

Editorial

Hello everyone,

It's a real pleasure to be back at the helm of the Newsletter following an extended period of leave. My editorial team, I think you will agree, did a fantastic job of not only keeping the editions of the Newsletter coming out as they should in my absence but filling it with interesting contributions!

The EFRJ also has had some wonderful achievements over the summer. The Summer School was held in Como on the topic of serious crimes and RJ (24–28 July). One of the attendees, Ramkanta Tiwari from Nepal, was one of the overseas participants and we have taken the relatively unusual approach of the Newsletter to include his experiences of the character and shape of the restorative justice movement in Nepal. I found his article truly fascinating as it sits firmly within my own interests in the application of restorative justice within transitional settings. I am sure that you will share his passion for the potential of restorative justice to bring about wonderful moments of tenderness in relationships that have been characterised by violence, fear and mistrust.

Our second contribution is from Barbara Pawlak who provides us with an overview of her research into the implementation of mediation in cases of domestic violence. Her article, I am sure you will agree, raises a number of issues about the problems that arise when mediation is subsumed within the criminal justice process. It appears that judges do not necessarily require stakeholders to voluntarily participate, that mediators have not necessarily been trained properly in the spirit of restorative justice and that offenders, at times, do not honour their promises contained within the agreement. These issues naturally create a number of issues for the victim and Barbara rightly points to the concern that this holds for the revictimisation of those victims who agree (or alarmingly who are sometimes forced) to participate in the process. We would be keen to have more country-specific contributions on the implementation of the new Victims' Directive; so please do get in touch if you are working in this area!

Our next two contributions come from members of our Editorial Committee. First, Nicola Preston has written a detailed review of Evans and Vaandering's book titled *The Little Book of Restorative Justice in*

Education. Nicola suggests that the book is useful for a wide range of audiences, not only those who are interested in the application of restorative justice within school settings. As such, it comes highly recommended! If you are reading anything at the moment and would like to share your thoughts with us, please do get in touch!

Next, Branka Peuraca and Nicola Preston share their experience of a conference that they attended at Haruv University in Croatia this July. While the conference itself was not on the topic of restorative justice, there were a number of participants who shared the application and practice of restorative justice to cases of child maltreatment and well-being. If you find yourself at a conference, please take some notes on who presented and what caught your attention; it would be wonderful to learn what colleagues are up to around the globe. You could even write a short overview of your own presentation for inclusion in the Newsletter — please get in touch with us to discuss these opportunities with us.

The EFRJ has two upcoming events that we wish to promote. The first is restorative justice week. This year the EFRJ will publish a booklet on arts and restorative justice which will include articles published in our special edition on the topic this June as well as some further solicited contributions. The EFRJ will also be launching the film *A Conversation* and we invite our membership to consider a film screening followed by a discussion (an article on this film was published in the [June issue](#)).

We are also very excited about the 10th EFRJ conference being hosted in Tirana, Albania from the 14–16 June 2018. Please submit an abstract; the deadline is the 1st November and the topic is: *Expanding the restorative imagination: Restorative justice between realities and visions in Europe and beyond*. For those of you who have attended our conferences before, you will

know how warm and friendly attendees are. It really is a great opportunity to meet with old friends from far and wide and to make new ones. We are looking forward to seeing as many of you there as possible!

Finally, we are looking for members to join the Editorial Committee, particularly from areas/language groups not well represented on the current committee; members serve for a two year renewable term. Please

let me know if you would be interested in joining the Committee so that I can put forward nominations at the Board meeting in November.

With very best wishes,

Dr Kerry Clamp

Editor

kerry.clamp@nottingham.ac.uk

Restorative Justice in Nepal: Hopes and hiccups

Restorative justice in its modern manifestation is a fairly new concept in Nepal. Before the advent of the national constitution and laws in the 1950s, many communities in Nepal had their own non-adversarial justice systems informed by the needs and interests of communities in which the conflicts or crimes took place. With the introduction of more adversarial laws and the professionalisation of justice in the following decades, these communities have been gradually disempowered, and even traditional mediation practices have been usurped by formal bureaucratic processes. The courts and the formal criminal justice system are promoted as the main drivers of justice, and they are considered to have a duty to deliver ‘justice’ to people.

This increased top-down bureaucratisation of justice, and other nascent problems of prison overcrowding, increased crime rates and re-offending and staggering state expenditure in prison and jail administration, has made it obvious that the statist justice system is heading in the wrong direction. Likewise, seen from the real stakeholders of crime — the victims, offenders and community — there is apparently no room for empowering or putting them at the heart of the justice system. All of this has made it loud and clear that Nepal needs a shift in re-imagining justice in formal spheres, and this is where restorative justice comes in handy.

Nepal experienced a decade-long civil conflict from 1996 perpetuated by long standing social, cultural, ethnic and economic factors. The conflict, which took more than 13,000 lives, left communities with divisions and brought to the fore various historical harms endured by the different socio-cultural groups. Although the conflict formally ended in 2006, no significant steps have been taken to address the structural causes or the lasting consequences of the conflict. At the national level, the [Truth and Reconciliation Commission](#) was formed after nine years (in 2015), but the body is again plagued with top-down bureaucratic approaches, and has alienated the real stakeholders in conflicts. Because of this professionalisation, again there have been apparently no opportunities or efforts thereof for dialogue, healing, truth-telling or reconciliation. In this context of serious harms and divisions engulfing communities, restorative justice still holds big promises in giving a better — and humane — way out of the current muddles of injustice and hopelessness.

Against this backdrop of outstanding calls for restorative efforts in formal and community spheres, one

can however see light at the end of the tunnel. For instance, the current Constitution of Nepal (2015), for the first time in Nepal’s history, has included fundamental rights of (crime) victims, assuring the right to information about the proceedings of the case, and a right to social rehabilitation and compensation. This provision of social rehabilitation and compensation can be extrapolated to include rights to social reintegration and emotional-psychological compensation, thus addressing more holistic needs of the victims. Likewise, Nepal has recently passed new laws on crime and sentencing, which also introduce probation and parole as a part of sentencing for the first time in Nepal’s history.

Drawing on the judicial mode of punishment, the new laws also allow judges to use discretion in sanctioning offenders by considering their age, economic status, occupation, social backgrounds, and so on. In addition to this, there are provisions related to correcting offenders and rehabilitating victims. And although clarity on how these ends will be met is absent, the new penal codes do mark a significant shift in Nepal’s legal-judicial history. Now it is the time for the judiciary to commit to the new challenges in implementing these corrective ideals of justice as espoused in the criminal laws. It may take decades for us to see the actual restorative outcomes within the judicial and legal confines, since it requires concomitant preparedness such as forming bye-laws and regulations, reshuffling bureaucratic-judicial structures, sensitising the officials through training and practice, and perhaps most importantly, gaining trust from the victims (or the public generally).

Instead, what has given restorative justice a real opportunity in Nepal is its potential for its use in community contexts. Nepal has a community mediation system in place contained within the Mediation Act of 2011. Most of the conflicts are settled in communities but because of the deeper structural biases towards a certain gender, ethnicity or religion, such community practices have traditionally tended to reinforce those imbalances leaving the aggrieved parties worse off. Recognising this, restorative justice has recently been introduced into community mediation. Aligning with restorative justice principles, these mediators are taught to identify harms in what looked like disputes on the surface, and are trained to refer to relevant organisations which work on healing harms or, if they are trained themselves, to organise healing or harm circles. This approach to restorative justice is slowly gaining ground.

Very recently, some organisations such as the [Nepal Institute of Justice \(NIJ\)](#), [The Asia Foundation](#) and [Sambad Samuha \(Dialogue Fora\)](#) have joined forces in introducing restorative justice in addressing community-level conflicts which have strong elements of emotional harms, and which can also require the harming party to acknowledge that and take responsibility. Such community-led, community-driven initiatives are the greatest carriers of the whole restorative justice movement in Nepal. Moreover, in conflict-ravaged communities, restorative justice has also been introduced (albeit, in a handful of cases) to organise

peacemaking and healing circles based on restorative justice values.

Likewise organisations such as the Nepal Institute of Justice have been established to promote restorative and community justice in Nepal. NIJ also hosts a [Restorative Justice Resource Center](#), a stock of resources on restorative justice available to the public interested in the subject. Likewise, it also has a Restorative Justice Conferencing Center which has started organising conferencing among parties to conflict and harms. A few intermittent conferences focused exclusively on restorative justice have also been organised, and discussions and training have occurred sporadically. These efforts have, to some extent, helped to promote restorative justice within the wider public space in Nepal. Yet, the success of the restorative justice movement in Nepal is predicated on two main factors. First, the judicial system and community people should recognise that restorative justice has important applications in contexts of both crime and conflict, and in both formal and informal justice systems. Second, upholding the values of dialogue and inclusion espoused by restorative justice, the formal and community justice systems should complement each other, rather than territorialising justice, only to defeat the values of restorative justice itself.

Ramkanta Tiwari

Nepal Institute of Justice
nij@nepaljustice.org

Restorative Justice in Domestic Violence Cases — A Polish Study

Background to the study

The European Union is committed to the establishment and protection of minimum standards with regard to victims of crime. Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and Council (2012) established minimum standards on the rights, protection and support of victims of crime. In addition, the Council of Europe *Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence* (2011) is the European legal instrument to create a comprehensive legal framework to protect women, children and elderly people exposed to domestic violence. The Directive builds upon the key principle of the ‘role of the victim in the relevant criminal justice system,’ so that any victim can rely on the same basic level of rights, regardless of their nationality and country in the EU in which the crime took place.

The core objective of this Directive is to assume an individual approach to victims’ needs and protection for victims of certain crimes due to, in particular, the risk of secondary victimisation. Protecting crime victims against the risk of secondary victimisation is especially important in domestic violence cases. The notion of secondary victimisation is defined as additional suffering of a crime victim, taking place after the occurrence of the offence, which is not its direct effect but

rather a consequence of the victim’s negative feelings related to the operation of (for example) agendas of the justice system during the process of enforcing the victim’s rights violated by the offence. It is generally accepted that secondary victimisation must be avoided when applying restorative justice services, such as mediation, particularly in cases of domestic violence.

The Preamble to the Directive 2012/29/EU states that ‘primary consideration are the interests and needs

of the victim, repairing the harm done to the victim and avoiding further harm' (European Parliament and Council, 2012, pp. 57ff). Victims have a whole range of needs that should be addressed to help them recover:

1. to be recognised and treated with respect and dignity;
2. to be protected and supported;
3. to have access to justice; and
4. to obtain compensation and restoration.

Two contradictory positions exist on the application of mediation to domestic violence cases. On the one hand, it is regarded as a 'consensus of the parties, provided it is a result of a voluntary settlement based on ethical standards, which usually offers greater assurance than a court ruling of a permanent resolution of the conflict between the parties. Furthermore, it increases the chance of fulfilling the provisions agreed upon, obviating the need for the involvement of the enforcement apparatus' (Rękas, 2012, p. 38). On the other hand, 'the mediation process is one more additional opportunity for the perpetrator, while this solution does not benefit the victim' (Rękas, 2012, p. 39).

This article presents the findings of research conducted on the implementation of mediation in domestic violence cases in Poland. The key purpose of the project was to consider mediation from the perspective of the victim, in particular with respect of the consequences of the mediation settlement and the procedural safeguards as to its performance by the perpetrator. Mediation is a complete success only when the offender has fulfilled the obligations of the mediation settlement, and the victim has obtained the redress for the wrong incurred. When the offender refuses to meet the provisions of the mediation settlement, the entire essence of restorative justice is lost and there is a risk of secondary victimisation. This is especially important with respect to victims of domestic violence, due to the unique characteristics of the offences and the close relations with the perpetrators.

The research study

In the research project I conducted in Poland, I focused on the problem of enforcement of settlements reached in the presence of a mediator in domestic violence cases. The research consisted of the following:

1. an investigation of the provisions of Polish civil and criminal procedure related to mediation,
2. an evaluation of the regulations of the European Union and the Council of Europe related to restorative justice,
3. an exploration of legal regulations of selected European states related to mediation,

4. the identification and analysis of Polish and international literature,
5. an empirical approach in the form of quantitative and qualitative research, composed of:
 - a) the study of files of cases referred to mediation in court proceedings and preliminary proceedings, and
 - b) a questionnaire.

The study used files in courts and prosecution authorities of Łódź appellate jurisdiction, and randomly selected cases where the parties were referred to mediation in the period 2008–2013, irrespective of the mediation process outcome. The study included 231 criminal cases, including 125 domestic violence cases and 356 civil cases. Questionnaires were limited to judges and prosecutors of Łódź appellate jurisdiction, notaries public of the Chamber of Notaries Public in Łódź and mediators entered on the lists of permanent mediators in Łódź appellate jurisdiction. Quantitative studies were carried out in 2014. The questionnaires were filled out by 151 notaries, 139 judges, 93 prosecutors and 51 mediators.

My research found that in criminal cases the victim does not enjoy the legal guarantees of sanctions that are imposed within a court. For the most part, this was due to the fact that, once the offender and the victim had agreed to participate in mediation, the court considered the case as closed. In other words, the successful resolution of the case was not dependent on the offender fulfilling the contents of the agreement that was secured in the mediation process. As such, this represented an acute problem given that the process benefited offenders to the detriment of their victims.

The research findings indicate that a number of key issues should be taken into consideration when referring a case to mediation and in conducting a restorative justice process. These include: the nature and severity of the crime, the ensuing degree of trauma, the repeat violation of a victim's physical, sexual, or psychological integrity, power imbalances and the age, maturity or intellectual capacity of the victim, which could limit or reduce the victim's ability to make an informed choice. This is especially important in mediation cases of domestic violence, where the victims have a close relationship with the perpetrator, those involving elderly people or where there is a history of longer-term domestic violence. Mediation in such cases should take place with a maximum degree of caution, making both parties to the mediation process equal and with the use of measures preventing secondary victimisation, not only directly during the mediation process, but also after the parties have concluded the mediation settlement, prior to the perpetrator's performance of its provisions.

The effectiveness of mediation depends on the real cause of the conflict and on the real expectations of

the parties, especially in domestic violence cases. The victim is not always interested in the direct punishment of the offender. Sometimes the victim wants to exert pressure on the offender to enforce a change of conduct or to obtain other tangible benefits, like the consent to the proposed property division during divorce proceedings or the acquisition of child support. Mediation settlements concluded in cases of this type are not always directed at obtaining financial recompense from the perpetrator. Sometimes it is more important for the victim to receive an apology and a promise of a change of conduct. Provisions of this type in mediation settlements cannot be enforced by bailiffs. Therefore, it is worthwhile considering, as in other states, the introduction of a time period between the conclusion of the mediation settlement and the perpetrator's obtaining beneficial procedural effects such as: the suspension of a sanction, its reduction or provisional discontinuation of the proceedings. During this period, the offender could be given the opportunity to fulfil the obligations and the closing of the case should be contingent on his or her performance of the mediation settlement.

The research found that the court's decision to refer a domestic violence case to mediation is not always informed by the best interest of the victim. Sometimes the court's decision depends on the complexity of the case, the judge's difficulties in communicating with the parties or the desire to close the case as soon as possible. This is especially evident in domestic violence cases referred to mediation on the court's initiative, when communication with the parties is hampered and the victim and the perpetrator cannot express themselves or define their expectations. Sometimes there are also additional aggravating factors such as an alcohol problem, another addiction or the victim's old age.

Sometimes, arguably, the criminal justice system and the offender can be perceived to be the real beneficiaries of terminating the criminal proceedings as an outcome of a mediation agreement. In Poland, when the beneficial procedural effects for the perpetrator are not contingent on his or her performance of the mediation settlement, the problem is quite frequent. Under the current legal regulation, neither the justice system, nor the mediator are interested in verifying the performance of the mediation settlement. The perpetrator gains procedural benefits already at the moment of concluding the settlement. It is also when the mediation process finishes for the mediator and the court, since the parties have entered into a mediation settlement, may issue the final ruling. A case is recorded in statistical data and the proceedings are efficiently and quickly concluded. Since in domestic violence cases we often deal with authorised representatives appointed by law, also from their perspective because of the time devoted

to the case, such a solution is advantageous.

When the mediation agreement is not performed, there is a risk of secondary victimisation of the victim, especially in domestic violence cases. The victim, when notifying the justice system about domestic violence, has taken a huge risk. Often the victim relies on the perpetrator for housing or is, in another way, psychologically or economically, dependent on the perpetrator. To take part in the mediation process requires renewed trust in the offender. In such a situation, the perpetrator's refusal to fulfil the provisions of the mediation settlement is all the more acutely felt by the victim and may intensify his or her problems in relations with the perpetrator of violence.

The character of settlements ('wishful settlements', for example, which include promises to change behaviour or treatment or 'quasi-civil settlements,' for example, compensation for damages or redress) reached during victim-offender mediation determines whether there is a real possibility of securing their performance by the offender. This study demonstrated that not all mediation settlements, because of the nature of their provisions, may be successfully executed by bailiffs. Even if the mediation settlement contains provisions of a civil nature which as of 1.07.2015 have been enforceable, the victim may not always be able to apply for such execution, and even if they do, it may turn out that there is no property against which the claim can be settled.

The accepted changes to the criminal procedure in mediation institutions through a possibility of issuing a writ of enforcement may appear to be insufficient from the victim's perspective because of the content of the settlements reached, especially in domestic violence cases. The perpetrator's non-performance of the mediation settlement provisions, with his or her simultaneous obtaining procedural benefits arising from the very fact of concluding a mediation settlement, may result in the victim's secondary victimisation.

Based on the research presented, the Public Advisory Council on Alternative Dispute Resolution at the Polish Ministry of Justice on June 22, 2017 adopted Recommendation No. 5/2017 on Amendments to the Law on Mediation in Criminal Matters.¹ In the Recommendation, the Council identified the victim as the principal beneficiary of mediation, her security, her interest in remedying the damage and the prevention of secondary victimisation. In addition, the obligation for the Law Enforcement and Judicial Authorities to check whether the settlement concluded before the mediator has been or is being performed by the perpetrator before the judgement giving rise to the case. This recommendation is the first step to change the law.

¹<https://ms.gov.pl/pl/dzialalnosc/mediacje/spoleczna-rada-ds-alternatywnych-metod-rozwiazywania-konfliktow-i-sporow/oradzie/> [Accessed 13th September 2017]

Barbara J. Pawlak, PhD

Attorney at Law; Mediator;
Member of the Public Advisory Council on Alternative
Dispute Resolution at the Polish Minister of Justice
barbara.jadwiga.pawlak@gmail.com

References

Council of Europe (2011). Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168008481d>. Istanbul Convention.

European Parliament and Council (2012). Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA. [EUR-Lex](#).

Rękas, A. (2012). Mediacja w prawie karnym. In: W. Broński and P. Stanisław (eds.) *Mediacje i negocjacje prawnicze. Skrypt dla uczestników studiów podyplomowych w zakresie mediacji i negocjacji prawniczych*. Lublin.

Book Reviews

Evans, K and Vaandering, D (2016) *The Little Book of Restorative Justice in Education*. New York: Good Books ISBN: 978 1 68099 172 7 ISBN: 978 1 68099 173 4 (ebk)

The Little Book of Restorative Justice in Education is a welcome addition to the Justice and Peacebuilding 'Little Book' series. Evans and Vaandering highlight a set of core beliefs that they suggest are common to restorative justice in education (RJE) — that 'people are worthy and relational' and that practice is rooted in the values of 'respect, dignity and mutual concern.' The main thrust of the book is an emphasis on the need for a stronger theoretical framework for restorative justice in education to prevent practices from becoming 'misunderstood, diluted, or misused' and although the focus is on education, it has much to offer the reader who wishes to reflect on the broader principles of developing healthy learning environments and building relationships whatever the context.

Section 1 of the book (Chapters 1–3) explores the history, values and beliefs and the cultural dimension of restorative justice (RJ) to encourage the reader to think about 'the way we do things around here' and how these values, beliefs and practices build to develop organisational climate. The reader is challenged to think about these ideas through the analogy of the growth of a plant illustrating the 'organic growth' of the movement and the need for strong root systems to nurture healthy growth rather than focusing only on the beautiful 'bloom' of the flower above ground.

Section 2 of the book (Chapters 4–6) builds on the core concepts of restorative justice. The authors recognise that RJ in education is not easily defined but support the case for the continued use of the word 'justice' which is then related in the education setting through a set of foundational concepts: respect, dignity and mutual concern. The authors make great use of stories

and examples to allow the reader to relate the concepts to the education environment and reflect on their own understanding of just and equitable learning environments and how to address underlying needs and 'justice' in its widest sense. The importance of nurturing healthy relationships within the current challenging context of our often, disconnected communities acknowledges many of the challenges that exist within both schools and other institutional contexts. The authors build on Wachtel and McCold's social discipline window to develop a 'relationship matrix' emphasising the need for a balance of support and expectations in healthy relationships. In Chapter 6 the authors consider harm and conflict in more detail and how they can leave people with unmet needs. They highlight that RJ in education addresses healing and justice rather than focusing on what 'they deserve.' Again, examples and processes such as circles are described to illustrate how restorative justice might provide the framework to redesign school discipline systems and establish relationship focused school cultures.

Section 3 of the book (Chapter 7) draws the themes together to encourage the reader to think about sustainability. Through the use of two case studies the reader is brought back to the analogy of the plant and the trees that are on the front cover of the book. Slow intentional and collaborative approaches with ongoing modelling, professional development and the engagement of young people are recommended as ways in which practice can be sustained and the reader is encouraged not to forget 'the seed and the roots' which require 'nurture at every stage of development.'

The Little Book of Restorative Justice in Education builds a strong case for restorative justice to be viewed as a philosophical approach to developing nurturing educational environments that have relationships at their heart and is therefore of interest to readers beyond the educational context. The authors clearly demon-

strate that restorative justice in education is not just a set of strategies or processes ‘borrowed from judicial settings’ to deal with behaviour or discipline in schools and use the analogy of the plant to emphasise the need for time and attention to be paid to values and beliefs that will nurture and sustain healthy growth and ‘root’ systems. They make good use of stories, examples and their own extensive experience to build a framework for introducing restorative justice into education and integrate research in the field to support their recommendations. In my opinion, there is still some way to go to develop a theoretical framework that the authors argue for at the outset and therefore the dangers of prac-

tices being diluted or misused are very real especially in the educational context where the pressure in many systems is on academic achievements and scores rather than people. The book should therefore be viewed as a guide and introduction to restorative justice in education and those interested in implementation would be advised to refer to the extensive list of resources listed to further their understanding and professional development in the field.

Nicola Preston

Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education and Humanities,
University of Northampton, UK
nicolapreston@iirp.edu

‘Child maltreatment and well-being: contemporary issues, research and practice’ International Scientific Conference held at Haruv University, Rijeka, Croatia, July 7—8 2017

A group of institutions from universities in Croatia, Israel, Germany, Spain, The Netherlands and United Kingdom organised the first international scientific conference on child maltreatment and well-being which took place at the University of Rijeka in Croatia. The conference included a range of fascinating keynote speeches followed up by paper and poster presentations and ample opportunity to further discussions through the exchange of ideas, findings and best practices across fields.

The conference provided the space for researchers and professionals from different fields such as social sciences, social work, law, criminology, medicine, nursing, and public health and more than nine different countries to develop multi-professional approaches to child well-being. The presentations and posters allowed experienced and early stage researchers to share their insight into issues including a wide range of topics such as: the participation of children in the child protection system, sibling sexual abuse cases, media coverage of specific cases and children-related risks to the experience of rural youth.

The afternoon session on Day 1 of the conference was dedicated to restorative practices. Participants included Razwana Begum BT Abdoul Rahim (Singapore), Branka Peurača (Croatia), Nicola Preston (UK) and Mary Clarke Boyd (Ireland). The overall themes included sharing experience and research findings in setting up restorative frameworks and practice in the care sector, in strengthening protective factors and resilience of children in care, in identifying safeguarding issues in the field of special education needs and ‘at risk’ populations of young people and in influencing the creation of social capital in youth work, community work and schools. The restorative framework complemented the other topics discussed and the experience from this conference confirmed once again that there is much

potential for developing the impact of restorative programs in synergy with other fields of expertise related to child well-being and maltreatment.

The presenters on restorative practices found the work on the inclusion of the voice of the child to be of particular significance. In particular, the longitudinal research presented by Professor Asher Ben-Arieh, PhD, Director of the Haruv Institute, Jerusalem, Israel showed how advances in the use of new methodological approaches as well as theory is building a vast worldwide data-base of valuable information from the child’s perspective. Prof. Ben-Arieh initiated and coordinated the multi-national project ‘Measuring and Monitoring Children’s Well-Being,’ and was among the founding members of the [International Society for Child Indicators](#) (ISCI). The voices of over 90,000 children have already been recorded and the work continues to expand. The [Haruv Institute](#) is also working towards a ‘children’s campus’ using their research and treatment methodologies across an array of disciplines to provide a child abuse recovery centre. It was a powerful and inspiring conference to take part in and those who attended are looking forward to the next conference in 2019.

Further details about the conference and the program can be found on the [conference website](#). The next conference is to be held in Berlin, Germany in 2019

(dates to be confirmed); look for an announcement of the exact dates either at the above website or at the [Free University of Berlin](#) where the next conference is due to be held.

Branka Peuraca

PhD student of Social Work and Social Policy,
Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb

branka_peuraca@yahoo.com

Nicola Preston

Adjunct Faculty International Institute for Restorative Practices Graduate School,
Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education and Humanities,
University of Northampton, UK
nicolapreston@iirp.edu

Calendar

IIRP 23rd World Conference *Learning in the 21st Century: A Restorative Vision* 23–25 October 2017 Bethlehem, PA, US Further details from the [IIRP](#).

Conflict Resolution Conference 2017 *Relate — Resolve — Restore* 1–2 November 2017 Wellington, New Zealand Further information from the [Conflict Resolution Conference](#).

Transforming Conflict *Restorative Approaches in Youth Settings A constructive approach to conflict, bullying, disruption and challenging behaviour* 6–11 November 2017 Reading, Berkshire, UK Download the PDF from [Transforming Conflict](#).

International Juvenile Justice Observatory (IJJO), in partnership with KU Leuven and the EFRJ *Training on RJ with child victims* 8–9 November 2017 Leuven, Belgium Further details from the [EFRJ](#).

DETOUR *Confronting dilemmas of pre-trial detention* 9 November 2017 Bundesministerium für Justiz, Museumstraße 7, 1070 Wien Further details from the [DETOUR](#).

RJ Week 2017 International Restorative Justice Week 19–26 November 2017 Events include:

Film screenings of *A Conversation*: see [EFRJ Events for November 2017](#)

22 November 2017: a series of TEDx Talks on RJ to launch Leuven as a RJ City

Further information from the [EFRJ](#).

Eight annual conference of the Victimology Society of Serbia *Victims between security, human rights and justice: Local and global context* 30 November — 1 December 2017 Belgrade Further details from the [Victimology Society of Serbia](#).

European Family Justice Center Alliance *How to start a Family Justice Center* 1–2 December 2017 Royal Library, Brussels Further details from the [European Family Justice Center Alliance](#).

Howard League *Redesigning Justice: Promoting civil rights, trust and fairness* 21–22 March 2018 Keble College, Oxford Further details from the [Howard League](#)

10th International EFRJ Conference *Expanding the restorative imagination: Restorative justice between realities and visions in Europe and beyond* 14–16 June 2018 Tirana, Albania. Call for proposals open until 1 November 2017. More information from the [EFRJ](#).

Editorial Committee:

Publisher: EFRJ [Coordinator: Emanuela Biffi (Belgium), E-mail: emanuela.biffi@euforumrj.org]

Editor: Kerry Clamp, E-mail: kerry.clamp@nottingham.ac.uk

Members: Branka Peurača, Nicola Preston, Catherine Jaccottet Tissot, Martin Wright, Diāna Ziedina, Robert Shaw

The views presented in this Newsletter are the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the EFRJ.

Secretariat of the European Forum for Restorative Justice Hooverplein 10 • 3000 Leuven • Belgium • T +32 16 32 54 29 www.euforumrj.org

With the financial support of
the European Commission.

