

# RAN Collection practice template

<p><b>Name of the practice</b></p> <p>Please note that by practice we mean an activity/method/tool that has been used or is in use by professionals and/or community members.</p>	<p><b>Removing parent benefits if families refuse to address concerns of radicalization (Forældrepålægget)</b></p>
<p><b>Description</b> (max. 300 words)</p> <p>Short description of the aim and working method of the practice. Please note that in this description, it must be clear that <u>there is an explicit connection to preventing and/or countering radicalisation and/or violent extremism</u>. This means that in the aims and/or the activities/methods/tools of the practice, there is a link to preventing and countering radicalisation and/or violent extremism. Practices without this link cannot be included in the RAN Collection.</p>	<p>Working with families where social services have concerns of radicalization is a complex matter. Historically this has been the job of the intelligence services or Police. Denmark has taken a different approach where social services cooperate with Employment Services, Police, Crime Prevention Unit, Deradicalisation-Unit (VINK) and The Probation Unit form a coordinating Anti-radicalization Unit where all reports of radicalization is discussed and handled (If investigations by police and intelligence service is finished).</p> <p>Part of this new approach is that police needs only to address reports of a certain gravity when dealing with radicalization. Social Services must therefore be more insisting when trying to get in contact with families, where there are legitimate concerns as to whether parents or children have radicalized. Therefore tougher sanctions are needed. A new tool used by the Municipality of Copenhagen is to remove the monthly payments that all parents receive pr. Child in the family if the families refuse to address concerns of radicalization.</p> <p>This has caused discussions on what grounds Social Services could remove monthly payments. If a family refuses to send their children to school, if they don't attend meetings with Social Services, if they don't show and engage in family therapy or if they actively counteracts efforts to help children who are in danger of being radicalized, then their monthly payments are revoked.</p>
<p><b>Key themes</b></p>	<p>Family support</p>

<p>Please <u>choose</u> 2 key themes most corresponding with the practice.</p>	<p>Community engagement/civil society</p>
<p><b>Target audience</b></p> <p>Please <u>choose</u> a minimum of one target audience most corresponding with the practice.</p>	<p>Authorities</p> <p>Educators / Academics</p> <p>First responders or practitioners</p>
<p><b>Geographical scope</b></p> <p>Please indicate where the practice has been/is implemented (countries, regions, cities).</p>	<p>By this author only known to have been implemented in Denmark and specifically by municipality of Copenhagen.</p>
<p><b>Start of the practice</b></p> <p>Please indicate when (year) the practice was developed and implemented to indicate the maturity of the practice. In case the practice is no longer active, please indicate when it ended.</p>	<p>Starting year: 2013</p>
<p><b>Deliverables</b></p> <p>Please indicate if the practice has led to concrete deliverables, such as (links to) handbooks, training modules, videos.</p>	<p>This method was made possible by Danish law in 2007 but was never applied until 2012 by the Municipality of Copenhagen. No handbook or training has been used specifically regarding radicalisation but it has become relevant due to the nature of these closed-circuit families where radicalization can occur.</p>
<p><b>Evidence and evaluation</b></p> <p>Short description on <u>performance measures</u> of the practice, including</p>	<p>Evaluations show that from 2012-2016 the Municipality of Copenhagen went from 1 ( in 2012) until 106 (in 2016) cases where revoking Parent Benefits was used or where parents had been given warning. This however includes citizens where Social Services had other concerns than radicalization. Measuring empirical effects other than the rise in numbers is difficult because measuring effect on deradicalisation has not been made operational (And it's questionable whether professionals can ever agree on criteria)</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>qualitative views and quantitative (statistical) data</u> e.g. measure of the success of your project or intervention.</li> <li>2. <u>evaluation and feedback</u>, including surveys and/or anecdotal evidence e.g. have you done either an internal or external evaluation, have you encouraged any feedback from your target group?</li> <li>3. <u>peer review</u> which feedback did the practice receive in the RAN working group and/or study visit where the practice was discussed.</li> </ol> <p>Please elaborate on the outcomes of your monitoring and evaluation efforts.</p>	
<p><b>Sustainability and transferability</b> (maximum of 200 words)</p> <p>Short description on the sustainability and transferability of the practice, including e.g. information on the costs of the practice. <u>Please elaborate on which elements are transferrable and how.</u></p>	<p>Revoking parent benefits as a method has greatest effect if never effectuated. Revoking benefits is a three level process. The first level is where parents receive a warning. At the second level parents receive formal instructions on what needs to change if they are to preserve their parent benefits. At the third level parents are informed that their benefits have been revoked. At this stage parents also receive date for the next appointment with Social Services along with specific instructions on what needs to change in order to regain benefits. Usually only a warning is needed to ensure cooperation.</p> <p>The method is not transferable to countries where parent benefits are non-existing or low. But the method deals with Social Services using force to make families address their problems and negotiate minimum standards for citizenship. This can come in other forms, but it is imperative that the method is only used if a credible form of family support is offered by Social Services.</p>
<p><b>Presented and discussed in RAN meeting</b></p> <p>Please note that to be included in the Collection, the practice is preferably nominated through one of the RAN meetings. Add name of the RAN Working Group/event, date, place and subject of meeting.</p>	<p>Name: RAN H&amp;SC</p> <p>Date: 14-15 September 2016</p> <p>Place: Hamburg</p> <p>Subject: Children and youth in radicalised families</p>

<p><b>Linked to other EU initiatives or EU funding</b> (maximum of 100 words)</p> <p>Please indicate how your project was funded, if your practice is linked to other EU initiatives or projects, AND explicitly note if it is (co-) funded by the EU, and if so, by which funds? Such as Erasmus +, Internal Security Funds (ISF), European Social Fund (ESF), Horizon 2020, etc.</p>	-
<p><b>Organisation</b> (enter maximum of 100 words and select organisation type)</p> <p>Please briefly describe the organisation behind the practice including the legal status e.g. NGO, governmental, limited company, charity etc.</p>	<p>Borgercenter Boern og Unge Municipality of Copenhagen Municipal organisation serving under Danish law by the Danish Government</p> <p>Type of Organisation: <a href="#">Governmental institution</a></p>
<p><b>Country of origin</b></p> <p>Country in which the practice is based.</p>	<p>EU or EEA country: Denmark</p> <p>or:</p> <p>Non-EU country: Enter name if non EU country</p>
<p><b>Contact details</b></p> <p>Please provide contact details of who can be contacted within the organisation, with name and email address.</p>	<p>Address: Griffenfeldsgade 44, 2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark Contact person: Jeppe Rask Moustsen Email: zzv@sof.kk.dk Telephone: (0045)24995941 Website: www.kk.dk</p>
<p><b>Last update text</b> (year)</p>	2021