

Project JUST Closer

JUST-2021-JACC

GA No. 101056657

WP2: <Closer Spaces>

D2.3-8 Participatory Needs Assessment
Report

WP2 Leader: DCI Italy

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the JUST Programme		
Dissemination Level:		
PU	Internal	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
EU-RES	Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-CON	Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-SEC	Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
Document version control:		
Version	Author(s):	Date:
Version 1	Ludmila Dias Andrade	27/02/2023
Version 2	Elizabeth Vrieling and Ludmila Dias Andrade	26/05/2023
Version 3		

Table of contents

Introduction of the project and scope of the Participatory Needs Assessment Report	1
1. Approach and methods	2
1.1 The participants: recruitment of the YT&As	2
1.2 The activities	3
1.1 The principles of child-friendly justice as the starting point for discussion	4
Introduction	4
1.2 The results of the interviews: experiences, opinions and proposals	5
2. Conclusions	12
3. Annexes	15
ANNEX 1: List of participants per activity:	15
ANNEX 2: Participatory Needs Assessment - Final	16



Introduction of the project and scope of the Participatory Needs Assessment Report

The project JUST CLOSER aims to promote and reinforce child participation in criminal proceedings by starting from actual practices as well as from the direct experience of children. JUST CLOSER contributes to the effective and coherent application of EU criminal law, by focusing on the practical implementation of the Child-Friendly Justice Guidelines (Council of Europe) - in accordance with Directive (EU) 2016/800.

Young Perspectives works directly with youth in contact with the juvenile justice system in the Netherlands. YOPE is present both inside and outside detention centres and will engage both youngsters currently deprived of their liberty and previously incarcerated youth in the project.

The Closer Spaces work package (WP2) relies heavily on the experience and leadership of young people who had contact with the criminal justice system and uses this experience to appoint venues to improve the system itself. In order to achieve that, YOPE has set up a national group of *experience experts* who will lead the development and implementation of different activities, with the technical and logistical support of the project coordinators.

In the Netherlands, this has been done through a participatory research workshop inside a youth detention institution, with the supervision of the organisation's facilitators.

1. Approach and methods

1.1 The participants: recruitment of the YT&As

Young Perspectives works with **experience experts** (from now on referred to as experts only) who use their own experiences and ideas to transform the system by bringing you close to the world of young people during and after detention. They do so by training and advising forensic professionals for a better juvenile justice and care system and sharing their experience with decision-makers, academics and the public.



Experts receive individual and group guidance from the YOPE coordinators and from external trainers in order to develop their confidence and competences for the assignments. Every year, about 15 young people are selected to work as a group in a two-year process. After that, they remain involved as alumni for a long time. In this role, they are paid for their engagement as experts by experience while gaining professional experience. YOPE is a place where young people can develop themselves and their participation serves as a positive springboard to future work or study opportunities.

From the pool of experts, individuals are selected for specific assignments based on their availability and their level of experience. For instance, whenever possible, more experienced youngsters are paired with less experienced youngsters to ensure peer-support and peer-learning. The coordinators also ensure that opportunities are spread evenly across the group. In case of medium and long-term projects, such as JUST CLOSER, the coordinators try to involve a good number of experts, while trying to maintain some stability throughout the activities. When a new expert joins an ongoing activity, they are briefed and have a moment to clarify questions.

Therefore, the Youth Trainers and Advisors (YT&A) group was set up ahead of the Exchange Workshop on Methodology (Turin, Italy - 27 and 28 October 2022) and two youngsters were recruited to attend the two-day workshop, which aimed to review the road map. See list of attendees in the annex 1.

1.2 The activities

Following the Exchange Workshop on Methodology, the YOPE developed a zero draft of the methodology for the Participatory Needs Assessment (activity 2.4). This activity aims to identify the gaps in the implementation of different EU Directives related to Child Friendly Justice. In other words, compare the different policy frameworks to the reality experienced by youngsters in contact with the judicial system.

The coordinators of the group, Lamyn and Elizabeth, drafted the initial proposal and set a joint session with two members of the YT&A group to discuss and 'pilot' the proposal - one who was present in Turin and a new member.



The session took place on 7 December 2022 in the YOPE office. During the session, Lamyn explained the goal of the activity, the role of the youngsters and went through the proposal step-by-step. The participants offered comments, suggestions and concerns, which were incorporated into the second draft (annex 2).

The session was scheduled to take place on 1st March 2023 in a youth detention centre in the Netherlands. The session would be part of the larger YOPE curriculum during the break-week, when artistic and sport workshops substitute the school activities. However, one day before the session, one incident happened and the institution decided to cancel all activities while investigation took place. As a result, the participatory needs assessment was also cancelled. YOPE coordinators have then contacted other institutions where the activity can be implemented, however their availability is limited and they could only find a spot in a month's time.

The decision to implement the activity inside detention is two-fold:

- reaching a larger number of participants and therefore having robust results: outside detention, the pool of participants would limit itself to experience experts (approximately 12 at the moment), while in the detention centre the pool would be bigger;
- time and cost-efficiency: despite the delay of following the centre's schedule, a focal group set-up allows us to collect all the data in one day. If we opted to carry the assessment with boys outside, it would be very hard to find a day and time where all youngsters are available, which would require us to run the session multiple times, requiring more time from the staff and young trainers and more funding for one activity.

Finally, a new session was successfully implemented on 26th April 2023, from 9.00-15.45hr. YOPE coordinators Lamyn and Elizabeth organised the four workshop sessions during a break-week in a closed institution in the middle of the Netherlands. We do not specify the location, due to our consent-restrictions. Each workshop was built on creative methods and involving the two YOPE experts Nigel & Jousri (see annex 2 for the outline of the workshop). Lamyn led the workshop, supported by Jousri and Nigel, meanwhile Elizabeth took notes for this report.



1.1 The principles of child-friendly justice as the starting point for discussion

Introduction

We opened our workshop with a short introduction round, where the experts introduced themselves to the group. After, Lamyn and Elizabeth kick off the session by explaining what our aim for the day was and why the experts are joining. We showed the trailer of Exchanging Perspectives, so the participants got an image of what we do in the outside world with justice professionals, with international projects like Just Closer. Afterwards, we handed out the consent forms, which they could sign after the session if agreed.

Elizabeth briefly explained the meaning of the 9 principles for child-friendly justice and asked if any of those were familiar to the youngsters in the room. Lamyn continued by interviewing the YOPE experts, via the film script-method, to get more familiar with the experiences and insights of the experts but also inviting and asking the young participants of the workshop to share their experiences. The first group had 3 participants, the second workshop 6 participants, the third workshop had 1 participant and the final workshop had 5 participants. They were aged between 15 and 21 years old. Most of them had a (non-western) migration background, but were born or growing up in the Netherlands. The workshop was finalised by a brief summary of the discussed themes and a big thanks to the participants and YOPE experts for their energy and openness.

1.2 The results of the interviews: experiences, opinions and proposals

Workshop 1-4 - main themes and outcomes

One of the first themes discussed was the **right for family life and privacy**. Lamyn asked which of the nine principles on the slide spoke to them the most and this one was mentioned by many of the participants. Most of them felt like this right was violated during court days but also during arrests by police or in the juvenile institution. They also mentioned that they realised it is hard for the institution to facilitate this right, due to risk and procedures. But during the conversation it was evident that most (if not all) participants felt violated on this right.

Child-friendly justice is justice that is...

... respecting the right to private and family life



Participants shared:

“On trial, I was not allowed to give my mom a hug while she was crying. I was not allowed to greet them properly, even after not seeing them for such a long time.”

“If you are 14 years old and they blow up your front door, while your little brothers and sisters are home too. And the whole street is awake too. But they knew I was home. Why did they have to break in like that?”

“They knew I was home too and my sister usually wears a veil but they just broke in the house. I don’t think that’s in line with the family principle then.”

“[The police] should see per case how severe it is and how you must enter the house. If there are (other) kids in the house and no guns, then they should adjust the procedure to that too. And [adjust] to the type of family too.”

“I’ve heard they [the police] were very disrespectful to my parents, while I was already taken away - but they didn’t do anything wrong.”

Another striking topic was the **treatment and handling of the police during the arrests** (or the AT / special arrest unit of Dutch Police); all participants of this workshop had something to share on this topic. To sum up what we’ve heard, most of the participants have experienced their arrest as traumatic and aggressive. They did not feel like it was age-appropriate or respecting family life. The participants share some impactful experiences, but also give recommendations on what approach might work better: “Police need to use a fatherly tone” or note that in the Netherlands the police communicate better than some experienced in Belgium.

Child-friendly justice is justice that is...

... age appropriate;

... adapted to and focused on the needs of the child;

... respecting the right to integrity and dignity.

A few quotes to illustrate the above:



"I would never treat or approach a 12/13 year old like they handled me at the time. Maybe I'd firmly grab someone, but I was arrested as if I was a big man. And my younger sister was there too, she was very scared."

"My advice would be to approach with a fatherly tone, for the very young boys that get arrested. That would work much better and still have an impact."

"Police stays police, but if they work so aggressively with such young boys, then you stimulate hate against the police too."

"It would make more impact if someone would just come and talk to me, like the neighbourhood police officer. He is a relaxed guy, but also straight with me if I did something wrong. That made an impact on me too, I will remember what he said."

"The AT is not joking around with you. They don't respect your home, they don't look you in the eye or talk to you. They just pick you up and give instructions."

"In the Netherlands, the police still talk to you, but in Belgium it's much worse and the prisons are much worse there too."

"One time, I didn't know the police came to pick me up. So there were a lot of sirens and cars and they threw me on the ground. My whole chest had scratches."

"I would really advise young boys to collaborate with the police if they come for you, because otherwise they will get very aggressive with you."

"Look, if you have done something wrong you can expect something, but they should also realise it can be traumatising for young boys. And this trauma gets stimulated in youth detention too, by the room-checks all the time."

After sharing experiences on their arrest, we focused on the topic **"going to court"**. The most dominant experiences that were shared was how most youngsters felt like everybody in court was very official and cold (or even angry-looking) on their court day. Most of them did not understand everything that was happening and being said, but some had a good lawyer who explained deliberately what was happening. Participants highlighted the importance of involving and informing the young suspects in the right manner on



court days, giving them the feeling that they need to be heard and they can have an impact on their case if they share their thoughts and experiences. What they would want is a more open and empathic environment, where they feel welcome to speak and feel heard, opposed to “a cold environment where everything is already decided”.

Child-friendly justice is justice that is...

... respecting the right to participate in and to understand the proceedings

Hereby a few quotes of the participants' experiences:

“It was a very cold atmosphere in court. Literally cold, because I was sitting in a cell for six hours on a concrete bench. To me, it felt like everything was lost and decided already. Everybody looked sour and angry at me.”

“Even child protection and probation services, they advise the judge and they know you, but if you get your punishment - they don't care for you anymore. I've never heard from them again.”

“One time here in the institution, the biggest boss of the Prosecution Service came to talk to me. He was a friendly man and he listened too.”

“I think I understand everything that was happening on trial.”

“To be honest, I was sitting there and I felt screwed up by them. How they talked, especially the prosecutors.”

“If I look back now, I should have spoken and shared more on trial. But you also feel pushed in a corner on those days. And it felt like I didn't get enough time to talk either. I felt like it was all decided already.”

*“You are young, so you don't know how to react to all that is happening. Sometimes so much bullsh*t has been shared by the professionals that you think “oke never mind”.”*

The final topic was experiences of the participants **in the youth detention centre**. The most important messages that they shared, was how they sometimes did not feel understood by the staff and felt like there was so much uncertainty during their stay. A personal approach and adjusting the treatment and care to each youngster is what they marked as important and still lack, while residing in the institution. Most of them emphasised the fact that if you do something wrong, you can expect to get punishment for it and that *“It's up*



to the young person himself if he is going to make that change” (participant). But uncertainty about their future and unfair situations, caused by staff members and them not owning up to their mistakes - is a reason for some not to cooperate or feel positive about the institution.

Child-friendly justice is justice that is...

... speedy and diligent

A few quotes to illustrate:

“Sometimes the lawyer doesn’t seem to understand what PIJ-measure is or what it is like in a youth detention centre.”

“I’d prefer an adult punishment because then I got clarity and a date. Now with the PIJ-measure so much is uncertain, it feels endless.”

“My behaviour is good enough to go on probation, but I did not receive my treatment yet - so I still can’t go.”

“If it works for one person, that doesn’t mean it works for the others too.”

“Sometimes you get a 24 month extension (maximum), while that new therapist doesn’t even know you. But the judge still listens to her.”

Statements: dilemma exercise

The second part of the workshop we continued our conversation with a dilemma-exercise, where the participants needed to take a stance and share their thoughts with the group on each topic.

(1) I am aware and informed about my rights in court.

Majority of the young participants felt like they knew what was happening and what their role was during the court day.

“My lawyer but also a friend of mine informed me about how everything works.”

“This is my first time being detained, it is all very new to me. But I knew my lawyer already, so he informed me pretty well on everything. And you also just need to see what’s going to happen.”

“They used so many difficult words, I kept on asking my lawyer what they meant.”

“I remember my prosecutor said: “You trivialise everything.” So I asked what that meant and then I understood.”



“Honestly, I did not know anything about my rights the first time. I just arrived in the Netherlands and I did not know what was going to happen. My parents also did not know anything about the Dutch judicial system. You just expect the worst.”

- (2) In the juvenile justice system in the Netherlands, the age and approach of young people suits their capacities.

Most of the participants did not agree with the statement. Some said it should depend on the case and the youngster how he/she is treated in trial. A few quotes on this topic:

“I feel like, if you want to do severe stuff when you are very young, you need to feel and realise what the consequences are. But I do think you still need to be treated age-appropriately.”

“If you go inside at a very young age, it is very likely that you will return soon too. Juveniles get called back very quickly in NL. Once in the system, it’s hard to get out.”

“Child protection services give bad advice, because they don’t really know you. And after the trial, they don’t check up on you anymore.”

“School is very important, otherwise you can’t develop yourself. You must have access to school.”

“They must help families better too. For example, to help them move to a better neighbourhood, even if they don’t have a lot of money. My mom wanted to move out of our neighbourhood right after the first time I got detained, but we just couldn’t.”

- 3) “I have someone who is important to me here, someone to confide in and who is real with me.”

Most of the participants agreed on this statement and marked the importance of having someone to trust and talk to in the institution. For some participants it’s a fellow in their unit, but for others it is a certain care worker or family member who visits.

“Inside, you also build a relationship with each other and try to be there for each other.”

“I was stubborn and hard to deal with, but I did have someone who eventually encouraged me to start over after release.”



"I had a community-police officer who was always strict and real with me, but also gave me some space at times too. But he was very honest about that, so I knew: if I mess it up, he's coming for me."

4) If my family comes to visit me here in the institution, I get enough space and privacy to spend time with them.

Most of the participants disagreed with the statement. They feel like they are always being watched. Most of them understand the security measures, but on the other hand they miss a level of trust (and space) too.

A few quotes to illustrate:

"On one hand, they do let you hug your family. But on the other, you always know security is around and able to listen."

"It's gotten worse after Covid pandemic. Nowadays you can get a lot less visits and before you could sit next to your mom, but now it's not allowed anymore. It's much more strict now."

"So much new and temporary staff nowadays. They come and go but want to work on long-stay units. How do you think that's going to work?"

"There must be a good handover between care workers, they should know what the unwritten rules are here. There is so much change in staff."

"Sure, rules are rules. But you should understand that long stay units are run differently than the strict regime on short stay units."

"You need to make the system work for you. You should know your rights and ask for what you need. The manner in which you ask things makes a big difference."

"Sometimes, it feels like they work against you, slowing you down instead of helping you."

At the closing of the workshop, we've asked all participants to share what helped them to keep them on their feet and remain focused for their own goals. It was striking how all of them agreed that everybody should focus on themselves to work towards release, but also marked the importance of family and that motivation for change also needs to come from the youngster himself.

"You need to learn to stay calm here, focus on family and your own process."



"If I didn't have a family, I wouldn't be outside right now. They are very important to me."

"Bro honestly, I was not behaving ideally and caused a lot of problems back in the days. They even wanted to put me away on the special individual care unit. But that made me realise: oke I have to make a change now, because if I don't - they will bring me to that unit. So that was a turning point for me to change."

"You need to be lucky with care workers who really want to help you."

"You need to learn to stay calm and don't give them [care workers] chances to pick on you. Do well."

"Shortage of staff harms the youngsters. Activities or school do not go as planned, probation is cancelled. And of course, they inform you. But you can't do anything about it, it leaves the boys empty handed. And if you freak out, they will use it against you."

Closing: "What is your next destination on your GPS?"

We closed the sessions with the questions where they see themselves in a couple years and what their dreams for the future hold. This way, after sharing intense or personal experiences in the workshop, we wanted to put emphasis on the future and end the session in a positive and hopeful way. The experts of YOPE shared a bit more about where they are today and what surprised themselves after release (positively), aiming to motivate the participants to keep their focus on themselves and their goals towards release, marking that brighter days will be ahead for them too.

Finally, Elizabeth shared some quotes that came across, so they felt aware of what we took out of this session. We thanked all participants for being actively involved and the experts for coming back to the institution to share their story. In summer we hope to come back and provide them with a (general) update of our project.

2. Conclusions

About the process

We were pleasantly surprised by the openness and willingness of the participants to share their experiences and thoughts on their judiciary process with us. With all four sessions, the participants were holding back at first to see what the intent of the workshop was. But after the YOPE experts shared their experiences and



Lamyn & Elizabeth explained about the importance of hearing their experiences, the participants joined very openly in conversation. Taking time for the opening is thus important, to build trust especially in the closed environment we were in (in the institution). The creative methods (film-script and dilemmas) were a good way to spark the conversation on these sensitive topics and give a low-key and safe space for participants to share. This resulted in dynamic conversations and discussions, where different opinions were shared. We were surprised how actively the participants wanted to join the discussions and share their thoughts or challenge others' stand-point. One participant even wanted to join the workshop a second time. When asked what made him come back, he said: *“There was a good vibe and you don’t get to talk about these topics everyday. I liked it.”*

It was very important for the trainers and experts to find a good balance between negative and positive experiences. We did not want to facilitate a session where all is negative; the creative methods and the presence of the YOPE experts were vital to keep it constructive too. Speaking about these events may also spark trauma or emotions, so we wanted to be aware and sensitive about that. We put extra time and effort into the closing of the session in a positive way, by speaking about hopes for the future. The role of the YOPE experts was explicitly important here, to motivate the participants and keep them on the right path towards release.

If we reflect on the sessions and formulate **lessons learned**, we realise:

1. As trainers & experts you are dependent on the system and what’s going on that week/day in the institution. Practical issues or even miscommunication between staff (of the institution) may hinder participants from attending. We expected 24 participants, but welcomed 15 on that day. Despite that, we want to highlight the importance of being flexible and take every opportunity to speak with young people seriously - adjusted to the vibe/atmosphere they are in that day. A good title and short description (maybe with a flyer) might also help the young people understand what they can expect, though there is a risk that reading about “rights and sharing experiences” may not attract them or give a different expectation. We would say “less is more” but be upfront on what the workshop is about.



2. We would recommend letting them fill in the consent form after the closing of the workshop. It is important to be transparent about the session from the start, but we experienced that asking them to sign the form before anything had been discussed (and they just met us) had a negative impact on the safe space we were building for the conversation. These conversations in the institution and asking for consent in this context (where they can hardly decide or sometimes understand what's being asked) need to be taken into consideration and communicated sensitively.
3. Young people have the right to participate in their trial and this project marks the importance of giving young people the opportunity to open up and share what they feel and think. In our workshops we realised (once again) these young people do really want to talk and share what is going on in their lives or how they feel, when they get the chance to do so. It's the task and responsibility of the court and its professionals to facilitate a safe space where the young people feel invited and secure to open up.
4. Most of the sessions started with a lot of negative and painful experiences and pessimistic views of the young people about the judiciary system. However, articulating this in the workshop helps them zoom out and reflect on what professionals and young people can learn from those experiences. Active listening may help youngsters articulate their experiences and, after sharing their negative experiences, they did open up for positive and reflective views too. This session not only gave a safe space to ventilate a bit, but also invited them to exchange perspectives and think on a meta-level how the system or themes within the nine principles can be fostered or improved. The ability to reflect and see positive changes too, may help them stay positive and motivated for their own trajectory ahead in the institution.

Take-away messages

To sum up the most important messages from the young people, we come to four main recommendations:

1. There needs to be better communication about and emphasis for the right of family and privacy for young people in contact with the law and/or residing in institutions. Most of the young people we spoke to do not feel this right is protected and facilitated accordingly.



2. The approach and treatment of young people during their arrest (by the police) or during court is not always suited to their needs and age-appropriate. Some participants did note that contact and communication with (community) police can also be positive. But still there are opportunities here to improve the treatment of young people in line with the nine principles of child friendly justice.
3. Young people do want to talk about and share their experiences, but in this repressive context it is up to professionals to invite them to open up and make them feel safe and heard in their experiences and perspective. Without taking away the accountability that they have for the damage that they may have caused, there is room for improvement for professionals to guide young people towards an age-appropriate trial and treatment in the institution, hopefully resulting in a transition out of crime.
4. Invest in hiring, training and retaining staff in the closed institutions. High turnover of staff and lack of preparedness have a direct impact on how youngsters experience detention and how they feel cared for.

What should be changed in the youth justice process according to young people?

- More time and opportunity to spend time with your family, while residing in a closed institution.
- Better age-appropriate approach during police arrests of minors.
- More and better information and consultation about how the judicial system works; what is going to happen after their arrest; what they can expect in court; what their perspective is after trial.
- Opportunity to talk to the prosecutor or judge, just to get to know who they are, before the trial starts.

What were aspects that they valued or should remain in the procedure?

- Participants valued situations that they felt heard, by either a police officer, a judge or some other justice professional.



- Family visits and their attendance at trial is valued and should be maintained, hopefully expanded in opportunities in the future.

3. Annexes

ANNEX 1: List of participants per activity:

<p>Exchange Workshop on Methodology 27-28 October 2022 - Turin, Italy</p>	<p>Jousri Ben Riad - Youth trainer Jason Miedemma - Youth trainer Lamyn Belgaroui - Advisor Ludmila Dias Andrade - Project coordinator</p>
<p>Participatory Needs Assessment - methodological meeting 7 December 2022 - Amsterdam, Netherlands</p>	<p>Yeabsira Wenzinga - Youth trainer Jousri Ben Riad - Youth trainer Lamyn Belgaroui - Advisor Ludmila Dias Andrade - Project coordinator Elizabeth Vrieling - support</p>
<p>Participatory Needs Assessment 26 April 2023 - Sassenheim, Netherlands</p>	<p>Jousri Ben Riad - Youth trainer Nigel Smit - Youth trainer Lamyn Belgaroui - Trainer Elizabeth Vrieling - support / reporting</p>

ANNEX 2: Participatory Needs Assessment - Final

Framework for JS - workshops in JJI

Feb/March

ACTIVITY 1 PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOPS IN JJI

For whom: short & long stay in closed facility

Duration: 60/75 minutes

With whom: Lamyn + 2 YOPE Experts (Elizabeth reporting)

Where: Teylingereind facility, Sassenheim



Slides for the PPT: Photos of YOPE Experts in action, trailer 'Exchanging Perspectives', 9 criteria for Child Friendly Justice

Material: Canvas for 'the film script', post it's, A2 sheets, pens & paper, Certificate of participation

OPENING (15 mins)

- spoken word by Lamyn / Jason
- introduction round - who are we, what are we doing, what are we doing outside with Youthlab
- slide with 9 criteria - what are your rights as a young person in your process > examples
- clarify what we are going to do with the information we collect // give feedback in a few weeks
- agreements - no right / wrong answer, keep it close to yourself, dare to express and challenge your own opinion, positive and negative experiences that people can learn from, we take it seriously and do not share what you do not like to share and
- Either inform back what was typed and/or share it in a beamer so they can follow at all times

ICE-BREAKER

- *fun fact that no one knows about me...* (must be something positive)
- word association game

ACTIVITY #1 SUPERHERO

- Suppose you had all the superpowers
 - 1) what would that superhero do and how?
 - 2) what would he look like?

WORKFORM #2 FILMScript / STORYTELLING / SUPER LAWYER

Explore the participants' experience at different moments during their contact with the judicial system and identify when and how the CFJ were present and/or absent.

SCENE 1 ARREST Go back to the first time you were arrested

OPTIONS:

- In group: role play > sec exchange with group what is still missing > are there any additions that could also be better for you?
- Individual > and then what would you like better about it?



REFLECTION: how did you experience that? what feeling(s) do you get when you think back on that? Is there something or someone that you immediately think of at that moment? What points come up for you (negative)? how could this moment have been handled better by those involved?

SCENE 2 CELL COMPLEX / AT THE POLICE STATION

you entered - who did you see first? what has stayed with you the most, describe the place and atmosphere where you came?

REFLECTION: What impressed you there? e.g. youth wing (not between adults and junkies), should cells for 21- (minors) look different? Should guards look more like youth workers or does that not matter?

SCENE 3 AT COURT

You enter the courtroom...

What is the most vivid memory you have of the courtroom?

Did you understand everything that has been said?

Did you feel like you were well prepared?

What impression did you get from the prosecutor?

What impression did you get from the judge?

Were there topics or experiences that you would have liked to share at trial, but which you haven't? If yes, why did you choose not to share this?

SCENE 4 IN THE JUVENILE DETENTION

You arrived at the institution...

What was it like for you to be brought here for the first time?

What is your most vivid memory of the first day/week there?

Let's say you would be the director of the institution, what would be things you would change right away? (inspection, guards not as the first people that pick up the young person at the entrance, separate young people by age / period of stay / or...)

WORKFORM #3

Suppose you are the director of the detention center...

If you were the director of the detention center, what would you change to improve the stay for young people? Where would you put more time and resources in? How would you do that? Why would you focus on those things?



Other working method options

- Writing - storytelling
- Interviewing each other in pairs
- Dialogue Canvas/film script - in which they write a short piece/ keywords

CONCLUSION

- What have we heard today, what we take away and learn from your stories (YOPE)

Behind the scenes:

- bring statements when there is little input

