vulnerable children.

Our participants all agreed they are missing at national level and as a whole in Europe the following points:

1. **Establish a European Juvenile Justice System:** The working group emphasized the need for a unified European juvenile justice system to ensure consistent policies, practices, and funding mechanisms across member states. This would facilitate better coordination, information sharing, and collaboration among stakeholders.
2. **Enhance Collaboration and Communication:** To address the complexities of the juvenile justice system, it is essential to establish effective collaboration and communication frameworks among education and training providers, welfare agencies, health services, and justice systems. This would enable the mainstreaming of education and training provisions in prisons, aligning with the Council of Europe's Recommendation on Education in Prison and the European Prison Rules.

3. Professionalize Teacher Training: Develop a common language and training framework for teachers and education professionals working within the juvenile justice system. This should involve the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Justice, and relevant national and regional authorities to ensure consistent standards and qualifications for educators.
4. Collect and Share Data: Emphasize the importance of data collection and transparency in the juvenile justice system. Establish mechanisms for sharing data among stakeholders to inform evidence-based policy development and monitor the effectiveness of education and rehabilitation programs.
5. Mobilize European Networks and Platforms: Leverage existing European networks, such as the European Prison Education Association (EPEA), to disseminate best practices, promote knowledge exchange, and raise awareness about effective education and training models in the juvenile justice context.

As a result of this activity, backed by national structured public hearings in each EDUPRIS country and further working group moderation, we are proposing the bellow narrative of how we understand the context and what will be our public policy recommendations.

According to the European Commission, approximately 1 million children face criminal justice proceedings in the European Union each year (thus representing 12% of the estimated 9 million people facing criminal proceedings in the EU)¹ while millions more are at risk of involvement with the system for myriad reasons. The 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child² is the international treaty which provides for children's rights, including the rights of those in conflict with the law. At the European level, the Council of Europe Guidelines on Child-Friendly Justice³ (<https://www.coe.int/en/web/children/child-friendly-justice>) offers guidance on the treatment of children in conflict with the law.

Juvenile justice and child welfare agencies serve youth who are involved with both systems better when they work together toward positive outcomes. The child welfare and juvenile justice systems have historically operated in isolation from each other to the detriment of the youth. Increasing the integration and coordination between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, as well as other child-serving systems, such as mental health and education, can improve outcomes for youth in both systems by helping to identify youth at greater risk of juvenile justice system involvement earlier and by providing the expertise and resources to meet the needs of these youth most effectively.

Over the last twenty years, the child welfare field has slowly acknowledged the population of vulnerable youth has been impacted by both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. This population has unique paths and positions in multiple systems, as well as strikingly negative outcomes. These youth are commonly referred to, among other terms, as "**crossover**" youth. The term "crossover" youth has been defined as a broad category of youth who have been maltreated and involved with the juvenile justice system at some point in their lives (Herz, Ryan, & Boychik, 2010⁴). These youth include:

- those involved in the child welfare system and then the juvenile justice system;
- those who have a history with the child welfare system but no current involvement at the point when they enter the juvenile justice system;
- children who experience maltreatment but have no formal contact with the child welfare system and then enter the juvenile justice system; and
- youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system when they enter the child welfare system.

The fundamental goal of the paper is to increase attention to the issues facing crossover youth, provide an overview of the current state of policy impacting this population, and offer a new policy approach to improve system **collaboration and outcomes for youth**. When discussing two or more agencies that are working together to solve social problems, or to provide a product or service to members of the public, the first meaning of collaboration is typically

¹ European Commission, (2019)

² Convention the Rights of the Child.

³ Council of Europe (2010).

⁴ "Challenges facing crossover youth: An examination of juvenile-justice decision making and recidivism.", Denise C. Herz and Joseph P. Ryan and Shay Bilchik}, Family Court Review}, 2010}, volume={48}, pages={305-321}

invoked. Kraus⁵ (1980, p. 11) defines collaboration among organizations as *“a cooperative venture based on shared power and authority. It is non-hierarchical in nature. It assumes power based on a knowledge or expertise as opposed to power based on role or function.”* These attributes and outcomes are much sought after when agencies deal jointly with juvenile offenders. The juvenile justice field is replete with calls for community-based treatment that involves multi-disciplinary and multi-agency approaches for responding to youth who come into contact with the system. Collaboration is seen as a way to provide juveniles and their families with a broader range of services that may be more cohesive and efficient than the traditional separatist approach where agencies acting as discrete entities contact a juvenile.

The first one is the benefit for **youth and families**. Accessing services can be a daunting task for youth and families that requires the navigation of multiple systems, each of which has different procedures, rules, and terminology). Youth who were receiving services in the community prior to coming into contact with the justice system may experience disruptions or changes in medications and providers, and information about their medical and mental health

history is often not shared. The various systems may provide services or impose requirements on families that are duplicative or conflicting. The result is a fragmented service delivery system and worsening youth and family outcomes.

In contrast, youth and families experience far less fragmentation when they receive services in the context of a system in which services are provided seamlessly, without regard to the particular system a youth appears in, and in which support is a coordinated effort among the multiple systems involved in a youth's life. Collaborative practice can result in less fragmentation in services, an improved ability to meet specialized needs, more choices in services, improved access to services, and improved outcomes for children and families⁶(Hodges et al., 1999, p. 67). Collaboration can also improve access to services by bringing attention to gaps in the system and reducing barriers for families.

A second benefit is that related to the **program sustainability**. Meaningful collaboration can be critical to the long-term sustainability of a system of care program focused on youth in the juvenile justice system. After a grant funding ends, the sustainability of a program often depends on a number of factors, such as the ability to access a range of funding streams (including juvenile justice funding streams), the amount of political and agency support for the program (which can be significantly hampered if the juvenile justice system does not view the program as important), and the extent to which the program can demonstrate positive outcomes on the variables important to the juvenile justice system. Having a **“partner”** at the table, helping make the case for why a program should be continued or expanded, can strengthen the program's chances of sustainability.

The last benefit is related to the input on **systems and the community**. Cross cooperation can yield significant benefits for both systems, as well as for the community as a whole. This collaboration can result in improved system relationships and serve to build trust

⁵ Collaboration in organizations: alternatives to hierarchy Author: William A. Kraus, 1984

⁶ Hodges, Sharon & Hernandez, Mario & Nesman, Teresa. (2003). A Developmental Framework for Collaboration in Child-Serving Agencies. Journal of Child and Family Studies

between the agencies. Embracing a concept of joint responsibility for the community's youth helps reduce the tendency to place blame on the other systems when children fall through the cracks. Furthermore, reducing duplication of services and engaging in coordinated needs assessments and planning efforts allows limited resources to be used more efficiently. Formal collaborative structures, such as memoranda of understanding, can increase the efficiency of decision-making and service provision. These changes can result in significant cost savings to the taxpayers, while at the same time ensuring a more comprehensive and effective system of care for youth in the community. In carrying out the act of justice in the case of crimes committed by minors, several institutions are involved, each with its role - clearly or less clearly defined -, each with its organizational structure, with. An assessment of the inter-institutional collaboration in the field of justice for delinquent minors could be considering the following factors:

- dimensions of collaboration and type of collaboration relationships stability between institutions;
- the quality of collaborative relationships and
- the factors that influence collaboration.

Dimensions of collaboration and types of relationships

Assessing institutional actors involved in justice for delinquent minors, three main directions can be distinguished in which to achieve inter-institutional collaboration. First of all, there is a collaboration centered on the legal procedure, that is, on the set of expectations that each institution has from the others it comes into contact with within the legal basis. This collaboration influences the activity and activity of each individual institution. Although apparently this collaboration has a formal character, reality from the field showed the great importance of the informal, inter-personal relations between the representatives of these institutions.

Second, there is what we might call inter-institutional collaboration within working groups with variability in terms of stability over time and degree of formalism. Such a working group is the Child Protection Commission, which includes representatives of several public institutions: the child protection department, police, school inspectorate, etc. Third, there are collaborations on joint projects, generally initiated and developed by non-governmental organizations. In general, the projects aim either at the professional development of justice workers through courses, seminars, exchanges of experience, or at educational-informational campaigns, generally focused on prevention.

The quality of collaborative relationships

The quality of inter-institutional collaboration fluctuates depending on the type of institution and place. However, we can find strong links and the weak links of collaboration in the field of justice for delinquent minors. The strong links ,are constituted by the following inter-institutional relationships: the collaboration between the police and the prosecutor's office, due to the fact that the investigation activity of a police officer is supervised by a prosecutor on each individual case The weak links encountered is determined unilaterally by the quality of the social

investigations carried out by the authority, as well as by the fact that, in general, it does not get involved in these cases, not participating in the act of justice when it is summoned.

The rest of the inter-institutional relations are positioned in terms of quality between the two types of relations mentioned and vary from one location to another in terms of intensity (frequency) and efficiency. For example, there are areas where the police collaborate very well with the minor's protection department, based on protocols, but also based on informal relations, but also areas where minor's protection department is dissatisfied with the communication with the police.

Factors influencing inter-institutional collaboration

The main factors that have an influence on the collaboration between the institutions involved in juvenile justice can be divided on the one hand into structural or institutional factors, and on the other hand into human factors. The first category includes:

- the amount of work related to the number of staff,
- bureaucracy and rigid relationships
- hierarchies within the institutions,
- the legislative framework that regulates the activity of each institution and
- the existence of a specialized structure on minor issues in inside the institutions.

Within the human factors can be included: the degree of development of some informal relations between the workers of various institutions and the mentalities. The high workload of the workers in these institutions represented, for example, by the large number of cases that a policeman or prosecutor has to investigate or that a judge has to solve negatively influences their ability to collaborate on the concrete activities in which intersect, as well as their willingness to get involved in joint projects.

Elements for Effective Cross-System Collaboration

The process of coordination and integration requires a strong foundation of commitment from multiple system leaders. Each entity should formalize a leadership group that will be responsible for making decisions and guiding the reform process. The group should include those who have the authority to make decisions within their agencies or entities as well as those who have experience working with youth and families. At a minimum, such a group must include leaders from child welfare, juvenile justice, and the juvenile court. These leaders must develop a shared vision, communicate it effectively, and hold themselves and others accountable for achieving it. In many jurisdictions this group, often referred to as an executive committee, manages the work of several subcommittees focused on specific tasks that contribute to the overall development of a strategy for change.

An important aspect of collaborative initiatives is the formalization of new approaches, as well as good practices that might already be in use informally. Such agreements can serve a variety of purposes – from formalizing a general commitment to working together to outlining very detailed cross-system practices. Agreements can be used to address long-standing and complex

issues such as bridging deep philosophical divides or tackling data and information sharing conflicts. Whatever the purpose, interagency agreements provide a platform from which to develop agreed-upon language defining the issues to be addressed and the actions that will be taken to address them.

Among the factors that promote integration and coordination is staff training across systems. In order to effectively work together with staff in other agencies or organizations, staff members need to learn how those other agencies work. Educators need to be trained in any changes in practice and new responsibilities or job requirements. All stakeholders affected by an initiative need to learn about the purpose of the initiative as well as the new values, priorities or goals developed as a part of the reform. Cross-system training cannot be a one-time event; jurisdictions must work to develop a training plan that addresses dual status youth work with new hires and in an ongoing fashion.

Dually-involved youth and their families are likely to be working with both social workers and probation officers – professionals who may have different missions and mandates. These professionals may rarely contact one another, much less coordinate their plans. To address this common problem, some jurisdictions have established cross-system practices, multi-disciplinary meetings, and even specialized units or teams that dedicate staff in each agency to working together with dual status youth.

Conclusions

Today, juvenile justice reform has become a largely bipartisan issue as lawmakers work together to develop new policies to align sound fiscal responsibility, community safety and better outcomes for youth. There also now exists an abundance of research that is available to lawmakers and the field on adolescent development—that includes the latest neuro[logical], social and behavioural science that distinguishes juveniles from adult offenders. Recent trends in juvenile justice legislation across the EU represent a significant new direction to broadly reform justice systems. Juvenile justice policies require balancing the interests of public safety, accountability and rehabilitation. The challenge for lawmakers is to develop policies that seek to disrupt the pathways that youth follow into the justice system. According to the new ways of addressing the juvenile delinquency, the paradigms of education and self-development, reintegration and compensation, mediation, and support victims must characterize the philosophy of the European system of juvenile justice, in order to prevent the escalation of crime and recidivism.

Juvenile justice does not mean only sanctioning and enforcement of the sentence in the special scheme. On the contrary, it means: avoiding, as far as possible, the involvement of the formal judicial system, and to grant efficient measures for reintegration in the community. From an ideal point of view, juvenile justice should involve family, friends, neighbours and schools for preventing juvenile delinquency. In some countries in Europe, in institutional terms, juvenile justice is rather a theoretical concept, approached and analysed on a regular basis, especially at the national or international conferences. In terms of practice, there is undeniable progress on addressing children in conflict with the law, especially at a time when they are in rehabilitation centres. At least in the execution of imprisonment sanctions, the practice ahead the law. Building

a professional network, made up of institutions and NGOs who are able to work in partnership, based on institutional procedures and practices and the wide scale use of restorative justice and mediation in juvenile delinquency cases should be indispensable conditions to ensure that juvenile justice would become form a theoretical concept to an efficient and coherent system.

The creation of effective and efficient community-based programs that serve youth who are in contact with the juvenile justice system requires a level of collaboration that many communities have found difficult to achieve. The challenges to such collaboration, however, are not insurmountable, and there are practical things a community can do to create an environment that is conducive to collaboration. Implementing these strategies can help overcome traditional barriers to collaboration and build systems of support that use collaboration as a foundation for serving youth in the juvenile justice system.

CURRENT PRACTICES, CHALLENGES, AND RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO JUVENILE EDUCATION SERVICES IN PRISONS

1. The current landscape of education during prison

Juveniles have conventional insignificant consideration in terms of the right to education, and prison education seems to be an unpopular subject as it seems infrequently in neither public discourses nor sufficiently in educational research. General, prison education appears to be a field that remains under-researched and under-theorized and it “has been astonishingly imperceptible in some European policy documentation”. In order to stress, between additional things, the universal right to education, the UN has put forward a document called “The Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners” (also known as Nelson Mandela Rules) which were first available in 1955. It has served as a guide in emerging prison laws, policies and practices. It entails “universally acknowledged minimum standards for the detention of prisoners” (UN, 2015, p. 1).

While the general number of youths involved in the juvenile justice system has been declining, on any given day in 2022 there were still more than 4,276⁷ young people imprisoned or committed to juvenile justice facilities. Numerous of these adolescences have experienced abuse or neglect dangerous neighbourhoods environments, marginalization, and/or involvement in the child wellbeing system. A huge percentage of committed adolescents display mental health circumstances and have, historically, failed to obtain mental health services. In addition, there are three to four times more students with disabilities who require special education and related services—such as those diagnosed with emotional disorder or explicit learning disabilities—in the adjudicated youth population than among students in community schools

Numerous studies deliver convincing evidence of the undesirable effects on youths with long-term commitments to juvenile justice facilities. For example:

- Undergoing imprisonment in youth age significantly increases the probability of recidivism.
- For adolescences with mental health conditions, the harmful effects of institutionalization and the challenges of dealing with a disorder, place them at risk of a difficult threat of suicide than other youths.
- Subsequently leaving prisons, many youths do not return to school, and of those who do, many drop out earlier finishing high school.

We cannot continue to admit the upcoming risks, deprived outcomes, and security values that too often have developed inevitable conclusions for youths committed to prisons. Consequently, juvenile justice changes focusing on diversion are expanding in many communities, guided by the principle that prison should promote rehabilitation and redirection

⁷ Aebi, M. F., Cocco, E., Molnar, L. & Tiago, M. M., (2022). SPACE I – 2021 – COUNCIL OF EUROPE ANNUAL PENAL STATISTICS: PRISON POPULATIONS. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Table 7.

by addressing the educational and related needs of incarcerated youths. Providing youths with appropriate educational services during imprisonment is crucial to keeping them involved in their education and focused on their future, thereby allowing them to set realistic long-term goals, counting a fruitful return to a community school or entry to a postsecondary establishment upon release

Justice-involved persons typically have lower literacy levels than the general population and are less likely to have a high school diploma or to have conventional postsecondary education. Many penitentiaries offer education plans in an effort to address these inequalities, though typically only a portion of inmates really are included in a program. Frequently accessible prison education programs contain academic training at all levels, special education courses for students with disabilities, and occupational training and life skills programs that deliver concrete skills.

Research shows that prison education can decrease recidivism and grow employment after being released from prison. Philosophy and circumstantial evidence suggest that education may also advance in-prison behaviour and endorse positive re-entry outcomes outside recidivism and employment. Education endorses rehabilitation in numerous ways, through palpable benefits such as formal certifications and concrete skills, as well as imperceptible gains like better decision-making abilities and pro-social values.

There are numerous pathways by which education can advance results for persons both in prison and after release. Education expands decision-making skills and endorses pro-social thinking, thus refining in-prison behaviour and easing adjustment to prison. It preserves inmate involved and energetic, evading inactivity and opportunities for misconduct. Education also grows human capital, enhancing cognitive skills. After release, these improvements can help people get and preserve employment and avoid engaging in illegal action. Education can also help shape pro-social abilities after release and become better family and community members. In addition to these positive consequences, numerous people view education as an intrinsic right, a process that is appreciated in and of itself, and a significant constituent of a full and enjoyable life.

By increasing students' aptitudes and providing precise skills, education can make it easier for returning prisoners to find stable, well-paying jobs. In addition, education has a signalling effect to employers, serving as a formal indicator of an individual's abilities and achievement. Formal educational achievement can challenge the negative signalling effect of incarceration, whereby conviction and incarceration send a negative perception about an individual's character and abilities.

In all probability, education touches imprisoned students in a sum of ways, and disentangling all these pathways is stimulating. Yet seeing the mechanisms by which education may affect in-prison and re-entry consequences is valuable since it can help guide research on the efficiency of prison education. It can also impact the growth of education programs, since a program's purpose and design are likely to differ depending on the impact expected by from the program. For example, policymakers and prison administrators might emphasize their programs on providing specific vocational skills.

While appreciated, such programs might miss the benefits that liberal arts or other, more generalized curriculum could deliver in improving cognitive functioning. All these programs are multifaceted, and the fact that incarcerated students have a range of needs, implies that certain programs that might be successful for certain students may not be for others. Research on the efficiency of prison education principally emphasizes two sets of consequences:

(1) recidivism, in terms of reoffending, rearrest, or reincarceration, and

(2) employment-related actions such as labour market contribution and wages

A handful of mostly qualitative studies have also explored the consequence of prison education on in-prison behaviour and changes. Research examining re-entry consequences outside employment and recidivism, such as pro-social attitudes, cognitive functioning, family relationships, and civic appointment, could provide a much complete picture on the influence of prison education. Regrettably, the field lacks well-designed studies that address these consequences.

Also, the evidence providing the impact of juvenile education in the community is failing to differentiate from results for prior inmates, since various assessments of these sorts of programs do not differentiate people with imprisonment histories from other members. While the field has not shaped a clear understanding of the effect of prison education on a full range of in-prison and post-release consequences, there is extensive research on the effect on recidivism and unemployment, which are frequently the consequences of greatest apprehension to policymakers, criminal justice officials, and the public. Taken together, many studies recommend that prison education can decrease recidivism and rise employment levels and salaries. These positive effects have been found for a range of types of programs, as well as vocational training and juvenile basic, secondary, and postsecondary education

The current body of research has not advanced far sufficient to identify evidence-based best practices that are explicit to education for criminal justice populations. Furthermost assessments of prison education agendas do not distribute the information on program structures—such as curricula, intensity, and staffing—that is essential to determine finest practices. However, researchers have recognized some over-all principles of actual practice in prison education :

- The most effective programs highlight individual rehabilitation through skills building, cognitive growth, and behavioural transformation. By their very nature, many prison education programs fit straight within this agenda.
- Multimodal agendas that address numerous needs are extremely effective, and they recommend that , prison education may need to happen in tandem with substance abuse treatment, cognitive-behavioural therapy, job training, and other actions.
- Programs need to be applied with honesty, meaning the model is grounded on a strong theoretical framework, the program basics and methods are grounded in research, and programming is provided by capable, trained staff following standardized protocols.

2. Education behind the walls: Challenges and opportunities

Prisons present exclusive tasks for the delivery of educational services. Instructors are tasked with teaching juveniles with an extensive range of intellectual abilities and previous educational experiences, counting many who have constantly been ineffective in the wider public education system. Teachers must instruct these persons in the face of inadequate funding, space, and resources; disruptions to program steadiness; and institutional safety concerns that meaningfully compel programming. Feasibly the principal challenge is that prisons are, firstly and primarily, institutions of control and safety, not schoolrooms or colleges.

Despite these difficulties, education can flourish inside the prison walls with the assistance of prison administrators and the professionalism s on the part of prison educators to teach within and around the restrictions. In fact, education can contribute to the prison assignment of secure facilities and safe communities by enlightening inmate performance and indorsing success after release. The form that effective prison education programs take, differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in terms of construction, staffing, teaching practices, program transfer, materials and technology, and other mechanisms The prison environment presents many tasks for the delivery of educational services. The most common include the following:

- **A miscellaneous population with an extensive range of cognitive skills and prior educational experiences**

The education stages of imprisoned people differ, ranging from total illiteracy to approximately level of high school education or even postsecondary knowledge. In addition, proper educational achievement is not constantly a consistent indicator of skills; an individual may have got or even accomplished high school yet be reading at a 6th grade level. Imprisoned students with a complete variety of official and actual skill levels can occasionally end up in the same classroom together, In addition to the variety of educational grades among inmate students, an important share includes learning disabilities, emotional or behavioral difficulties, and/or mental health topics that complicate their social and educational requirements. Inappropriately, learning incapacities and mental health issues are frequently undiagnosed, misdiagnosed, or indecorously preserved. Additional groups that present special educational needs are students with incomplete language skills.

- **Incomplete funding, resources, space, and other properties.**

As with education agendas in the community, many prison education systems face serious funding and resource boundaries. Reliable, enthusiastic funding streams for prison education are often missing, as funding may come from numerous sources and may be one item amongst many in a facility's general budget. Over the previous several years, funding for prison education commonly has not been increased proportionally with the magnitude of the incarcerated population.

Education programs are frequently the first to go during budget cuts, either since they are regarded by prison managers as nonessential or because legally obligatory services such as medical care and sanitary living conditions must be given priority. Incomplete funding limits the accessibility to classroom resources; equipment for vocational agendas; computers, Internet access, and other technology; and even the accessibility of adequate numbers of well-trained teachers. In fact, a number of prison education programs are created and staffed by non-profit organizations or volunteers. Space concerns are also an issue: since numerous prison facilities were not planned with educational programs in mind, classroom space can be limited and

overcrowded. Classrooms may have to be shared with additional programs, and space for computers or specialized equipment for vocational training can be unusual.

- **Disruptions of program continuousness, counting short stays, regular transfers, and limitations on inmate movement.**

Research has established that dosage is an important factor inducing program efficiency, and that continuous participation in programs for a specified period is frequently vital to achievement. Until now the needs of the prison system regularly take priority over the need for program steadiness. Facility lockdowns or limitations on the movement of certain inmates can impede engagement. Based on system wide requirements, inmates may be relocated to alternative facilities with a slight notice in advance, and the new facility may or may not offer similar educational programs. Unreliable funding streams and teacher vacancies can also hinder program steadiness. Short stays are an important issue because of the trouble of providing programs to a population that changes from day to day and is only imprisoned for a short time.

- **Institutional security alarms.**

Things that may appear simple in community schoolrooms, such as offering Internet access or providing scholars with certain equipment or resources, may be almost intolerable in prison facilities. Even guaranteeing that external teachers and volunteers are able to enter and exit the facility rapidly and simply can be challenging. Bringing inmate students of dissimilar security regimes in the similar schoolroom may be problematic, and those on isolated security regimes of detention may need one-on-one teaching or some method of computerized programming.

The vast majority of prison administrators rank a safe and secure facility overhead all else, with good reasons. The test for prison educators is to work inside and around the subsequent limits, but also to prove to managers that educational programs can really indorse institutional security rather than threaten it. Program occuppies and involves students who might then be idle, and education can expand decision-making skills and indorse pro-social performance.

The restrictions and challenges of providing educational programs in a prison background only complicate the previously difficult task of educating juveniles who have frequently been unproductive in the public education system for many years. Researchers in the field have yet to regulate how imprisoned juveniles best learn, resulting in wide difference in program models across jurisdictions. Programs vary meaningfully in terms of curricula, instructional approaches, value of instruction, use of technology and additional materials, staffing, program distribution, dosage, participation motivations, participation and completion rates, administration and organizational structures, and supplementary components. Since limited data exist on various of these elements, describing a perfect or even a characteristic prison education program is problematic.

Furthermore, schools and educational programs within prison look and feel different and are systematized very different from those in traditional community colleges. As they attempt to deliver the services needed for high-quality education, juvenile justice institutions have tasks and face a number of challenges comparable to those in the traditional school system, as well as others **exclusive to juvenile justice systems.**

Some of these include:

- **Student selection and performance management.**

Although both community schools and those in juvenile institutions need to address student engagement and behavior management, youths arriving in prison may have previously experienced many trials both in school and in the community. Their knowledges in community schools have not been helpful, including advanced rates of school postponement and/or exclusion compared with their peers, not involved with the criminal justice system.

Effective constructive interactive involvements and classrooms management methods are vital to addressing unruly behaviors and providing an environment favorable to learning. Harmless, supportive, and attractive classrooms permit teachers suitable time to teach, increase student engagement in knowledge, and help address students' social and emotional requirements.

- **Access to highly competent and effective teachers.**

Given the variety of the educational needs of students in prisons, teachers in such facilities need wide-ranging ability sets. Certainly, they must be ready not only to address their students' academic and cognitive requirements but also to foster students' social and emotional skills in prison. Preferably, facility administrators would pursue teachers who have the mandatory credentials and knowledge on working with youths who are highly at risk, and such teachers are ready on their first day in a new facility. Though, engaging such teachers for these settings can be problematic due to their presumptions about prisons and the young people they serve.

- **Diverse student educational requirements and multilevel classrooms.**

Prison typically do not have the capacity to deliver a "traditional" school setting with individual grade-level classrooms and fundamental subject educators. Instead, education staff frequently must deliver teaching to students at a diversity of ages and academic levels in one room at the similar time. In addition, there are disproportionately more students with disabilities in the referred youth population.

So, it is vital for teachers providing prison education to be flexible in their approaches to teaching. Instruction must address students' separate needs, and teachers should be able to teach across numerous subject areas in a assumed class period while also safeguarding that students master core subject content.

- **Re-entry preparation.**

Almost all youths leave prison and come back to their communities, nonetheless for many youths, preparation for re-entry does not start early enough, nor does it involve the youths and family in programs concerning re-entry. Thus, re-entry planning ought to start proximately upon a student's entrance, plan how the student will continue with his/her academic career, and, as desirable, address the student's conversions to career and postsecondary education. Re-entry planning is multifaceted and requests to be well-coordinated among prison **staff** (including teachers, facility administrators, security staff, and other relevant in-school providers), the youths, the family, the community school, and other community partners assisting with re-entry related actions.

Actionable re-entry strategies and supports not only endorse a youth's success and help avoid future involvement with the justice system, but, when well performed, can also create a basis for overall life goals. Though providing real re-entry planning offerings genuine challenges, they can be overwhelmed. Indeed, failure to involve committed youth in re-entry planning

further reduces their chances for achievement and increases the likelihood of lengthy engagement with the juvenile justice system

- **Security fears and access to technology.**

Education and reintegration are important for youths confined to prison. At the same time, prisons need to preserve security, and endorse community and facility safety. Some educational and vocational practices or opportunities, like Internet access, may need to be controlled in order to avoid threats or violations in facility and community safety. Though, boundaries are placed on a student's admission to the Internet for safety or security reasons, it is imperative to admit that as access to educational technology has developed standard for many students in community schools, prison may face barriers to providing similar educational experiences for their students without it.

Indeed, these barriers must be overcome if assistive technology is essential for the education of students with disabilities. On the other hand, technology must not be used as a subsidiary for teachers and classroom training in a prison any more than it would swap classroom teaching and appointment in a regular educational setting.

3. From classroom to community -Policy recommendations for Good Education in Juvenile Settings

Youth in general enter the juvenile justice institutions with substantial educational shortfalls. Many have previously suffered a numerous of blockades to educational success, including under-resourced colleges, exclusionary school discipline policies, and overly-restrictive educational settlements. Furthermore, aspects like poverty, abuse, trauma, emotional conditions, and extreme mobility are related with both involvement in the juvenile justice system and poor academic outcomes. Placement in a juvenile justice prison grants a turning point: without suitable programs and management, too many youths fall further behind although in custody.

- **Developing the Programs,**

The restraints and tasks of providing educational programs in prison only complicate the previously problematic task of educating juveniles who have often been ineffective in the public education organization for numerous years. Academics in the field have yet to determine how imprisoned juveniles best acquire, resulting in varied difference in program models across jurisdictions. Programs vary meaningfully in terms of curricula, instructional approaches, quality of instruction, use of technology and additional materials, staffing, program transfer, dosage, participation motivations, participation and conclusion rates, management structures, and other mechanisms. Since few data exist on numerous of these basics, describing an ideal or even a characteristic prison education program is difficult.

- **Programs Assessment**

The instructive program an imprisoned student receives must be personalized to the educational needs and purposes of that student, as well as the prison system. Systems need to precisely screen and assess inmates, preferably at intake, and have guidelines for placing them in education and other programs that suit their requirements. Needs assessment and correct conditions, mental health issues, or other distinct needs. These persons frequently have trouble following in a regular classroom and may need dedicated programming provided by expert teachers.

Assessment is vital not only for placing students into programming, but similarly for measuring their development and backup release preparation. Constant student assessment can measure the efficiency of a facility's programs and hold both students and teachers responsible. Assessment shortly previously release can deliver individuals with evidence about their existing abilities and help them make suitable educational strategies for after their release. Pre-release evaluation also delivers respected evidence about the educational level of the lately released population in a community, as well as those on probation. Inappropriately, educational evaluation at the time of release is sporadic, as is the transmission of institutional educational accounts to programs at other facilities or in the community.

- **Well-Trained Educators**

The accomplishment of any educational system finally results on having well-trained, engaged teachers who are armed with the tools desirable to teach their students. Numerous prison systems need their teaching staff to be appropriately trained and certified. Even certified trainers may need supplementary training, though, to make them to address the learning needs of incarcerated juveniles. Incarcerated students have a wide range of ability levels and educational backgrounds, and many have had poor experiences with education in the past

Finding capable, well-trained educators interested in working in prison facilities can be problematic. Prisons are frequently situated far from urban zones or other places with big numbers of possible trainers. In numerous organizations, predominantly those with scarce resources, certified teachers are complemented with volunteer teachers from the community and inmate instructors and tutors.)

- **Suitable Technology**

In current years, promising new computer and communications knowledges have gradually been merged into prison education. Multimedia content and interactive learning opportunities can now be carried via the Internet, closed/controlled computer networks, satellite, closed-circuit television, CDs or DVDs, videotapes, or videoconferencing. Coursework using these skills ranges from extremely structured, pre-packaged training to self-guided, adapted, and interactive educations. Technology holds great potential for addressing numerous of the challenges of providing teaching in a prison environment, such as institutional security constrictions and insufficient funding and resources.

Technology is more than just an instrument for distributing education; using computers, the Internet, and other communications technologies can be an educative experience in and of itself. Subsequently numerous imprisoned students have incomplete exposure to these technologies, any interaction with computers or the Internet can serve as a method of vocational training. Computers and the Internet are also a progressively indispensable part of the educational process itself, and together teachers and students rely profoundly on these tools for looking for information, locating articles and references, and composing documents. Having technology accessible in prison facilities also unlocks the occasion for computer skills classes and other technological training sequences.

The integration of new technological applications can enhance prison education by

- providing programs rigorously pitched toward imprisoned populations;
- offering tailored instruction that addresses diverse learning styles and capacity stages, as well as special needs;
- distributing concurrent training to large numbers of students in numerous locations, saving money and staff resources;
- helping facilities that are too remote or have too few students to make face-to face programming cost-effective
- providing consistent assignments that is reliable across students and facilities;
- serving imprisoned students who, since of their security classification or for other motives, cannot be in contact with other inmates;
- connecting students to courses being accessible in the community; and improving training programs for prison educators.

Frequently, teachers fear that technology will substitute them or deter their chosen instructional approaches. Numerous educators also enquire whether distance learning, or other technology-driven agendas can deliver similar quality of education as face- to-face instruction. Hybrid models, where programs like distance learning are blended with face-to-face schoolroom teaching and provision, may offer a capable compromise.

New technologies also come with safety risks, which is why some prisons are strongly reluctant letting Internet access to imprisoned students. Many of these security worries can be addressed with cautious planning and guidelines governing access and practice. Software applications such as firewalls and content filters can limit Internet access, and strong rules and

authorizations can discourage misuse of technology. Although the security concerns are well-founded, there is justly extensive agreement that technology must be permitted into prison in some formula, given the significant role that computers, the Internet, and other communications technologies play in life outdoor the walls

- **Effective Incentives**

Student inspiration is a key issue in enhancing educational system, principally in settings such as prison where many students have been discouraged by their previous educational experiences. Well-made encouragement structures can inspire individuals to contribute in and comprehensive education programs. In-prison assistances, such as prolonged access to visitation or shopping's, and recompenses such as good time credits or other forms can endorse involvement. Not all incentives need to deliver palpable rewards: honors and credit within the classroom may seem minor but can do a great deal to retain students' interest and make them feel happy with their accomplishments.

Communication amongst educators and prison staff helps guarantee that individuals who attend programs do not miss out on perquisites like recreation time or shopping time . Inmates may not have time for education courses since they need the money or other paybacks from in-prison jobs

- **Partnership with community**

Habitual detainees face trials on many fronts and gaining education and training may not be their primary urgency as they fight to meet their elementary needs and reconnect with their families. Individuals who do attend education programs may have difficulty with finding transport to class or a job and a constant, peaceful living atmosphere in which to study and rest. People need re-entry preparation and case management to help them cross the re-entry process and guarantee that all the pieces are in place to support their service and education activities. In the realm of engagement, previously imprisoned persons frequently need "soft skills" training that covers such themes as arriving at work on time and cooperating with superiors and colleagues. They also need resumes and interview trainings, basic computer skills, that help with job progress and assignments. Vocational and theoretical education must be complemented with these categories of training activities

One of the most problematic challenges to continuing one's education after release is funding, given the fact that individuals just released from prison are frequently qualified for financial aid. Partnerships between prison, public supervision, service providers, educational institutions, and companies can reinforce prison and community education programs and generate links between imprisonment and the community. Partnerships are predominantly valued for providing multimodal programs that address person's numerous consistent re-entries needs, from employment and education to physical and mental health, substance abuse behavior, stable housing, and family relinking.

Summary of Guiding Principles

Prison systems in EU should deliver the leadership and sustenance to ensure that young people both in confinement and upon reentry have access to, and training in, technology by working enlarge access to technology to sufficiently prepare young people to fully engage in the community and workforce;

Prison systems in EU assess prison and reentry education improvement plans and collect data on academic achievement in prison facilities and upon reentry to ensure responsibility

Prison systems in EU should deliver strong leadership to safeguard that schools in juvenile prison provide high quality, reasonable education that prepares young people for college and 21st century professions. Prison systems in EU should safeguard that academic programs in prison facilities provide an education that line up with state standards

Prison systems in EU should provide motivations to improve the value of teaching in prison facilities by funding training for teachers and staff and requiring state education agencies to include prison educators in professional advance opportunities;

Prison systems in EU should guarantee that each juveniles receives a comprehensive assessment of his academic, social and emotional status, including an assessment of whether the person should be referred for a preliminary special education evaluation

Prison systems in EU should decrease the antagonistic effect of collateral costs on the educational and employment opportunities of delinquency by enhancing access to public college, post-secondary career, and technical education.

4. Conclusions

Numerous children in the youth justice system have had slight or not at all school presence. Countless have learning disabilities and lack the elementary skills in literacy and numeracy to thrive at school. There are also children whose parents have been influenced to take their child off the school and, technically, to educate them at home.

The links amid low educational appointment and fulfilment and the risk of juvenile offending are well established. Primary and nursery schools have a serious part in making sure that families get in to respectable habits of school attendance and that any forms of absence are rapidly and vigorously managed, through direct work with the family or a referral to education welfare services. The breach between the attendance of the poorest children and their better off peers is still too large, and prison systems should continue to make attendance a priority.

Recently, several EU Member States have announced their aims to reform prison education, or they are in the process of applying prison reform and are vigorously seeking information and best practice examples from colleagues across the continent. Recent economic changes have influenced member states to be more inspired in emerging prison education. Digital and technological progress have commanded the expansion of digital applications for the prison environment, to help keep up to speed with conventional society and with the request for skills on the labour market.

Difficult decisions are to be made if equally financial restraints and quality necessities are to be considered. In a country where second chances and opportunity are declared values, democratic access to high-quality higher education must contain access for juvenile in prison and those who have been sentenced of crimes. We cannot bar the most defenceless people from the very thing that has the highest potential to change their lives. People from all walks of life chase education for much the same reason: for the reason that it provides opportunity—the opportunity for self-improvement, an improved life, and the resources to provide for oneself and one's family. Inappropriately, the country's pledge to public education has not been accomplished, predominantly for low-income people, people from ethnic minorities, and for those involved in the criminal justice system.

The absence of formal education amid the imprisoned population is deep-rooted in a considerably greater fiasco of the public education system in communities across EU, a failure that confines the economic, political, and social opportunities accessible to people in these communities. For numerous individuals, even at the start of the 21st century, the great transformative power of education remains out of scope. The importance of admission to high-quality education for incarcerated and previously incarcerated people has once again gathered attention as part of a greater conversation on strategies for addressing the social and financial challenges produced by mass incarceration and prisoner re-entry. Research reveals that education can change thinking, encourage pro-social behaviour, growth employment, and decrease recidivism.

Education's power to change lives in both perceptible and imperceptible ways makes it one of the most appreciated and real tools we may have for helping people reconstruct their lives subsequently imprisonment, as well as for fighting crime and dropping criminal justice budgets. While providing education inside prison environment is stimulating, education programs can flourish within prisons when devoted educators are fortified with the necessary resources and are reinforced by prison administrators and staff. There is still a great deal to

study about what program models work and what instructional approaches, staff training and qualifications, technology applications, participation motivations and other program mechanisms are active for diverse types of students.

Providing first-rate education in juvenile justice settings presents exclusive challenges for the managers, teachers, and staff who are accountable for the education, rehabilitation, and wellbeing of youths committed to their attention. These encounters cannot be overwhelmed without vision, commitment, and leadership. There is also a serious need in the field for supportive resources grounded in the obtainable research, practitioner knowledges, and capable practices from around the countries. The services provided to them in secure care facilities must be developmentally suitable and emphasis on the youths' educational, social-emotional, behavioural, and career planning needs so that their time inside a secure facility becomes a constructive exercise throughout which they reach new skills and move on to a more creative pathway.

The attitudes outlined underneath are not explicit just to prison education, however they may offer valuable vision into how best to educate imprisoned juveniles. Obviously, there is still a great deal to learn about what works in prison education, as well as how efficacious programs function and what program models are most effective for diverse types of students.

- A harmless, well facility-wide climate that prioritizes education, delivers the circumstances for learning, and inspires the essential behavioural and social support services that address the individual needs of all youths, together with those with disabilities.
- Obligatory funding to support educational opportunities for all youths inside custodial systems, including those with disabilities, similar to opportunities for peers who are not system-involved.
- Recruitment, engagement, and retention of trained education staff with skills relevant in juvenile justice settings who can completely influence long-term student outcomes
 - Proper processes and procedures – through statutes, memoranda of understanding, and practices – that guarantee efficacious steering across child-serving organisations and smooth re-entry into societies.
- Programs should have visibly defined recruitment and employment procedures for instructors and policies that categorize what constitutes competent program staff.
- Programs must be provided in atmospheres helpful of learning in which students feel physically safe and easy. Programs must use resources and activities that have been designed particularly for juvenile learners and are **“applicable and expressive to students’ life settings.”** In addition to print materials, programs must use computers and distinct training.

My support for critical juvenile education in prisons and my criticism on the policy documents might be too utopic as one has to consider the realm of the possible. Funds are not unlimited and hereafter limitations have to be made in what can be offered and what should be given importance. Even though official policy documents incline to be determined and condescending while the reality falls short of those high ambitions, the documents offer a sense of direction and authenticate good practice on the ground. Prison education, implemented in the philosophy of critical education, can supports to more equality and social justice. Supplementary, it is important to rethink how we depict inmates (and especially juveniles) in policy documents as these shapes how society reflects about them.

. Education, as stated in the Declaration of Human Rights, should be provided to everybody as their fundamental right. This applies also to inmates and one needs to deliver a comprehensive curriculum pointing at an all-inclusive growth of the person. It should not be compulsory in the direction of being used only for economic purposes. The governments have a specific accountability in providing inmates genuine education as they are reliant on what is accessible within the prison. They have no chance to turn to different education institutions and henceforth constituting one of the most vulnerable groups regarding access to education.

To settle, to focus and improve prison education is a acknowledgement of the human rights and its applicability to truthfully all

Romania

From Romania we have the following conclusion and recommendations

- Correctional educators face unique challenges in their work, which require specialized training and continuous professional advancement. This includes managing the cultural shock of prison life, as well as filling knowledge and skill gaps in areas such as communication skills, understanding human behaviour, and teaching in heterogeneous classrooms under the constraints of prison settings.
- To improve policy responses for working with learners in correctional environments, it is critical that educators and social workers are equipped with a solid understanding of the nature of their educational needs. This includes addressing factors such as childhood victimization, abandonment, prior institutionalization, homelessness, and antisocial attitudes. Educators must also possess the necessary skills to make accurate assessments and implement appropriate measures to prevent misconduct and adverse responses.
- Effective educative interventions should focus on events around and outside the school environment, promoting resilience and confidence in seeking support, managing social interactions, coping with stress, communicating constructively, collaborating in teams, negotiating effectively, and understanding different viewpoints.
- Continuous training is essential to develop new knowledge and techniques that can be applied to rehabilitation, re-education, and reintegration. Game-based interventions can also be practical and effective in addressing these needs by promoting the development of resilience-conducive skills and attitudes through meaningful scenarios. Games can also engage youths and adults in cross-generational collaborative activities to promote collective learning, strengthen relationships, and facilitate learning transfer.
- Correctional pedagogy programs must be fully integrated into policy-making processes and implemented within the juvenile justice system. Interdisciplinary approaches that enhance communication skills and key competencies for managing daily life within prisons and preparing for liberation are crucial.

UK

From UK, the following public policy recommendations are suggested to improve education and justice in the criminal justice sector:

- Increase pay rates for professionals in the sector to encourage more individuals to pursue careers in criminal justice.
- Develop bespoke training packages for educators to support vulnerable individuals within the justice system.
- Introduce a shared communication platform and joined-up service to ensure all professionals have access to shared knowledge and updates.
- Promote a societal attitude change towards prison reform to increase pride in working within the criminal justice sector.
- Improve infrastructure and digital support in prisons to deliver more effective mainstream education.

- Offer specialist training for trauma-informed approaches to education, recognizing that a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate.
- Run education in prisons like regular schools rather than "prison schools" to create a better environment for learning.

Italy

From Italy, following are policy recommendations for improving education and training in the prison context, based on the challenges identified in encounters between school and prison:

- Encourage self-sufficiency in coping with negative events.
- Develop alternative solutions for addressing challenges unique to prison contexts.
- Provide support for the psychological, physical, and emotional well-being of young people in prison.
- Prepare teachers to manage small groups and find flexible teaching methods that work within both school and prison contexts.
- Create educational projects that focus on the positive aspects and resources of young people, involving them as protagonists in their own education and future.
- Change the perception of prison as a "school of crime" to a "school of legality and opportunities for change."

These recommendations aim to promote self-sufficiency, well-being, and positive change among young people in correctional environments, while also addressing the unique challenges faced by educators in these settings.

Poland

From Poland we have the following recommendations

- Develop practical skills for establishing and maintaining cooperation with various institutions.
- Encourage students to undertake voluntary activities in partner rehabilitation centers.
- Develop procedures in the process of rehabilitation that are clear and unambiguous.
- Provide clear delineation of roles, powers, and competences for educators working with minors in cooperation with the family.
- Improve parental competences among people in prison through projects undertaken by associations and foundations.
- Address the lack of proper relations with family members to prevent deepening of juvenile social maladjustment.
- Establish systemic actions to protect children whose parents are serving a sentence of imprisonment.
- Enhance supervision of employees of aid institutions to prevent professional burnout and unclear procedures.

Portugal

From Portugal there are the following recommendations:

- Develop training programs that are tailored to the needs of specific populations, such as prisoners, and that consider the length of their sentence. Such programs should be double-certified and designed to enhance the skills of the target audience.
- Provide teachers with continuous training that includes dynamic processes to help them motivate prisoners and promote success. This should include good practices for the existing context and measures to address challenges and stereotypes.
- Create a "Profile of the teacher in a prison context" that includes justice and education skills, to ensure that teachers are equipped to work effectively in this environment.
- Invest in better technological equipment for classrooms, but also provide teachers with adequate training on how to use it effectively to enhance learning outcomes. Teachers should be encouraged to adopt new teaching perspectives and strategies that incorporate technology.
- Redefine training sessions to be shorter, more specific, and more engaging. Training programs should be designed to empower trainees for change and promote critical thinking. The focus should be on practical strategies and specific objectives, rather than simply transferring knowledge.
- Encourage the sharing of knowledge and good practices among different professionals and organizations working in the education sector. Synergies between entities should be valued, and conferences should provide opportunities for open discussion and collaboration. Soft skills should also be emphasized, as they are increasingly relevant in today's workforce.
- These recommendations aim to improve the quality of education provided to prisoners by addressing key challenges facing teachers in this environment, while promoting innovation and collaboration in the education sector more broadly.

As a result of the national activities taking place for the last 3 years, we were able within EDUPRIS partnership to create a working group of specialists and experts from all the ecosystem stakeholders, outside of the partnership, to support us with a peer review during a 2 day policy workshop in Brussels.

Specialized Training for Correctional Educators:

- a. Develop specialized training programs for correctional educators to address the unique challenges they face in working with incarcerated individuals.
- b. Provide continuous professional development opportunities to fill knowledge and skill gaps in areas such as communication skills, understanding human behavior, and teaching in heterogeneous classrooms within prison settings.

Understanding and Addressing Educational Needs:

- a. Equip educators and social workers with a solid understanding of the educational needs of incarcerated learners, including factors such as childhood victimization, abandonment, prior institutionalization, homelessness, and antisocial attitudes.
- b. Implement accurate assessments and appropriate measures to prevent misconduct and adverse responses, while promoting resilience and confidence in seeking support.

Focus on Holistic Development:

- a. Develop educative interventions that go beyond the school environment and address events around and outside the prison setting.
- b. Promote resilience, constructive communication, stress management, social interaction, teamwork, effective negotiation, and understanding of different viewpoints among incarcerated individuals.

Continuous Training and Innovative Approaches:

- a. Provide continuous training for correctional educators to develop new knowledge, techniques, and rehabilitation approaches.
- b. Incorporate game-based interventions that promote resilience-conducive skills and attitudes through meaningful scenarios.
- c. Engage incarcerated individuals in cross-generational collaborative activities to facilitate learning transfer and strengthen relationships.

Integration and Interdisciplinary Approaches:

- a. Fully integrate correctional pedagogy programs into policy-making processes and implement them within the juvenile justice system.
- b. Encourage interdisciplinary approaches that enhance communication skills and key competencies for daily life within prisons and preparation for reintegration into society.

Improved Working Conditions and Infrastructure:

- a. Increase pay rates for professionals in the criminal justice sector to attract and retain qualified individuals.

- b. Improve infrastructure and provide digital support in prisons to deliver more effective mainstream education.
- c. Create a better learning environment within prisons by running education programs more like regular schools.

Trauma-Informed Approaches:

- a. Offer specialist training for trauma-informed approaches to education, recognizing that incarcerated individuals may have experienced trauma.
- b. Recognize the importance of individualized support and avoid a one-size-fits-all approach.

Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing:

- a. Develop a shared communication platform and promote collaboration among professionals in the criminal justice and education sectors.
- b. Encourage the sharing of knowledge, good practices, and effective strategies among different professionals and organizations working in the correctional education field.

Support for School Counselors and Psychologists:

- a. Recognize the crucial role of school counselors and psychologists in supporting the learning and well-being of young offenders within correctional environments.
- b. Provide necessary resources and training to school counselors and psychologists to effectively address the specific needs and challenges of young offenders.
- c. Encourage collaboration and team-building between school counselors, psychologists, and correctional staff to create a cohesive and supportive environment for young offenders.
- d. Facilitate regular communication and knowledge-sharing between school counselors, psychologists, and correctional staff to ensure a holistic and comprehensive approach to the education and rehabilitation of young offenders.
- e. Allocate sufficient staffing and funding to ensure an adequate presence of school counselors and psychologists in correctional institutions, enabling them to provide individualized support and interventions for young offenders.

Community Policing and Crime Prevention Officers:

- a. Recognize the pivotal role of community policing and crime prevention officers in supporting the juvenile justice system and promoting positive outcomes for young offenders.
- b. Provide specialized training and resources for community policing and crime prevention officers to enhance their understanding of juvenile justice issues, including the unique needs and challenges faced by young offenders.
- c. Foster strong partnerships and collaboration between community policing officers, crime prevention officers, and relevant stakeholders, such as schools, social services, and community organizations, to create a comprehensive approach to juvenile justice.
- d. Encourage community policing officers and crime prevention officers to actively engage with young offenders, their families, and the community to build trust, provide guidance, and support positive behavior change.

- e. Promote restorative justice practices within the community, where community policing officers and crime prevention officers play a crucial role in facilitating dialogue and reconciliation between young offenders and their victims.
- f. Advocate for adequate staffing and resources for community policing and crime prevention units to ensure their effective presence and engagement in addressing juvenile justice issues at the local level.

Our group discussed the possible steps we would recommend from the perspective of a prison administration to take, and we decided in the following:

Enhance Professional Development:

Provide specialized training and continuous professional advancement opportunities for correctional educators, social workers, school counselors, psychologists, community policing officers, and crime prevention officers.

Address knowledge and skill gaps in areas such as communication skills, understanding human behavior, trauma-informed approaches, and managing diverse classrooms within prison settings.

Foster interdisciplinary collaboration and exchange of best practices among professionals working in the juvenile justice system.

Promote Holistic Support for Young Offenders:

Recognize and address the unique needs of young offenders, including childhood victimization, prior institutionalization, homelessness, and antisocial attitudes.

Provide comprehensive support for the psychological, physical, and emotional well-being of young people in prison, including access to counseling, trauma-informed care, and interventions that promote resilience.

Establish effective communication and coordination between correctional staff, school counselors, psychologists, and other professionals to ensure a cohesive support system for young offenders.

Develop Innovative Educational Approaches:

Implement evidence-based educational interventions that focus on promoting resilience, social skills, conflict resolution, and positive behavior change.

Incorporate game-based interventions and technology-enhanced learning to engage young offenders and facilitate learning transfer.

Create educational projects that highlight the strengths and resources of young people, empowering them to take an active role in their own education and future.

Strengthen Community Engagement and Reintegration:

Encourage collaboration between correctional staff, community policing officers, crime prevention officers, and relevant stakeholders to support the successful reintegration of young offenders into the community.

Foster restorative justice practices that promote dialogue, reconciliation, and accountability between young offenders and their victims.

Establish partnerships with community organizations, schools, social services, and other relevant entities to provide comprehensive support and opportunities for young offenders upon their release.

By implementing these steps, a prison administration can create a more supportive and effective educational and juvenile justice system that promotes rehabilitation, reintegration, and positive outcomes for young offenders.

We also had a number of discussions on the role of education and schools in this narrative. Based on the recommendations provided, we identified four steps that schools and school inspectorates could take to support education and juvenile justice:

Implement Trauma-Informed Practices:

Develop and implement training programs for teachers and school staff on trauma-informed approaches to education, recognizing the impact of adverse experiences on young offenders.

Create safe and supportive learning environments that promote emotional well-being, resilience, and positive behavior.

Provide access to counseling services within schools or establish partnerships with external support agencies to address the mental health needs of young offenders.

Strengthen Collaboration and Communication:

Foster effective communication and collaboration between school staff, correctional staff, school counselors, psychologists, and other professionals involved in the juvenile justice system.

Establish regular meetings, joint training sessions, and information-sharing platforms to ensure a cohesive and coordinated approach to supporting young offenders' education and well-being.

Develop protocols and procedures for sharing relevant information while maintaining confidentiality and data protection.

Provide Individualized Educational Plans:

Conduct comprehensive assessments of young offenders' educational needs, taking into account their academic abilities, learning styles, and potential barriers to learning.

Develop individualized education plans (IEPs) that outline specific goals, strategies, and support mechanisms to address their unique educational requirements.

Monitor progress, provide ongoing feedback, and make necessary adjustments to ensure the IEPs are effective in supporting young offenders' learning and development.

Promote Community Engagement and Restorative Practices:

Engage parents, guardians, and families in the education and rehabilitation process of young offenders, fostering a sense of shared responsibility and support.

Implement restorative practices within the school environment, such as circles and mediation, to address conflicts, promote accountability, and build positive relationships.

Collaborate with community organizations, local authorities, and social services to create opportunities for young offenders to engage in positive activities, skill-building programs, and community service.



www.edupris.eu



uniss
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SASSARI



Uniwersytet Papieski
Jana Pawła II
w Krakowie



merseyside
**EXPANDING
HORIZONS**



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission support for the production of this publication under the project EDUPRIS 612205-EPP-1-2019-1-RO-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.