Proposal for Expert Review and advice

RAN offers practice owners throughout Europe the opportunity to receive advice on how to improve the quality and impact of his/her project/tool/method from an expert of the RAN expert pool. This advice is only meant for the practice owner, on a voluntary basis, and will not be published online.

Name of practice:

Date of review:

Review author / expert:

1. What is the theoretical basis / implication of the practice? What theoretical aspects could be specified?
Answer: The practise is based on social work/ education within the social proximity of radicalized individuals and at-risk-youth/ those vulnerable to radicalisation with specific attention to work with ideologically/ politically radicalized individuals in the phenomena of right-wing extremism. Furthermore, the practise seems to pay special attention to counselling based on attachment – theories and their implications for the clients.

2. Is there a clear understanding what this practice should contribute to/which problem is being tackled?
Answer: The approach, its methods and contribution to disengagement efforts are clear and well defined.

3. To what extent are the practice owners able to explain the mechanism at work: how are the particular activities leading to achieving the desired objective? (i.e. theory of change)
Answer: The practise owners can explain their approach and the mechanisms at work quite clear, although there is no in-depth insight in specific contents of their case-management (e.g. role of parents and other in counselling/ case work).

4. Are there clearly defined quality standards to ensure the quality of the practice? What other resources or mechanisms should be elaborated on in order to improve the practice?
Answer: Since JUMP has participated in well-know and well-defined evaluation programmes a certain degree of quality-standards is certainly in place. Furthermore, JUMP is part of the so-called "Nordverbund", a regional network of experts for prevention and disengagement and a network on a federal level ("BLAG"), which further ensures the quality of their work. Although it has not been specifically mentioned anywhere, it can be assumed that part of the collaboration in these networks includes a standard of inter-vision by colleagues and experts from other organisations and initiatives.
The practise could be further improved, if it included a multi-agency-approach and were connected to existing risk-management systems/ structures.

6. To what extent has there been either an evaluation on process and/or effect to better understand the quality and impact of the practice? What recommendations can you give in order to increase success factors of the practice?
Answer: JUMP participated in well-know and well-defined evaluation programmes. Apart from the multi-agency-approach mentioned above, a standard procedure of risk assessment for the clients of JUMP could improve the practise. A cooperation with security services and the police could provide such a risk-assessment. There are possibilities to exchange information on cases/ individuals with governmental security agencies in accordance with legal regulations on privacy of the clients (information exchange on an anonymous base, without personal data that would allow an identification like names, date of birth or place of residence). Furthermore if there is a trustful relationship between civil society and e.g. the police, government security agencies/ the police can even be a source for acquisition of disengagement cases, since these agencies and authorities might also be aware of behaviour that might indicate a willingness to exit extremism.

7. To what extent does this practice introduce new working methods or tools, or a new perspective to preventing radicalisation?
Answer: The most striking innovation seems to be the special attention paid to behavioural changes that indicate feasible points of time or a cognitive or emotional opening for a targeted intervention. The combination of this approach with attachment-based theories of social work represents quite an innovative approach to disengagement.

Summary of the review (max. 200 words):

JUMP represents an approach of intervention with right-wing radicals and youth-at-risk. Its pedagogics focus on the individuals' biographic factors that contribute to their pathway of radicalisation. Ideological issues seem to play a less prominent role in the pedagogic work with the clients, although working on ideology doesn't appear to be entirely absent. This approach is definitely highly modern and a clear strength of JUMP. JUMP seems to acquire the majority of cases from local social spaces and other civil society institutions (e.g. youth-centres). Another advantage of JUMP is the way of initiation of disengagement of already radicalized individuals: They give the advice to others to inform them (JUMP) when a *behavioural change* can witnessed that indicates a *cognitive or emotional opening* for the exit of extremism. In summary, the contextual approaches to case acquisition and to the pedagogic work with their clients show a deep understanding of how radicalisation works and how to effectively tackle radicalisation by means of disengagement. Considering the network JUMP seems to be embedded in, however, there appears to be a somewhat one-sided alignment with other civil-society organisations. References to cooperation with local or state authorities are rather vague. This a missed opportunity, since authorities can also be a source of case acquisition. Regarding the implementation of a multi-agency-approach, there is still potential for improvement.

Overall, the pedagogic approach to case management represents a *best practise model* from my point of view. However, since there is still potential to create a real multi-agency setting and an institutionalized cooperation with the authorities, in total JUMP should be considered as an *inspiring practise*.
My advice to JUMP would be to further reach out to local and state authorities and eventually become part of a larger multi-agency- framework.