



This Project is funded by the European Union and the Republic of Turkey
and implemented by the Council of Europe

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

THE EUROPEAN UNION / COUNCIL OF EUROPE JOINT PROGRAMME

“DISSEMINATION OF MODEL PRISON PRACTICES AND PROMOTION OF THE PRISON REFORM IN TURKEY”

Budget line(s): 2007 IPA

Reference: TR 0702.18-01/001

REPORTING PERIOD
1 March 2009 – 30 September 2012

Strasbourg and Ankara, March 2013



For any additional information please contact:

The Office of the Director General of Programmes
of the Council of Europe
Palais de l'Europe
Avenue de l'Europe
F-67065 Strasbourg CEDEX
FRANCE

List of acronyms used in the report

CFCU	Central Finance and Contracts Unit
CoE	Council of Europe
CPT	European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
DG-I	Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law
DGPDH	Directorate General of Prisons and Detention Houses
DoA	Description of the Action
EU	European Union
EUD	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EPR	European Prison Rules
ER	Estimated Results
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
ISKUR	Turkish Employment Organization
JMPR	Judicial Modernization and Penal Reform in Turkey Project
LA	Linguistic Assistant
LTC	Long-Term Consultant
MEU	Ministry for European Union Affairs
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
OBP(s)	Offender Behaviour Programme(s)
PF	Project Fiche
PA	Project Assistant
PM	Project Manager
PMM	Prison Management Manual
PR	Public relation
PSTC(s)	Prison Staff Training Centre(s)
SC	Steering Committee
SNPE	Senior National Project Expert
SPO	Senior Programme Officer
STC	Short-Term Consultant
TAIB	Transition Assistance and Institution Building
TBA	Union of Turkish Bar Associations
TGNA	Turkish Grand National Assembly
ToT	Training-of-Trainers
TRT	Turkish Radio and Television Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THE REPORT</i>	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF ANNEXES	6
INTRODUCTION.....	6
1 BASIC INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT	8
2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
3 REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE	10
3.1. POLICY AND PROGRAMME CONTEXT.....	10
3.2. IMPLEMENTATION ENVIRONMENT AND ARRANGEMENTS.....	12
3.2.1. <i>Institutional set up and overall Project organisation</i>	12
3.2.2. <i>Key partners and their functions</i>	12
3.3.3. <i>Staff and Qualifications</i>	14
4 RESULTS AND ACTIVITIES	16
4.1. EXPECTED RESULT 1: RULES AND PRACTICES ADOPTED AND IMPLEMENTED REGARDING PRISON MANAGEMENT AND THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS, ACCORDING TO EUROPEAN STANDARDS	16
4.1.2 ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ER-1	18
4.2. EXPECTED RESULT 2: REHABILITATION AND TRAINING OF PRISONERS WHICH COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND PRISON STANDARDS ENSURED, DETENTION CONDITIONS IMPROVED.....	25
4.2.1. RESULTS UNDER THE ER 2:.....	25
4.2.2. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ER 2:.....	27
4.3. EXPECTED RESULT 3: THE TWO NEW PRISON STAFF TRAINING CENTRES ARE OPERATIONAL WITH THE SAME LEVEL OF PROFESSIONALISM AS THE OTHER THREE TRAINING CENTRES.....	35
4.3.1. RESULTS UNDER THE ER 3:.....	35
4.3.2. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ER 3:.....	36
4.4. EXPECTED RESULT 4: THE ROLE OF MONITORING BOARDS AND ENFORCEMENT JUDGES ENHANCED	39
4.4.1. RESULTS UNDER ER 4:	39
4.4.2. ACTIVITIES UNDER ER 4:.....	40
4.5. EXPECTED RESULT 5: PRISON REFORM PROMOTED TO THE PUBLIC AND CIVIL SOCIETY	46
4.5.1. RESULTS UNDER THE ER 5:.....	46
4.5.2. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ER 5:.....	47
4.6. EXPECTED RESULT 6: THE CAPACITY OF THE DGPDH OF THE MOJ IS INCREASED TO FURTHER DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT PRISON REFORMS	58
4.6.1. RESULTS UNDER ER 6:	58
4.6.2. ACTIVITIES UNDER ER 6:.....	59
4.7 DESCRIBE IF THE ACTION WILL CONTINUE AFTER THE SUPPORT FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION HAS ENDED. ARE THERE ANY FOLLOW UP ACTIVITIES ENVISAGED? WHAT WILL ENSURE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ACTION?	79

4.8	EXPLAIN HOW THE ACTION HAS MAINSTREAMED CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES SUCH AS PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DEMOCRACY, GOOD GOVERNANCE, CHILDREN’S RIGHTS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND COMBATING HIV/AIDS (IF THERE IS A STRONG PREVALENCE IN THE TARGET COUNTRY/REGION).....	79
4.9	HOW AND BY WHOM HAVE THE ACTIVITIES BEEN MONITORED/ EVALUATED? PLEASE SUMMARISE THE RESULTS OF THE FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE BENEFICIARIES AND OTHERS.....	80
4.10	WHAT HAS YOUR ORGANISATION OR ANY ACTOR INVOLVED IN THE ACTION LEARNED FROM THE ACTION AND HOW HAS THIS LEARNING BEEN UTILISED AND DISSEMINATED?	81
4.11	PLEASE LIST ALL MATERIALS (AND NUMBER OF COPIES) PRODUCED DURING THE ACTION ON WHATEVER FORMAT (PLEASE ENCLOSE A COPY OF EACH ITEM, EXCEPT IF YOU HAVE ALREADY DONE SO IN THE PAST).	83
5	BENEFICIARIES/AFFILIATED ENTITIES AND OTHER COOPERATION	84
5.1	HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUR ORGANISATION AND STATE AUTHORITIES IN THE ACTION COUNTRIES? HOW HAS THIS RELATIONSHIP AFFECTED THE ACTION?	84
5.2	FINAL BENEFICIARIES AND TARGET GROUPS	85
5.3	OTHER THIRD PARTIES INVOLVED (INCLUDING OTHER DONORS, OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS, NGOs, ETC.).....	85
5.4	WHERE APPLICABLE, OUTLINE ANY LINKS AND SYNERGIES YOU HAVE DEVELOPED WITH OTHER ACTIONS.....	85
5.5	IF YOUR ORGANISATION HAS RECEIVED PREVIOUS EU GRANTS IN VIEW OF STRENGTHENING THE SAME TARGET GROUP, IN HOW FAR HAS THIS ACTION BEEN ABLE TO BUILD UPON/COMPLEMENT THE PREVIOUS ONE(S)? (LIST ALL PREVIOUS RELEVANT EU GRANTS).....	85
5.6	HOW DO YOU EVALUATE COOPERATION WITH THE SERVICES OF THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY?	85
6	VISIBILITY	85
	HOW IS THE VISIBILITY OF THE EU CONTRIBUTION BEING ENSURED IN THE ACTION? THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION MAY WISH TO PUBLICISE THE RESULTS OF ACTIONS. DO YOU HAVE ANY OBJECTION TO THIS REPORT BEING PUBLISHED ON THE EUROPEAid WEBSITE? IF SO, PLEASE STATE YOUR OBJECTIONS HERE.	85
7	LOCATION OF RECORDS, ACCOUNTING AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	86

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 1: Evaluation reports:

1. Evaluation report by Roger Houchin and Cornelius Boeij, CoE LTCs
2. The Project Evaluation report by BYS

Annex 2: NGO strategy:

1. Draft strategic plan on the role of NGO
2. Expert Opinion on the Development of an NGO Strategy by R. Houchin (December 2010)

Annex 3: Activities Assessment reports:

1. Activity assessment report n°1 (Dec 09-March 10)
2. Activity assessment report n°2 (Sept 09-Nov. 09)
3. Activity assessment report n°3 (June 09-Sept. 09)
4. Activity assessment report n°4 (April-July 2010)
5. Activity assessment report n°5 (July- September 2010)
6. Activity assessment report n°6 (1 October 10 – 5 January 2011)
7. Activity assessment report n°7 (1 January – 31 March 2011)
8. Activity assessment report n°8 (1 April – 31 June 2011)
9. Activity assessment report n°9 (1 July – 30 September 2011)
10. Activity assessment report n°10 (1 October – 31 December 2011)
11. Activity assessment report n°11 (1 January – 31 March 2012)
12. Activity assessment report n°12 (1 April – 30 June 2012)
13. Needs assessment report by Berthel Österdahl, CoE LTC

Annex 4: Steering Committees meetings Minutes:

1. Minutes of the 1st SC meeting (June 09)
2. Minutes of the 2nd SC meeting (29 Sept. 09)
3. Minutes of the 3rd SC meeting (January 10)
4. Minutes of the 5th SC meeting (17 June 10)
5. Minutes of the 6th SC meeting (5 October 10)
6. Minutes of the 7th SC meeting (February 11)
7. Minutes of the 8th SC meeting (13-14 April 2011)
8. Minutes of the 9th SC meeting (7 July 11)
9. Minutes of the 10th SC meeting (20 October 11)
10. Minutes of the 11th SC meeting (20 October 11)
11. Minutes of the 12th SC meeting (19 January 12)
12. Minutes of the 13th SC meeting (12 July 12)

Annex 5: Publications:

1. Prison Management Manual
2. Project Introduction booklet
3. Good prison management, leadership and operational standards – Trainer's manual
4. Training manual for prison teachers
5. Manual for Enforcement Judges
6. Manual for civil monitoring boards

NB: Due to their size, all annexes are available on the attached USB stick and Annex 1 is also available in hardcopy together with the Report.

INTRODUCTION

The “Dissemination of Model Prison Practices and Promotion of the Prison Reform in Turkey Project” (hereinafter to be referred to as “the Project”) was funded by the European Union (EU) under the 2007 programming of the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) Component 1: Transition Assistance and Institution Building. . The Beneficiary of the Project was the Directorate General of Prisons and Detention Houses (DGPDH) of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). The Project was a Joint Programme (JP) of the EU and the Council of Europe (CoE). The Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) was the Contracting Authority of this Project. The Project was a continuation of the reform achieved under the Judicial Modernisation and Penal Reform in Turkey Project (JMPPR), from which the DGPDH had benefited between 1 June 2004 and 30 April 2007.

The Project started on 1 March 2009, the day after the last party had signed the direct grant contract between the CoE and the CFCU, which was endorsed for financing by the EU as well. The Project was originally planned to end on 30 August 2011. In the meantime, the DGPDH and the CoE applied to the CFCU and the Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD) for a one-year extension of the Project’s duration and an extra budget allocation of € 1,200,000.00. After a long period of mutual consultations, the *Addendum* was communicated to the CoE by the CFCU on 28 March 2011 and then it was signed by the CoE on 05 April 2011. In August 2012, the Project was granted an additional one month, no-cost extension to leave time for the organisation of a Closing Conference and site visits to various prisons, which could not be organised due to the tragic events in Sanliurfa Prison and the following unrest in other prisons. At the end, the Project’s total duration reached 43 months with a total budget amounting to € 4.2 million.

The Project had two main components: The first component covered the establishment of training facilities and vocational training workshops in 90 medium and high security prisons and the provision of training materials and tools. The second component covered support for the sustainability of reform activities. The DGPDH and the CoE implemented activities on mutual cooperation and consultation in order to implement the second component. The first component was mainly under the responsibility of the DGPDH.

The Project aimed to provide assistance to the DGPDH’s efforts to elevate the penitentiary system in Turkey to the level envisaged by the European Prison Rules (EPR) and other international standards through creating a professional, effective and efficient prison service, upgrading prison services and contributing to the improvement of detention conditions.

The target groups of the Project were prison staff in 90 medium and high security prisons in Turkey, staff of the DGPDH, prison prosecutors, perimeter security guards, members of prison monitoring boards and enforcement judges. The final beneficiaries of the Project are staff in all Turkish prisons, prisoners, civil society and the public.

The main activities of the Project included the following:

1. Training of prison staff on the EPR.
2. Training of prison governors on good prison management and leadership.
3. Training of prison teachers, health care staff and psycho-social services staff on the operational standards applicable to specific areas of prison management.
4. Development and updating of offending behaviour programmes (OBPs)

5. Establishment of educational facilities and vocational training workshops in 90 prisons and provision of training materials and tools to these facilities.
6. Training of existing and future lecturers of the newly opened Prison Staff Training Centres (PSTCs).
7. Training seminars for the DGPDH staff, prison prosecutors, perimeter security staff (the gendarmerie), enforcement judges and members of monitoring boards on the EPR and CPT recommendations in the penitentiary field.
8. Workshops with the NGO representatives on the development of an NGO strategy.
9. Production of visibility items and development of a PR Strategy for the penitentiary system.
10. Purchase of books for the research and development centre of the DGPDH and for the libraries of 90 prisons.

1 BASIC INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

Project Title	Dissemination of Model Prison Practices and the Promotion of Prison Reform in Turkey
Project Number	TR 0702.18-01/001
Beneficiary Country	Turkey
Beneficiary Institution	Republic of Turkey Ministry of Justice, Directorate General of Prisons and Detention Houses
Project Starting Date	01/03/2009
Contracting Authority	Central Finance and Contracts Unit
Funding	European Union
Project Duration	43 months
Implementing Organisation	Council of Europe (DG I - Human Rights and Rule of Law)
Project Budget	EUR 4.175.589
Date of Report	March 2013
Reporting Period	1 March 2009 – 30 September 2012

Overall Objective(s)	To contribute to the improvement of the penitentiary system in Turkey in line with the EPR and other international standards.
Project Purpose:	To create a professional, effective and efficient prison service through the dissemination of model prison practices and the promotion of prison reforms in Turkey by upgrading prison services and contributing to the improvement of detention conditions.
Estimated Results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rules and practices adopted and implemented regarding prison management and the treatment of prisoners, according to European standards. 2) Rehabilitation and training of prisoners ensured complying with international human rights and prison standards; detention conditions improved. 3) Two new Prison Staff Training Centres operational with the same level of professionalism as the other three training centres. 4) The role of the Monitoring Boards and of the enforcement judges enhanced. 5) Prison reforms promoted to the public and civil society. 6) The capacity of the DGPDH of the MoJ to further design and implement prison reforms increased.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Narrative Report aims to give a detailed account of the activities implemented under the European Union – Council of Europe Joint Programme on “Dissemination of Model prison Practices and Promotion of the Prison Reform in Turkey”. The report, in particular, will provide information on the available results of these activities, assess potential future impact of the Project’s results and analyse prospects for sustainability and local ownership.

The narratives on the Project activities performed, assessments of the results of the activities and evaluations of the Project’s impact, sustainability and local ownership contained within this report are based on:

- ❖ observations of the Project team;
- ❖ evaluation forms filled in by the target groups;
- ❖ verbal interviews of the Project team with the target group;
- ❖ assessment reports prepared by the long term consultant (LTC);
- ❖ assessment reports prepared by short term consultants (STCs);
- ❖ external result oriented monitoring reports;
- ❖ results of the field research and the final evaluation studies.

The major achievements of the Project are as follows, according the results of the field survey conducted by an independent research team:

- ❖ 72% of staff, 51% of inmates think that thanks to the Project number of out-of-the-cell activities and social activities increased;
- ❖ According to approximately 70% of prison staff, the Project led to an increase in the quality and quantity of training activities provided for prison staff;
- ❖ 63% of staff think that after the Project; intra-inmate and inmate-staff relations got considerably better. This ratio goes down the 51% when answered by inmates, however still a considerably high rate which is also verified by the inmates themselves;
- ❖ 72% of staff; 52% of inmates think that the Project created more opportunities for employment after release;
- ❖ 50% inmates think that the Project increased responsiveness of administrators towards complaints;
- ❖ Only 9% of inmates believe that life in prison got worse whereas the 91% record either progress toward better or minimal but insufficient positive change

These figures reveal the impressive positive intervention made by the Project to the most problematic fields of Turkish penitentiary system within three and a half years despite the setbacks emanating from overall political conditions in Turkey, overcrowding of prisons and variations among prisons in terms of quality of physical conditions. Yet, it would not be realistic to talk about existence of 90 model medium and high security level prisons operating in accordance with the standards envisaged by the EPR.

The Project also revealed that ensuring full compliance of Turkish penitentiary system with the EPR would require:

- ❖ Further investments in betterment of physical conditions of prisons, providing more space and equipment, for vocational training and workshop activities in the architecture of prisons;

- ❖ Reducing overcrowding;
- ❖ Reducing understaffing;
- ❖ Employment of more psycho-social services staff;
- ❖ Using the momentum created by the Project and advise prison governors on the need to strengthen operational areas other than static security oriented ones;
- ❖ Ensuring that more rights-based NGO are involved in the system alongside the charity organisations;
- ❖ Strengthening external monitoring of prisons even further.

The quality of Project design and establishment of a common understanding among the Project stakeholders as early as possible appeared to be important points for consideration for success of future penitentiary reform Projects in Turkey.

3 REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE

3. 1. POLICY AND PROGRAMME CONTEXT

Since Turkey began prison reform activities in 1997, wide-ranging reforms have been carried out both in the legislative field and in implementation and practice.

When it comes to legislative work laying down the basis to vitalise penitentiary reform, significance of the legislative reforms made in 2005, namely adoption of the new Penal Code, Penal Procedure Code, Code on the Enforcement of Sentences and the Code on Protection of Children, is well known. The new legislation, which was the result of the overall judicial reform efforts of Turkish Government, ensured a legal framework under which a modern and professional approach toward both prison staff and to inmates could be adopted.

In the practical field, low-capacity and old prisons in small provinces and districts in Turkey are still being closed down and replaced with either campus type modern facilities, or with mainly L type prisons, which are up to a great extent in line with European and international standards as far as the physical conditions are concerned. There are currently 378 prisons in Turkey, 90 of which are high-capacity ones. Silivri and Maltepe Prison Campuses in Istanbul, Sincan Prison Campus in Ankara and Aliağa Campus in Izmir include 7 different prisons each.

In addition to the physical structure of prisons, substantial investment has been made to staff training, allocation of financial resources and inmate rehabilitation. Many prisons have been modernised in terms of both management and environment under the Turkish prison reform activities.

Since 2005 the DGPDH has also been sustaining efforts to increase the number of staff it employs. In the period 2005-2011, 11,856 more staff were recruited by the DGPDH to address staff shortcomings in the penitentiary system. At present, the total number of staff working in prisons is approximately 32,000. In-service training courses and seminars are organised in the Ankara, Istanbul, Erzurum and Kahramanmaraş PSTCs.

During the lifetime of the Project, the following major legislative amendments have also been made to enhance penitentiary reform further:

- ❖ The Code No 6352, which is also known as the “3rd Judicial Reform Package” entered into force on 5 July 2012 and has made amendments in a series of Laws including the Penal Code. The adoption of the package eased conditions of benefiting from probation services in general and earlier release in particular. It also eased conditions of transfer from high security and closed prisons to the open ones. This amendment had some positive impact on the overcrowding problem on the short run however in the medium term the prison population took over 130,000 again.
- ❖ Within the framework of the amendment made in subparagraph (p) of paragraph two of article 88 of the Legislation on Management of Penal Institutions and Enforcement of Penalties and Security Measures on the date of 15/06/2009, the convicts were given the opportunity to make telephone calls in another language in the event that they “declare” that they or their relatives cannot speak Turkish.
- ❖ Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15/A, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26/A, 27, Provisional Article 1, Provisional Article 2, Provisional Article 3, Provisional Article 4, Provisional Article 5 and Provisional Article 6 of the Law on Probation and Help Centres and Preservation Boards were amended and entered into force on the date of 11/4/2012. Within the scope of the said law, the structure of the probation organization has been amended as a directorate instead of a branch directorate.
- ❖ The transfer of jurisdiction on the provision of penitentiary health care services from the MoJ to the MoH and efforts of the MoH to embed penitentiary health care services into the overall system of family doctors happened right after the Project started, in April 2009. This change gave prison doctors employed by the MoJ an option to choose between staying with the MoJ or being transferred to the MoH as a family physician. Therefore a majority of MoJ doctors chose to leave for the MoH and ultimately only some 10 prison doctors remained with the MoJ. In the meantime, MoH started to task family doctors with providing health care services to prisons on a “1 family doctor for 1000 thousand inmates’ basis”. Almost all prisons under the scope of the Project were put under the new system gradually throughout Project implementation. Nevertheless, transfer of jurisdiction to MoH did not create the desired effect in the short run on the quality of health care services provided in prisons. On the contrary, because of relative inexperience of the MoH on the matter, further complications occurred, which even affected the course of health care related activities of the Project. The coordination problems between the MoJ and MoI became further complicated thanks to MoH coming into the picture. The coordination problems were partly solved when the tripartite protocol among the three Ministries were concluded in August 2011.
- ❖ Soon after the end of the Project, a draft law on Security Services in Prisons was submitted to the TGNA, which basically foresaw transfer of perimeter security from the Gendarmerie (MoI) to the MoJ. Though not realised within Project implementation, the CoE Project team welcomes the initiative as a step toward further compliance with the standards envisaged by the EPR.

The Turkish penitentiary reform has been supported by the EU and the CoE since its inception. To support the prison reform efforts of Turkey in the accession process, the JMPR Project was implemented between 1 June 2004 and 30 April 2007. This was a CoE/EU JP to which the EU contributed € 10.7 million in total. The penal reform component of the JMPR

provided technical assistance in the architectural design of the new prisons, the rehabilitation of old ones and guidelines on prison architecture. In addition, the training capacity of the PSTCs was strengthened. Concrete tools to promote systematisation and standardisation were developed, such as a Prison Management Manual (PMM) for prison governors and a Prison Doctors' Handbook for medical staff. Furthermore, two prisons (Uşak and Elazığ) in the western and eastern parts of Turkey were selected as model prisons where physical conditions had been improved, and staff had specifically been trained to provide a full range of services to prisoners for rehabilitation and training, complying with international standards. Vocational training workshops and social facilities had been established and tools and instruments had been procured in the aforementioned two prisons to provide vocational training to prisoners.

3.2. IMPLEMENTATION ENVIRONMENT AND ARRANGEMENTS

3.2.1. Institutional set up and overall Project organisation

The EUD, the CFCU, the DGPDH and the CoE were the key partners in the Project implementation. The Steering Committee (SC), which brought together these partners as well as important stakeholders such as the Ministry for European Union Affairs (MEU), the Union of Turkish Bar Associations (TBA), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and representatives of civil society, constitutes a platform for discussion on essential matters relating to the Project and effective coordination between the Parties.

This section of the report provides a description of the roles of the key partners and stakeholders involved in the Project.

3.2.2. Key partners and their functions

a. Delegation of the European Union to Turkey

The Project was funded by the EU under the 2007 IPA Programming. The EU was the sole donor of the Direct Grant Component of the Project.

The subject of the Project fell under the "Justice, Freedom and Security" chapter of the EU *acquis* and accordingly, the Project was monitored by the Justice, Freedom and Security Sector Manager of the EUD.

As envisaged by the Description of Action (DoA), the EUD contributed actively to the monitoring and evaluation activities of the Project and was represented in the SC in order to strengthen the Project results.

b. Central Finance and Contracts Unit

The CFCU was the Contracting Authority of the Project. In accordance with the DoA, the CFCU had responsibility for the overall budgeting, tendering, contracting, payments, accounting and financial reporting aspects of the Project, as well as overall coordination and monitoring of Project implementation. The Contract Manager appointed by the CFCU to the Project was in charge and fulfilled the above-mentioned responsibilities in close cooperation with the EUD, the CoE and the DGPDH. The Contract Manager also represented the CFCU at the SC meetings.

c. Ministry of Justice, Directorate General of Prisons and Detention Houses

The DGPDH was the beneficiary of the Project. The Director General of Prisons and Detention Houses, Mr Mustafa Onuk, was the Senior Programme Officer (SPO) of the Project when its implementation was concluded in September 2012. Mr İsmail Zararsız, Head of Foreign Relations Department of the DGPDH, was then the Senior National Project Expert (SNPE). The DGPDH carried out the following tasks and functions in accordance with the DoA:

1. Coordinating inputs from various departments, branches and units of the DGPDH.
2. Supervising the implementation of Project activities.
3. Contributing to the preparation and implementation of work plans.
4. Approving Project work plans.
5. Cooperating in any matter related to procurement or other administrative or financial issue related to the Project implementation.
6. Contributing to the monitoring and evaluation activities for the Project.
7. Making recommendations to the SC to strengthen the Project results.
8. Ensuring Project ownership by the final beneficiaries.
9. Ensuring Project sustainability and the widest possible dissemination of the Project results.

d. Council of Europe:

As the implementer of the Project, the CoE was responsible for the following tasks and functions:

1. Overall management and implementation of the Project.
2. Planning, in coordination with the stakeholders.
3. Conceptualisation of the content of training sessions and tools.
4. Preparation of Project reports.
5. Selection of experts with international expertise.
6. Ensuring the relevance of the contents of training sessions for the needs of the beneficiaries.
7. Selection of trainers in collaboration with the beneficiaries.
8. Providing the secretariat for the meetings of the SC.
9. Definition of participant profiles for the study visits, together with the DGPDH.

The CoE set up a Local Team comprising a Project Manager (PM), Long Term Consultant (LTC), Linguistic Assistant (LA) and a Project Assistant (PA). The Strasbourg-based team assigned to the Project comprised the Head of the Prisons and Police Reform Unit (PPRU) (not paid from the Project), a PA and an Accountant. Project implementation is under the supervision of the DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law of the CoE.

e. Ministry of Health:

The Ministry of Health (MoH) practically became a new beneficiary of the Project following the transfer of the jurisdiction over prison health care staff from the MoJ to the MoH in April 2009. The MoH partly contributed to the health care related activities of the Project.

f. Steering Committee

As envisaged by the DoA, the SC dealt with all strategic options related to the Project and addressed any major problems that might occur. The SC convened quarterly and held 13 meetings in total. Its responsibilities were the following:

1. To assess progress and agree upcoming priorities under the Project.
2. To make an assessment of emerging needs for sound Project implementation.
3. To adopt the overall work programme and the annual work plans.
4. To recommend strategies in the light of national sector priorities and the Accession Partnership (AP).
5. To conduct a final review of Project implementation and results.
6. To ensure that measures are taken to ensure the widest possible dissemination of Project results.
7. To recommend strategies for future sustainability.

The CoE provided the secretariat for the SC.

In accordance with the DoA and the decisions taken at the meeting, the SC comprised representatives from the DGPDH, the EUD, the CFCU, the CoE, the MEU, the MFA and the civil society. Meeting dates and venues of the SC were as follows:

For the minutes of the above-mentioned SC meetings, please refer to Annex 4 (available on the attached USB stick).

3.3.3. Staff and Qualifications

Project Team	
Ms Tanja Rakusic-Hadzic Head of the Prison and Police Reform Unit (CoE funded)	Criminal Law Division Action against Crime Department DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: + 33 3 90 21 53 99 Fax: + 33 3 88 41 27 36 E-mail: tanja.rakusic-hadzic@coe.int
Mr Baris Yunculer Project Manager (CoE Ankara Office)	Ankara Programme Office DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: +90 312 468 84 04; Fax: +90 312 468 84 06 E-mail: baris.yunculer@coe.int
Ms Sukran Ileri Linguistic Assistant (CoE Ankara Office)	Ankara Programme Office DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: +90 312 468 84 04; Fax: +90 312 468 84 06 E-mail: sukran.ileri@coe.int
Ms Zeynep Güllü Project Assistant (CoE Ankara Office)	Ankara Programme Office DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: +90 312 468 84 04; Fax: +90 312 468 84 06 zeynep.gullu@coe.int
Ms Marina Acha Project Assistant	Criminal Law Division Action against Crime Department

	DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 19; Fax: + 33 3 88 41 27 94 E-mail: marina.acha@coe.int
Ms Gülden Serbest Accountant	Ankara Programme Office DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: +90 312 468 84 04; Fax: +90 312 468 84 06 E-mail: gulden.serbest@coe.int

Long Term Consultant	
Mr Kees Boeij Long term consultant Former Resident Training Advisor and Project Team Leader (EU) Former Prison Governor (the Nederland) 10 January 2011 – present	Ankara Programme Office DG-I Human Rights and Rule of Law Tel: +90 312 468 84 04; Fax: +90 312 468 84 06 E-mail: kees.boeij@coe.int
Short Term Consultants	
Ms Yvonne Brown Teacher, Expert on Offender Learning Models	YvonneBrown292@aol.com
Mr Eric Svanidze Lawyer, Former CPT Member, Expert on International Standards on Prison Monitoring	eric.svanidze@coe.int
Mr John Teasdale Teacher, Expert on Adult Education and Training United Kingdom	johntea54@hotmail.com
Ms Catherine Creamer Clinical Psychologist, Lecturer at Glasgow Caledonian University, Expert on Offending Behaviour Programmes	Catherine.creamer@gcu.ac.uk
Ms Elisabeth Gilschricht Professor, Forensic Psychologist, Expert on the CALM Programme	liz.gilchrist@gcal.ac.uk
Mr Ewan Lundie Psychologist, Director of Scottish Psychology Services, Expert on Sex Offenders Treatment Programme	Ewnal2008@hotmail.co.uk
Mr James McGuire Professor of Forensic Clinical Psychology University of Liverpool, Expert on "Think First" Offending Behaviour Programme	j.mcguire01@liverpool.ac.uk
Stefan Antonie van de Lande Clinical Psychologist, Expert on Suicide Prevention Programme	s.a.lande@planet.nl
Mr Norman Powell, Administrator at the UK Ministry of Justice, Pre-Release Programme Expert	norman.powell@yahoo.com
Mr Kees Poll Prison Teacher, Expert on Prison Monitoring	kees.poll@planet.nl

Mechanisms	
Mr Johannes van den Brand Member of Dutch Supervisory Monitoring Board, Expert on Prison Monitoring Mechanisms	brand@aol.com
Mr Simon Forrester Freelance Consultant, Expert on Public Sector – NGO Cooperation Schemes	simon.forrester@eurasiasocialchange.com

4 **RESULTS AND ACTIVITIES**

This part of the report focuses on the activities carried out under the six Expected Results (ERs) envisaged by the Project.

4.1. **Expected Result 1: Rules and practices adopted and implemented regarding prison management and the treatment of prisoners, according to European Standards**

In order to have 90 model prisons operating in compliance with European standards and in order to change attitudes and behaviour of prison staff and inmates, training manuals and tools on the Penal Code, Penal Procedure Code, the new Regulation on Enforcement of Sentences, the revised EPR, the ECHR and the CPT standards had to be assessed, updated and based on these tools and manuals, training seminars aimed at approximately 15,000 staff had to be delivered by the end of the Project.

The most impressive achievement under this ER was **training of more than 18,000 prison staff on the basis of manuals, guidelines and booklets developed under the Project**. 24000 copies of 7 publications produced under this ER were distributed to the participants and libraries of 90 prisons. These impressive numbers are insurance that information produced by the Project could be communicated down to the roots of the penitentiary system.

The field survey results reveal that training materials, manuals, books and booklets produced thanks to the activities carried out under this result were **useful for the target group and relevant to what they were doing in their daily business**. About the CoE Recommendations in the Penitentiary Field Booklet, which was distributed to participants in each and every activity, approximately 90 % of the participants indicated that they saw the booklet as a valuable resource book, which was easy to refer to and user friendly. About the EPR training manuals, approximately 85% of the trainers indicated that the Manuals helped them deliver the cascade training sessions smoothly as they were concise and clear. About the Trainers' Manual for Prison Teachers, 95% of the prison teachers attended the cascade training sessions indicated that the Manual filled an important gap and is extremely useful as it helps them coordinate training related activities inside the prison better. There is also positive feedback on the Prison Management Manual and the accompanying Trainers' Manual by the prison governors.

The activities under ER 1 were also closely interlinked with those under the other ERs, especially under the ER 6. **The training materials, books and manuals produced under ER 1 provided the main resources on which the training sessions and seminars delivered**

under other ERs were based. Therefore, results achieved under ER-1 had a horizontal impact equipping the Beneficiary with a sustainable capacity to design, implement and evaluate training sessions on European and international standards in the penitentiary field and to draft and produce resource books and materials associated with those training sessions.

When it comes to the impact of these achievements, the field survey conducted at the end of the Project reveal that **there has been a general improvement in the attitudes of prison personnel towards prisoners** during the implementation period of the Project. According the **49,3% of prison staff**, staff attitude toward the inmates improved after the implementation of the Project. This ratio goes up to **63.5% when the same question is asked to inmates**, which is even a more important indicator in this regard.

These figures reveal prison reform activities in general and implementation of Project activities in particular have significantly contributed to betterment of prison staff attitude toward prisoners. These results also suggest that the Manuals helped prison staff fulfil their functions better and in line with the standards envisaged in the EPR, the ECtHR case law and other international documents. Though it is not possible to assert yet that all 90 prisons under the Project are operational in line with the European and international standards, it is possible to say that activities performed under the ER-1 has significantly contributed to the achievement of this overall objective of prison reform in Turkey.

The whole exercise under the ER-1 was concentrated on the drafting, publication and distribution of a set of resource books and guidelines in line with European standards, the most importantly in accordance with the European Prison Rules, for all actors of the prison system. The benefits of this exercise were most evident in two areas.

First, these manuals and guidelines laid down the basis and set the framework for the training sessions, seminars and workshops delivered under the other ERs of the Project. The trainers' manuals standardised training modules which enabled consistent and uniform delivery of training sessions in different corners of the country. The training guidelines included legal and practical information on the content of training programmes and the penitentiary sector in general that could be utilised as the main reference books for prison staff in future training sessions.

Second, this exercise developed DGPDH's capacity to draft training materials tailored for addressing specific training needs. This result is very important for the local ownership of the Project's results and to ensure its sustainability. The results achieved under this ER had horizontal effects on all ERs of the Project. Therefore development of an ultimate good capacity under this ER is also promising for the ultimate sustainability of other results of the Project.

Finally, the publications prepared under this ER reached a total of 24,000 prison staff, more than half of the total number of employees in the Turkish penitentiary system. In this way the information and knowledge produced under the Project was disseminated to the roots of the penitentiary system.

In order to take up these results further would be necessary to develop additional training materials in-service training. The following subject matters should be priority: communication skills, background of prisoners and criminality, role plays, computerisation, criminology, psychiatry and how to organise activities. The Turkish Prison Staff Training Centres could develop a curriculum for the several groups like prison officers and other more specialised staff.

These new training materials could equip the prison staff to work closer with prisoners and to offer them a day programme as it is meant in the European Prison Rules. More contemporary training tools like films and computer based materials are advisable as well.

Guidelines and informative documents for higher staff of the DGPDH might be developed on topics such as centralised and decentralised management, public relations, and prison staff training. Internal seminars or brainstorming sessions about these and other subjects can be helpful in developing a new policy to fight future problems. Experiences gained in other European countries might be inspiring for Turkish prison system.

4.1.2 Activities under the ER-1

4.1.2. a. Development of training tools and materials on the European Prison Rules

Aim: The aim of these series of activities was to develop manuals, on which the ToT, intermediate cascade ToT and cascade training sessions on the EPR would be based. The manuals were also expected to help increase of knowledge and awareness among prison staff on the EPR and ensure sustainability and local ownership of the Project. The Manuals were also planned to contribute to dissemination of results of the Project and therefore re-in force the multiplier effect.

Activity Description: This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Expert meetings on the development of training materials, tools and manuals on the EPR,
- ❖ Development of draft texts of the manuals,
- ❖ Testing and further upgrading of the draft manuals during the ToT, intermediate cascade ToT and cascade training sessions on the EPR,
- ❖ Publication and distribution of the manuals during and after the training sessions to the target group.

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ Expert Meetings on the EPR Manual for the ToT Sessions (May – July 2009)
- ❖ Testing, further upgrading and finalisation of the EPR Manual for the ToT Sessions (September 2009 – February 2010)
- ❖ Expert Meetings on the EPR Manual for the Cascade Training Sessions (December 2010 – January 2011)
- ❖ Publication of both Manuals (March 2011)
- ❖ Distribution of the Manuals (March 2011 – June 2012)

Participants:

Judges and Experts from the DGPDH, CoE LTCs and STCs, CoE Project Team

Outputs:

- ❖ 1,000 copies of the Trainers' Manual on the EPR (for the cascade training sessions) were published and distributed

- ❖ 500 copies of the Trainers' Manual on the EPR (for Training of Trainers Sessions) were published and distributed.

Results:

- ❖ Standard modules on the EPR training have been developed and inserted into the in-service training system of the DGPDH through the cascade training sessions on the EPR.
- ❖ Theoretical and practical framework for the most encompassing activity of the Project, that would include at least training of 15,000 prison staff was drawn up
- ❖ Both DGPDH trainers and existing and future trainees were equipped with a resource book that would facilitate their delivery of training and/or participation in training sessions of similar kind
- ❖ Potentials for sustainability, local ownership and multiplier effects of the Project's results strengthened.

4.1.2. b. Updating of the Prison Management Manual (P.M.M.)

Aim: The aim of this activity was to update the PMM originally developed under the JMPR Project. The updating exercise aimed to reflect the drastic changes that the Turkish penitentiary system underwent in the time between the end of JMPR Project and start of this Project into the Manual. The manual was also planned to be the main pillar on which the ToT and cascade training sessions on good prison management, leadership and operational standards would be built. The PM was designed to serve as practical guidelines to prison governors in their daily work and help them to deal with challenges and resistance to the reform that might come from the prison staff with more ease. The Manual also aimed to raise awareness among the prison governors on their role as main promoters and implementers of prison reform. As it is the case with all published Project documents, the PMM also aimed to strengthen prospects for sustainability and local ownership of the Project; as well as to help dissemination of results of the Project and therefore re-in force its multiplier effects.

Activity Description: This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Expert meetings on updating of the P.M.M.,
- ❖ Development of draft updated text of the Manual,
- ❖ Testing and further upgrading of the draft manual during the ToT, intermediate cascade ToT and cascade training sessions on the EPR and during the ToT and cascade training sessions on Good Prison Management, Leadership and Operational Standards
- ❖ Publication and distribution of the manuals after the training sessions on Good Prison Management, leadership and Operational Standards

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ Expert meetings on the updating of the P.M.M. (8 July 2009; 13-17 July 2009)
- ❖ Testing, further upgrading and finalisation of the P.M.M. during the ToT and cascade ToT sessions on the EPR and during the ToT and Cascade Training Sessions on Good Prison Management, Leadership and Operational Standards (September 2009 – May 2010)
- ❖ Publication of the P.M.M. (March 2011)
- ❖ Distribution of the P.M.M. (March 2011 – June 2012)

Participants: Judges, Prison Governors and Experts from the DGPDH, CoE LTC, CoE Project Team

Outputs:

2,000 copies of the PMM was published and distributed

Results:

- ❖ Prison governors were provided with guidelines on how to manage a penitentiary institution effectively.
- ❖ Theoretical and practical framework for the second most encompassing activity of the Project that would include at least training of 800 prison governors was drawn up.
- ❖ Both DGPDH trainers and future trainees were equipped with a resource book that would facilitate their delivery and or participation in training sessions of similar kind.
- ❖ Potentials for sustainability, local ownership and multiplier effects of the Project's results strengthened.
- ❖ New management models were introduced to prison governors in order to equip them with various management tools and methods to be used in different situations.
- ❖ Prison governors' knowledge on national penitentiary legislation was refreshed and their level of knowledge on the European and international standards in the penitentiary field was increased.

4.1.2. c. Development of a Trainers' Manual on Good Prison Management, Leadership and Operational Standards (the Manual)

Aim: The aim of this activity was to develop a guidance manual for the trainer-to-be prison governors who would train their peers on good prison management, leadership and operational standards. The Manual's primary focus was to develop an easy-to-understand methodology that would help prison governors understand various types of custodial management such as autocratic, democratic, liberal and bureaucratic management; qualities of a good "change manager", significance of operational areas other than the security –oriented ones such as psycho-social services, educational services and health care services and finally to re-inforce the concept of dynamic security in the understanding of prison governors.

The Manual was also design to supplement the PMM in a way that the two could be used during the ToT and cascade training sessions on good prison management, leadership and operational standards. While the PMM was much more focused on the practice, the Manual was much more focused on theory.

As it is the case with all published materials, the Manual also aimed to contribute to strengthening the prospects for sustainability, local ownership and multiplier effects.

Activity Description:

This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Expert meetings on the development of the trainers' manual on good prison management, leadership and operational standards ;
- ❖ Development of draft texts of the manuals ;

- ❖ Testing and further upgrading of the draft manual during the ToT, intermediate cascade ToT and cascade training sessions on the EPR and during the ToT and cascade training sessions on Good Prison Management, Leadership and Operational Standards ;
- ❖ Publication and distribution of the manuals after the training sessions to the target group.

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ Series of Expert Meetings on Good Prison Management, Leadership and Operational Standards (25-27 August; 11-12 November 2009, Ankara) ;
- ❖ Finalisation of the first complete draft of the Manual (November 2009) ;
- ❖ Distribution of initial draft to participants in spiral bounded copies, testing, further upgrading and finalisation of the Manual: (December 2009 – May 2010) ;
- ❖ Publication of the Manual (March 2011) ;
- ❖ Distribution of the published Manuals (March 2011 – June 2012).

Participants: Managers, Judges Experts from the DGPDH; Prison Governors, CoE LTC and STCs, CoE Project Team.

Outputs:

- ❖ 500 copies of the Trainers' Manual on Good Prison Management, leadership and Operational Standards was published and distributed.

Results:

- ❖ A standard module on prison management training was developed and inserted into the in-service training system of the DGPDH through the cascade training sessions on good prison management, leadership and operational standards ;
- ❖ The practical information provided in the PMM was supplemented by theoretical input in the Manual on Good Prison management, leadership and Operational Standards ;
- ❖ Theoretical and practical framework for the second most encompassing activity of the Project, that would include at least training of 800 prison governors was drawn up ;
- ❖ Trainer-prison governors were equipped with a resource book that would facilitate their delivery of prison management training to their colleagues ;
- ❖ Potentials for sustainability, local ownership and multiplier effects of the Project's results strengthened.

4.1.2. d. Development of a Train the Trainers' Manual for Teachers in Prison Education

Aim:

To develop a Manual to introduce the fundamental learning principles and instructional methodologies which will underpin the consistent delivery, throughout the Turkish prisons, of custodial trainer training.

Activity Description: This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Expert meetings of the CoE STC, LTC and the DGPDH Experts
- ❖ Finalisation of the Initial Draft of the Manual by the CoE STC

- ❖ Review of the Draft Manual by the DGPDH Experts and local trainers during the ToT sessions
- ❖ Finalisation of the Manual by the CoE STC
- ❖ Publication of the Manual
- ❖ Distribution of the Manual during the Cascade Training Sessions.

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ The first expert meeting on assessment of the needs and setting up of the content of the manual (April 2010)
- ❖ Submission of the First Draft of the Manual by the CoE STC (November 2010)
- ❖ Completion of review of the Manual by the DGPDH Experts and the target Group (March 2011)
- ❖ Submission of the Final draft by the CoE STC (April 2011)
- ❖ Publication of the Manual May 2011
- ❖ Distribution of the Manual to the Target group (June-August 2011)

Participants: Experts from the DGPDH; Prison Teachers, CoE LTC and STCs, CoE Project Team.

Outputs:

- ❖ 1000 copies of the Train the Trainers" Manual for Teachers in Prison Education was published and distributed

Results:

The Manual included the main guidelines for trainers in prison education and constituted the main resource book on which the ToT sessions and cascade seminars were based. The Manual contributed to the improvement of the quality of prison education by introducing improved standards for performing needs assessment, developing needs assessment tools, developing the goals and objectives of a training programme, implementing a training programme, creating an individual learning plan, preparing written and visual materials, using learning tools and materials and using motivational presentation techniques. The Manual also provided a range of practical training lessons, templates and resources.

The Manual also equipped prison teachers with a practical tool that can be used by any individual delivering training in a custodial environment. The Manual also contributed to the strengthening of prospects for sustainability of the results of the prison education component of the Project.

4.1.2. e. Updating of the Manual on Health Care Services in Prisons

Aim: To update the Healthcare Manual developed under the JMPR. The need to update the manual emanated from three major changes which had occurred: the transfer of responsibilities over prison healthcare staff from the MoJ to the MoH, scientific developments observed in the field, and the transformation of the primary healthcare model from a health-centres based into a family-doctor based system.

Activity Description: This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Expert meetings of the CoE STC, LTC, the DGPDH Experts and the MoH experts
- ❖ Finalisation of the initial draft of the Manual by the CoE STC
- ❖ Review of the Draft Manual by the DGPDH and MoH Experts
- ❖ Finalisation of the Manual by the CoE STC
- ❖ Publication of the Manual
- ❖ Distribution of the Manual during the Seminars for Health care Staff

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ Completion of expert meetings and identification of the parts of the Manual to be deleted, modified, upgraded or added. (September 2010)
- ❖ Submission of the first draft Manual by the CoE STC (November 2010)
- ❖ Completion of review of the Manual by the DGPDH and MoH Experts (December 2010)
- ❖ Submission of the final draft by the CoE STC (January 2011)
- ❖ Conclusion of the Tripartite Protocol (August 2011)
- ❖ Slight modifications on the manual in accordance with the new Tripartite Protocol (November 2011)
- ❖ Publication of the Manual February 2012
- ❖ Distribution of the Manual to the Target group(April-June 2012)

Participants: Administrators, Judges and Experts from the DGPDH, Administrators, Doctors and Experts from the MoH; Prison Doctors, CoE LTC and STCs, CoE Project Team.

Outputs:

- ❖ 1000 copies of the Manual on Health Care Services was published and distributed

Results:

The Manual constituted an important tool for facilitating the daily work of prison healthcare staff, The Manual addressed the changes with regard to the legislative and operational environment in which healthcare services are provided. These changes emanated from legislative amendments on the provision of healthcare services in prisons and the reform of the primary healthcare system in the whole country.

The collaboration of the CoE, the MoH and the DGPDH in updating the Manual prompted the MoH to improve the quality of healthcare services in prisons in general and of the healthcare-related activities of the Project in particular, as clearly shown by the personal contributions of the MoH officials at Director-General level to the studies on updating the Manual.

The training sessions aimed at prison healthcare staff will also be based on the Manual. Therefore, the Manual is the primary resource book that should increase the impact of the healthcare-related training activities of the Project and contribute to the dissemination of the Project results. The Manual is also expected to help the MoH establish an effective system that will ensure delivery of healthcare services in prisons in accordance with European and international standards.

4.1.2. f. Publication and distribution of CoE recommendations in the penitentiary field

Aim: To provide participants of the cascade training sessions on the EPR with a compilation of CoE Recommendations in the penitentiary field.

Activity Description, Milestones and Dates:

This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Compilation of the following recommendations Rec (2006) 2 on the European prison rules; Rec (2006) 13 on remand; Rec (2003) 23 on life-sentenced and other long-term prisoners; Rec (2003) 22 on parole; Rec (2000) 22 on improving the European Rules on community sanctions and measures; Rec (97) 12 on sanctions and measures and Rec (92) 16 on the European Rules on community sanctions and measures.
- ❖ Translation into Turkish of the recommendations which were not already available in Turkish (September 2010 – February 2011)
- ❖ Publication of the CoE Recommendations (March 2011)
- ❖ Distribution of the CoE Recommendations (April - September 2011)

Participants: CoE LTCs and CoE Project Team

Outputs:

20000 copies of the Booklet on the CoE Recommendations in the Penitentiary Field were published and distributed.

Results:

Turkish penitentiary system was provided with a user-friendly, easy-to-use pocket booklet that enables easy reference to the EPR and other CoE recommendations in the penitentiary field. Given the limited access to Internet and other online facilities inside prisons, the availability of such a collection of reference texts is important for prison staff. The booklet also facilitated delivery of all kinds of training sessions provided under the Project given the fact that all training sessions inevitably referred to the EPR and other CoE Recommendations in the penitentiary field and participants had a chance to look at these legal texts immediately when they were referred to by the trainer or lecturer.

4.2. Expected Result 2: Rehabilitation and training of prisoners which comply with international human rights and prison standards ensured, detention conditions improved

In order to increase the number of prisoners completing an Offending Behaviour Programme (OBP), spending an average of at least 30 hours per week outside their dormitory engaged in constructive activities and finding employment after their release, and to reduce complaints from inmates with psychological problems, the Project envisages the establishment of educational facilities and vocational training workshops, the training of prison staff on the six OBPs, the provision of training materials and tools for 90 prisons, the determination of national and international publications and books for the research and development centre of the DGPDH, study visits for the institutional, professional trainers to other European countries, the development of new OBPs, and the delivery of cascade training sessions for psycho-social services staff.

4.2.1. Results under the ER 2:

Two components under this ER were of utmost significance to increase the time that the inmates spend outside their dormitories and to reduce psychological problems observed among prisoners. The first was **establishment of 270 new vocational training ateliers in 90 prisons**. The second was **development and implementation of Offending Behaviour Programmes (OBPs)**.

The field survey results reveal that despite the unintended delays in the implementation of this component and the consequent impossibility, for the time being, of measuring the ultimate impact of the activities performed under this ER, favourable conditions for prisoners to spend more time out of their cell have been created by the Project. These early results also reveal that OBPs have contributed to a decrease in psychological problems and complaints of prisoners. Inmates' approach towards participation in constructive activities has also become more positive thanks to Project activities.

First of all, with regard to vocational training ateliers and workshops and other educational facilities established or strengthened by the Project, **72.3% of prison staff** think that sufficient efforts have been made, under the Project, to increase the time that prisoners/convicts spend outside the cell; **50.5% of inmates** are also of the opinion that opportunities to spend more time out of the cell have been increased during the Project implementation; **42.8% of prison staff and 48.2% of the inmates also believe that prisoners will more easily find a job** after release as a result of the vocational training ateliers established under the Project; **46.9 % of the inmates** articulated that they have started to spend more time out of the cell after the Project implementation; **50.5 of the inmates** are of the opinion that the number and duration of the social activities have been increased within Project implementation

We can also see in the results of survey that increase in the implementation of the OBPs contribute to a more positive approach of inmates towards constructive activities provided inside the prisons. Some **58.69% of prison staff observed a positive change in the inmates' approach toward social and constructive activities** after the implementation of the OBPs during the Project duration.

With regard to results of the OBPs implemented, **43.6% prison staff recorded a decrease in the number of prisoners with psychological problems** during implementation of the OBPs under the Project, whereas 37.2% of them did not do so, 19.2% of prison staff think

there was no difference with regard to psychological problems. On the other hand, **50.6% of prison staff believes that the OBPs are beneficial for the inmates**, 25% do not think so while 24.4% remain undecided.

Inmates' initial reactions toward implementation of the OBPs are promising. Despite relatively late completion of the OBP component under the Project, field research results show that **39.2% of the inmates have participated in at least one OBP so far. Given the fact that the OBP implementation takes a couple of weeks, 39.2% participation rate in the OBPs within the time between April – August 2012 is very high which shows, first of all, dedication of psycho-social services in prisons. Figures with regard to inmates' self-reflection on their own behaviour and attitudes after they have attended at least one OBP within this short period are also interesting;** 39.6% think their overall attitude changed positively and 6.1% stated a change towards negative; 30.5% believe that OBPs affected their relations with prison staff positively whereas 5.7 % stated a change towards negative; 37.6 % of prisoners are of the opinion that the OBPs helped them raise self-awareness. These early positive results reveal how it was important to strengthen OBP implementation, and how it has positively affected the overall atmosphere in prisons even within a short time.

The activities under this ER were among the most challenging for several reasons. The expectation that this Project would simply need to provide an upgrade / update of the already existing materials, proved to be mistaken. Instead, it meant full development, from the beginning, of some of the OBPs within a limited time-frame. This was done despite the fact that, especially for some OBPs, the development of an OBP is a lengthy process which necessitates substantial research spread over many years as the scientific literature suggests. Furthermore, the newly developed OBPs should be tested and further developed against the empirical data to be collected in the course of implementation and against the local socio-cultural context. To that extent the work on OBPs development could never be considered as finalised as it is a living instrument and should be revisited based on its own results and an assessment should be made on a regular basis to show whether an OBP works or not.

In addition, the number of psycho-social services staff working for the DGPDH, although significantly increased when compared with the beginning of the Project, was still inadequate compared with the needs of the Turkish prison system and European standards in this area.

In the phase of development of the OBPs, it appeared that the most challenging aspect of the work for psycho-social services staff was to agree with international experts on up to what extent the original programme should be adapted into the Turkish context. There were two main diverging opinions on that, one group of experts suggested that the original programmes should never ever be modified as it had a long-tested and verified internal logic. This group of experts were of the opinion that once the content of the programmes were modified, the internal logic gets disrupted and the programmes cannot deliver good results. Another group of experts were of the opinion that certain aspects of imported programmes were not applicable in Turkey because the original programmes are tailored for addressing the needs of a penitentiary system operating under another jurisdiction. Finding a definitive reply to this question was not easy as it was also a matter of discussion in the OBP theory. However, the DGPDH experts were generally advised by the STCs and the LTCs to make adaptations under the supervision of scholars specialised on this area. However it appears that this advice can only be kept once the DGPDH establishes well organised and structured cooperation schemes with universities, academia and the NGOs. Therefore, to ensure better sustainability of the results under this component, the DGPDH should establish a qualified academic supervision over the OBP implementation and evaluation processes.

Another important measure that should be taken to ensure continuous development within the system would be to increase, as much as possible, the number of psycho-social services staff. For effective delivery of some programmes, the psycho-social services staff should work in pairs. However the number of staff is almost equal to number of all prisons in the system, which means that there is only one psycho-social services staff member per prison. Therefore, the opportunities to implement most programmes are limited.

During the cascade training sessions it was observed that for many psychologists that was their first encounter with the OBPs. These psychologists also indicated that they had no background on the OBPs from the university education. Undoubtedly, OBP implementation is practically and academically a complicated process which requires extensive theoretical and practical preparation. Therefore for proper implementation, DGPDH should establish necessary structures that would allow intensive training of psycho-social services staff it employs prior to their effective start to duty.

For some psycho-social services staff, lack of support to their work from prison governors and prison guards is a major problem. Given the lack of sufficient staff, support from other categories of prison staff, especially from prison officers is of great importance. Ensuring involvement of more volunteers, NGOs and academicians in the OBP delivery efforts and creation of a suitable atmosphere for such involvement by prison governors is also required.

Not all OBPs should be implemented in each prison. This would cause too much pressure on the specialists. Prisons could specialise in OBPS and when there are sufficient specialists the number of therapies can be extended. Prisoners who are together in a therapy group should preferably be imprisoned in the same section.

4.2.2. Activities under the ER 2:

4.2.1. a. Needs analysis for the establishment of educational facilities and vocational training workshops in 90 prisons

Aim: The objective of the activity was to determine the 90 prisons that would directly benefit from the Project and to determine the types of vocational training ateliers and workshops to be established in these 90 prisons.

Activity Description:

This activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Drawing up of the list of 90 beneficiary prisons
- ❖ Determination of the 10 pilot prisons to be visited for needs assessment
- ❖ Site visits to prisons
- ❖ Drafting and submission of the needs assessment report.

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ The DGPDH and the CoE agreed on the list of 90 prisons (April 2009)
- ❖ The DGPDH and the CoE agreed on the list of 10 prisons to be visited (May 2009)

- ❖ On-site visits to 10 prisons completed (June 2009)
- ❖ Needs Assessment Report submitted (July 2009).

Participants: Judges and experts from the DGPDPH, CoE LTC, Coe Project Team.

Output:

The needs assessment report on the 270 workshops to be established in 90 prisons was submitted to the CFCU, the DGPDPH and the EUD on 29 July 2009

Results:

The activity had two main results. The first was finalisation of the list of 90 beneficiary prisons. The selection of the ninety prisons was based on their security level (medium and high security level prisons were chosen) and their capacity (small scale prisons were left out of the list and large prisons were put under the scope of the Project). Special attention was paid to the inclusion of juvenile prisons. There were just two women prisons in Turkey at the time of selection and these two had already been upgraded under another international Project, as the DGPDPH informed. Therefore, they were not included under the Project.

The DGPDPH experts and the LTC also decided to select ten prisons out of the ninety as the pilot ones to conduct the needs analysis studies in the field. The selection was based on geographical location (at least one prison was selected from each geographical region of Turkey), and on the situation of already available training facilities (the most crowded prisons with insufficient facilities for education and vocational training workshops were selected). Maltepe Juvenile and Youth prison in Istanbul was also included in the visit list in order to address the needs of this very vulnerable group.

For the detailed results of the site visits, please see the Needs Assessment Report.

4.2.1.b. Update of existing Offending Behaviour Programmes and development of new ones

Aim: To develop new OBPs or update the existing ones as necessary.

Activity Description:

The activity consisted of the following:

- ❖ Determination of the OBPs requiring no or minor updates
- ❖ Determination of the OBPs requiring major updates
- ❖ Determination of the OBPs to be further developed
- ❖ Drafting of the first complete drafts of the manuals on the OBPs by the DGPDPH experts and/or CoE STCs.
- ❖ Review of the OBPs developed by the CoE STCs by the DGPDPH experts before and during the ToT sessions on the OBPs
- ❖ Finalisation of the programmes by the CoE and DGPDPH experts.

Milestones and Dates:

- ❖ Determination of “Drugs and alcohol addiction”, “Anger management” and “CALM” (controlling anger and learning how to manage It) as the programmes requiring minimum revisions (September 2009)
- ❖ Development of the OBPs on sex offenders, general offending behaviour (Think First), pre-release and suicide prevention programmes (November 2009 – December 2011)
- ❖ Publication of the programme manuals on the OBPs (February 2012)
- ❖ Distribution of the OBP manuals (March – June 2012)

Participants: DGPDPH experts, CoE LTCs and STCs.

Results:

1. *General Offending Behaviour (Think First) Programme:* This programme was developed by the CoE STC and reviewed by the DGPDPH experts. During the ToT sessions on the OBPs, the CoE STC and the DGPDPH trainers had a chance to discuss the content of programme manuals, revisions proposed by the DGPDPH experts and the principles to be followed in adjusting the programme to the local context.

2. *CALM Programme:* The updated Manual was supplemented by new training materials prepared by the CoE STC. During the ToT sessions, the CoE STC and the DGPDPH trainers had a chance to discuss the content and implementation principles of the programme, with a special focus on the inmate profile to which the programme should be administered.

3. *Suicide Prevention Programme:* The Operator’s Manual of this Programme was completed through a series of workshops with CoE LTC and the DGPDPH experts in 2011.

4. *Sex Offenders Programme:* The draft programme manuals were prepared by the CoE STC. The initial review of the manuals by the DGPDPH experts suggested that the programme was highly sophisticated, complex and required long-term studies to reach a full understanding of the scope of the programme and to adjust it to the Turkish socio-cultural context. At the ToT sessions, a selected group of 10 DGPDPH experts received an intensive in-depth training on the Sex-Offending Programme (SOP) during which they were able to grasp the full complexity of this OBP and potential danger of its unprofessional and unselective application.

5. *Pre-Release Programme:* The programme manual was prepared by the CoE STCs and the DGPDPH Experts. During the ToT sessions, the CoE STCs provided a session-by-session overview of the programme, during which the STCs and the DGPDPH trainers had the chance to discuss, in detail, how to deliver and implement the programme.

6. *OBP Resources Manual:* The CoE STC prepared an OBP Resources Manual and it was distributed to the participants during the ToT sessions. The Manual comprised contributions from all CoE STCs took part in the training sessions and it was used as a Resource Book during the ToT sessions.

After the end of the ToT sessions, the DGPDPH experts studied further on the programme manuals on their own initiative, adjusted them into the Turkish context and handed the finalised Manuals over to the CoE Project Team.

Outputs:

1000 copies of each programme Manual were published and distributed.

4.2.1.c. ToT Sessions on the OBPs (Belek-Antalya, 24 October – 2 December 2011)

Aim: To train at least 20 psycho-social services staff of the DGPDPH as trainers on the OBPs who will be expected to train approximately 250 of their colleagues during the cascade training sessions.

Participants: 23 DGPDPH psycho-social services staff (except for the sex offenders training, which was attended by 10 participants), CoE LTC and STCs, CoE Project team members.

Flow of the Training:

The training took part in Belek-Antalya for a total of 22 working days between 24 October 2011 and 2 December 2011. On the first day of the ToT, all participants were combined in one classroom and on the other days; they were divided into two groups. There were 23 psychologists and social workers working mostly in prisons and some at the DGPDPH headquarters. Ten more psychologists and social workers were trained on the Sex Offender Programme that took place between 23 November and 2 December 2011.

The following CoE short term experts were engaged to deliver the lectures, take part in discussions and interactive activities:

- ❖ Professor James McGuire: Cognitive Skills (Think First) Programme (1)
- ❖ Professor Elizabeth Allison Gilchrist: CALM Programme (2)
- ❖ Dr Ewan Lundie: Sex Offenders Programme (3)
- ❖ Normal Powell and John Teasdale: Pre-Release Programme (4)
- ❖ Stefan Van de Lande: Suicide Prevention Programme (5)
- ❖ Catherine Creamer: Coached Preparation of Training Materials

Outputs and Results:

Taken as a whole, the activity produced significant results in relation to the objectives of the Project. The training provided the DGPDPH with a solid foundation upon which to further develop psycho-social services to meet the Project's objectives.¹ The "skills audit"² administered to the participants during weeks three and five displayed improvement in the skill level of participants. Initial results of the audit demonstrated that participants rated their overall skills as average. However, the skill level appeared to significantly change over programme practice sessions with many participants demonstrating high-level skills during week five.

A training evaluation form was completed during the final week of the training and answers are as reported below:

¹ Please see Annexes III and IV of the 10th Activity Assessment Report for programme by programme results of the ToT sessions.

² Please see Annex III page 36 of the 10th Activity Assessment Report for a detailed account of the skills audit.

The presenters were skilled and knowledgeable in their area of expertise.

Average = 4.5

The presenters were effective and skilled trainers.

Average = 4.5

The content of the course was of a high standard.

Average = 4.0

Handouts, including manuals, were useful and relevant.

Average = 4.5

The venue was comfortable and conducive to learning activities.

Average = 4.5

The knowledge/skill gained through this training could be applied immediately to my duties.

Average = 3.5

I will have the opportunity to share this new knowledge/skill with other employees in my work area.

Average = 4.5

Code for response:

1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Unsure; 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree

In general, participants rated the training highly, reporting that goals and expectations had been met. The average, for being able to apply the skills immediately, was 3.5 reflecting participants' concern that their level of skill and knowledge will decline prior to the roll out of cascade training later in 2012.

Recommendations by the STCs: The recommendations made by the STCs involved in the training programme can be summarised as follows:

- ❖ Possibilities for mentoring a Project on data analysis, the validation of specific tools for the Turkish prison population, programme implementation and evaluation should be sought. This will serve to ensure that resources are adequately targeted to the right areas, and future policy for programme implementation is appropriately formulated and evidenced based. Consideration should be given to the potential joint Projects with local academic experts.
- ❖ It should be ensured that offenders who have significant histories of intimate partner violence or whose index offence is intimate partner violence are matched appropriately to a particular programme. If the data suggests, advice regarding the development of a programme for domestic violence should be sought. Additionally, advice as to placing domestic violence offenders on programmes with those who have committed honour crimes should also be sought.
- ❖ Possibilities of awareness training for The Turkish Parole Board should be sought.
- ❖ Expert consultation, on an on-going basis, for mentoring and advice on the implementation of sex offender programmes should be ensured. Advice and help in developing staff awareness programmes should also be sought.
- ❖ It is recommended that a two-day six monthly or annual ToT forum is held. This will ensure the on-going motivation and development of trainer skill and provide

trainers with an opportunity to discuss progress with each other. If funds are available, consideration could be given to inviting short-term experts to review specific programme implementation and provide booster training.

- ❖ Where possible, trainers trained with the ToT should be involved in the development and launching of new programmes.
- ❖ Consideration must be given to the possibility of establishing sustainable partnerships with local and/or European universities in the field of OBP development, implementation and evaluation.

4.2.1. d. Cascade Training Sessions on the OBPs (Kundu-Antalya, 12-30 March 2012)

Aim: To train approximately 300 psycho-social services staff of the DGPDH on the newly developed/upgraded OBPs and to improve their knowledge and skills on the implementation of the new programmes and evaluation of their results.

Participants: Approximately 300 DGPDH psycho-social services staff, CoE LTC and STCs, CoE Project team members.

Flow of the Training:

The training took part in Kundu-Antalya for a total of 15 working days between 12 March 2012 and 30 March 2012. Approximately 100 participants attended the training programme every week and they were divided into four parallel classrooms. In each classroom, at least two local trainers trained under the Project in November 2011 were present as lecturers in charge of delivery of the training sessions. Local trainers were assisted by CoE LTC and STC, who were in charge of supervising the training sessions, supporting local trainers when needed and giving them feedback during the training evaluation meetings held every day after the end of the day's programme.

Outputs and Results:

Taken as a whole, the activity produced significant results in relation to the objectives of the Project. The training enabled the DGPDH's core psycho-social services team to share their knowledge on the OBPs with their colleagues working in different penitentiary institutions throughout Turkey. The attendance of the newly recruited young psycho-social services staff to the training sessions should have a positive effect on the potential impact of the Project. The new recruits became familiar with the OBPs developed and/or upgraded under the Project at this very early stage of their career and this creates a significant potential for the future sustainability of this component of the Project.

A training evaluation form was completed during the training and answers are as reported below:

The presenters were skilled and knowledgeable in their area of expertise.

Average = 4.3

The presenters were effective and skilled trainers.

Average = 4.2

The content of the course was of a high standard.

Average = 4.4

Handouts, including manuals, were useful and relevant.

Average = 4.7

The venue was comfortable and conducive to learning activities.

Average = 4.8

The knowledge/skill gained through this training could be applied immediately to my duties.

Average = 4.0

I will have the opportunity to share this new knowledge/skill with other employees in my work area.

Average = 4.2

Code for response:

1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Unsure; 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree

4.2.1.e. Two study visits to other European countries for the psycho-social services staff of Turkish prisons (UK, 12-14 June 2012; Norway, 19-21 June 2012)

Aim: To observe best psycho-social service practices employed in the British and Norwegian penitentiary systems, to observe implementation of the OBPs, to enable exchange of information and experiences between the Turkish Delegation and their European counterparts.

Participants: 8 psycho-social services staff, two DGPDH staff in charge of supervision and organisation of psycho-social services in Turkish prisons, CoE Long Term Consultant, CoE Project Team.

Results:

During the two visits the participants made comparisons on the scope, content and quality of psycho-social services in Turkey, the UK and Norway. Especially the opportunity to discuss one-to-one the implementation and assessment processes of the OBPs were found to be very useful by the participants. It enabled them to discuss the theory they learned during the training sessions held under the Project with their counterparts who implement it in practice. Especially the intensive amount of information provided on the implementation of programmes for sex offenders was found to be useful as this programme was the most challenging to develop and adapt among the OBPs addressed by the Project.

The main conclusions drawn by the Turkish Delegation were as follows:

- ❖ In the case of Norway, the Delegation learned more about an active involvement of prison officers in the implementation of OBPs, which they found useful given the fact that despite growing number of psycho-social services staff in the Turkish penitentiary system, understaffing still poses an important problem and in that sense, ensuring active support of other operational staff in this process could help

remedy these shortcomings. The two years training of prison officers for that purpose was found to be impressive and led the Delegation think on how to adopt a similar system for Turkish prison officers.

- ❖ In the case of UK, the quantitative variety of OBPs provided by the British penitentiary system impressed the Delegation. The Delegation concluded that further studies of the Turkish penitentiary system in this field should be based on establishment of a system that would include proper assessment of needs, development of new programmes based on the needs identified, a proper monitoring of implementation of the programmes and accreditation and/or revision of the programmes depending on the feedback to be derived from the implementation and monitoring process.
- ❖ In the case of Norway, a very rare example of provision of psychiatric care was observed, which was a very equipped psychiatric clinic based within the premises of Oslo Prison. The uniqueness of the clinic not only derived from its well-equipped nature in terms of infrastructure and human resources, but also from its location within the overall administrative structure. The clinic, though located within the prison's premises, was administratively and scientifically under the University of Oslo. The Delegation noted that this provided a model example of the level of cooperation between the penitentiary system and academy; though the likeliness of establishment of a similar structure in the short run in Turkey was found to be unrealistic.
- ❖ The structure of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) of the UK was analysed with interest by the Delegation because of the role it played in facilitation of cooperation between prison and probation services within a structure that is semi-autonomous from the UK MoJ. The participants concluded that this structure could increase effectiveness of OBPs and after-release programmes and supervision as it ensures better communication between prison services and probation services.
- ❖ Participants were informed that sex offenders were being kept in some designated prisons, in which sex offender treatment programmes and group therapies could effectively be implemented in cooperation with Universities. One of the prisons visited was among those penitentiary facilities and the Delegation appreciated the possibility to see such a penitentiary facility. It was noted that effective cooperation schemes with the academy should properly be in place for the sex offender programmes to bear successful results.

4.3. Expected Result 3: The two new prison staff training centres are operational with the same level of professionalism as the other three training centres

In order to improve the quality of the pre-service and in-service training of prison staff, the Project envisages the preparation of training materials and tools for the new training centres, ToTs for the new prison staff training centres on training methodology and curricula developed under the JMPR Project, as well as a study visit of the staff of the two new prison training centres to the three existing training centres.

4.3.1. Results under the ER 3:

Results foreseen under the ER 3 could not fully be achieved because, Denizli Prison Staff Training Centre, which was planned to be opened during the lifetime of the Project, was not opened. Though the non-opening of the Denizli Staff Training Centre had a limiting effect on the impact of activities performed under this ER, Kahramanmaraş PSTC had the chance to fully engage in the activities performed.

The activities performed under this ER resulted in identification of the gaps between Kahramanmaraş PSTC and the others. Therefore as a first step, training needs of lecturers of the Kahramanmaraş PSTC were identified and later on, they observed good practices in similar training centres abroad. Finally, a special advanced ToT course was exclusively designed for the lecturers of Kahramanmaraş PSTC, during which they enhanced their knowledge and skills by learning about the tools, methodologies and techniques applicable to prison staff training.

According to the results of the qualitative field research, activities performed under this ER had a positive effect on the regular updates made on the training curriculum of the PSTCs, owing to the fact that the participants to the ToT sessions and study visits were also members of the committee which convene regularly to discuss and upgrade training curriculum of the PSTCs and the new methods and tools introduced during the ToT sessions affected the course of these meetings in a positive way. This strengthened local ownership of the Project's results and increased chances for sustainability.

According to the qualitative assessment conducted in Kahramanmaraş PSTC, after the start of the Project and thanks to the studies carried under its scope, the EPR was added as a course in the training curriculum of the PSTCs. That has been recorded as a very positive development for the sustainability of efforts to increase knowledge level of prison staff on the EPR. The ToT sessions provided on the EPR under the ER-1 and the advanced ToT sessions organized exclusively for the lecturers of the PSTCs under the ER-3 have improved PSTC lecturers' skills.

As an overall observation, it is possible to say that after the studies carried out under the JMPR and this Project, the training curriculum of Turkish PSTCs was brought almost fully in line with the practices observed in other European countries. However the main structural problem that still exists with regard to prison staff training is that the lecturers are being appointed to the PSTCs on a temporary basis. This causes a lot of rotation among the lecturing staff and creates a detrimental effect on accumulation of knowledge and experience in these institutions. This creates major difficulties in terms of both the quality and continuity of training provided and the operation of the centers.

Both the DGPDPH, and the lecturers of the PSTCs accept the crucial role that the PSTCs have played in betterment of staff attitude toward inmates. Therefore results obtained here under ER-3 also had positive effects on the results obtained under the ER-1.

4.3.2. Activities under the ER 3:

4.3.1.a. Local Study Visits among the Prison Staff Training Centres (5-7-9 September 2011; Ankara, Erzurum and Istanbul)

Aim: To train the trainers from Kahramanmaraş and from the other PSTCs, who would possibly be assigned to the fifth PSTC to be opened and to enable lecturers from the Kahramanmaraş PSTC observe good practices in place in the three other PSTCs.

Participants: 8 trainers from Kahramanmaraş PSTC and 8 trainers from the others PSTCs, who would possibly be assigned to the fifth PSTC to be opened.

Results:

As a result of the observations made during the visits and of the results of the workshops and discussions carried out, the following problems and needs were highlighted:

- ❖ The trainers working at the Kahramanmaraş and other PSTCS are on temporary assignment to their respective places of duty and this negatively effects the motivation of trainers and institutionalisation of the centres.
- ❖ Though physical conditions are more or less the same in all PSTCs, Kahramanmaraş PSTC is more disadvantageous in terms of IT equipment and library facilities.
- ❖ Though periodical meetings to harmonise the curricula of all training centres are regularly organised, the curricula of the Kahramanmaraş PSTC should be further aligned with that of the other three, especially with respect to training on the European and international standards in the penitentiary field.
- ❖ Due to the fact that Kahramanmaraş PSTC was not included in the JMPR, the trainers who work there did not have the same opportunity, as their colleagues working elsewhere, to observe best practices abroad. Therefore, the study visits abroad should prioritise participation of trainers from Kahramanmaraş PSTC.

4.3.1.b. Advanced ToT for the Lecturers of the PSTCs (Belek-Antalya, 27 February - 2 March 2012)

Aim: To develop and enhance skills of lecturers of the PSTCs and thus to assist them in their efforts to harmonise the training curriculum employed in all PSTCs; To introduce them the most contemporary training techniques in a way to ensure sustainable improvement of the training programmes employed in the PSTCs.

Participants: 16 lecturers from the PSTCs, CoE LTC and STCs, CoE and DGPDPH Project team members.

Results:

The main positive challenge that activity faced was the high level of experience and knowledge and thus high expectations from the target group. However, thanks to the needs assessment made earlier in September 2011, the training programme was designed in accordance with the needs assessment, this challenge was successfully overcome. The skills audit administered to the participants revealed that the ToT sessions helped the participants develop their skills and knowledge even further. Almost all participants indicated in their feedback forms that the ToT sessions equipped them with contemporary new tools and skills that they would easily use in their daily work. As also commonly articulated by the participants, the new skills and tools provided thanks to the ToT sessions will help the PSTC lecturers to overcome the challenges emanating from group dynamics in a more efficient way. Finally, the participants noted that the training sessions and the accompanying training materials and tools will contribute to the institutional development of the PSTCs and help the training centres function fully in compliance with European standards.

From the participants' feedback, it can be deduced that the advanced ToT sessions contributed significantly to the advancement of the PSTCs through equipping the key actors of the PSTCs, the lecturers, with new tools, skills and methods that would facilitate their efforts aimed at harmonising training curriculum among the PSTCs and elevate the institutions' training quality to the level envisaged by European standards.

4.3.1.c. Two Study Visits for the Lecturers of Turkish Prison Staff Training Centres (Italy, 5-7 June 2012; Bavaria-Germany, 26-28 June 2012)

Aim: To analyse, training curriculum of PSTCs in Italy and Germany and to observe best prison staff training practices; To enable exchange of information and experiences between the Turkish Delegation and their European counterparts.

Participants: 14 lecturers of Turkish PSTCs, two DGPDH staff in charge of supervision and organisation of staff training in Turkish prisons, CoE Long Term Consultant, CoE Project Team.

Results:

During the two visits the participants were able to make comparisons on the duration, scope, content and quality of pre-service and in-service training of prison staff in Turkey, Italy and Germany.

The main conclusions drawn by the Turkish Delegation were as follows:

- ❖ In the case of Germany, the Turkish Delegation was impressed by the duration of the pre-service training of 18 months, as this period was only 5 months in the Turkish prison system. The Delegation was also inspired by the obligatory rotation of the candidate prison staff (staff in their probationary period) between the training centre and 10 different prisons during their on-site pre-service training. It was concluded that lengthening the duration of pre-service training in Turkey should be considered to equip prison staff with more and well established knowledge on their field of work.
- ❖ As regards staff selection procedures, the Turkish Delegation underlined the similarity between the Turkish and German jurisdictions in the first phase of the process of staff recruitment: a central examination organized by the Government. However, the second phase of the selection procedure was found to be more interesting and inspiring by the Turkish Delegation because selection of new staff

in Bavaria was done by a Commission consisting specialists and administrators working under or with the training centre through the use of methods that helps analyzing the suitability of the person to work in the penitentiary system (psychology, intelligence, attitudes, tendency to team work, etc. The Delegation noted that this system could enable recruitment of more suitable people into the system and would enhance appointments and promotions based on merit and therefore could be considered for Turkey too.

- ❖ The Turkish Delegation appreciated the accommodation conditions of training centres in Germany and Italy since students were provided accommodation in single rooms.
- ❖ The training centre's role to provide specific training sessions to probationary staff with certain vocational and pedagogic background was appreciated as this would support vocational training activities in prisons through involvement of skilled prison officers in the process too. Participants highlighted that the trainers in charge of providing vocational training to prisoners were coming from outside of the penitentiary system, i.e. the Regional Public Training Centres, while the Bavarian Training Centre had its own vocational trainers for whom they provide pre-service and in-service training. The German practice was noted as an alternative model an approach toward training of vocational trainers.
- ❖ In the case of Italy, the Delegation noted with interest that prison officers were no longer being called as prison officers (guards) but being called as prison policemen. Participants articulated that such a change might be considered in Turkey too to overcome some negative notions attributed to the concept of "prison guard" ("*gardiyan*") in Turkey.
- ❖ In both countries, high level of cooperation with university professors in the design, delivery and evaluation of prison staff training was pointed out as a good practice.