THE IMPLEMENTATION AND APPLICATION OF SOCIAL REHABILITATION IN LITHUANIAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Summary

Contemporary evidence based penal systems and sanctions are inseparable from the goals of offenders’ social rehabilitation, resocialization and reintegration into society. In accordance with modern theoretical approaches (Risk-Need-Responsivity Model and Good Life Model) and best practice (for instance Scandinavian penal system), correctional interventions contribute to reduce recidivism rates and integrate inmates into the community. However effective correctional interventions require eligible attention in their constant monitoring of implementation and evaluation.109

Although the ideas of resocialization are maintained in international documents (developed by the European Commission and the United Nations), Lithuania still can be referred to those countries, which have to humanize conditions of confinement, and improve process of offenders’ social rehabilitation. In Lithuania imprisonment is frequently and intensely applied, according to the rates of incarceration, Lithuania is one of the leading countries in Europe and the length of imprisonment is counted by years, meanwhile, in the Western countries it consists of a few months110. Long prison sentences complicates inmates’ integration. Harsher punishments and penalties don’t deter offenders from committing crimes, furthermore long-term prison sentences complicate offender reentry and return to the community.

As has been argued elsewhere111 process of social rehabilitation in Lithuanian correctional facilities is inconsistent, lacks an integrity, an evident and coherent direction. Though reports focusing on the analysis of social rehabilitation prepared by prisons’ administrators introduce various correctional programs, there is no knowledge about quality of its implementation, procedures of evaluation and treatment effectiveness. Hence, the aim of this study is using theoretical literature, various reports and semi structured interviews to analyze correctional interventions programs in Lithuanian penitentiary institutions and to reveal different problematic issues of its implementation and quality.

The research reveals that specialists of social rehabilitation section in Lithuanian prisons have too many duties and responsibilities, which are unrelated with correctional programming; it complicates implementation and quality of correctional interventions. Rethinking and redistribution of social workers’ duties and functions is a necessary improvement. Moreover, research shows that specialists of social rehabilitation section are unmotivated and do not believe in interventions’ effectiveness, because they lack support from prison administration and authorities. Finally, the term for preparation of individual social rehabilitation plan is to short, it leads to growing frustration on both sides: specialists of social


rehabilitation section and prisoners. Therefore, we suggest creating system of prisons’ staff motivation and support, and getting opportunity to participate in correctional programs’ training and supervision regularly.

The prison department efforts to develop evidence based correctional programing are very promising; however, some major changes are required. There is a lack of clear monitoring and evaluation system. The effects and quality of approved correctional programs must be evaluated. The research reveals that human resources are used intensively however results of social rehabilitation are unclear and unmeasured. A significant number of unapproved programs is applied, though content and effects of these programs are unknown. Therefore, after evaluation these programs have to be approved or eliminated.

To sum up it is important to emphasize that the required tools for social rehabilitation in Lithuanian correctional facilities are available; however, the quality of its implementation, monitoring and evaluation should be improved.