

Country: ROMANIA

Partner organisation: NATIONAL ANTI-DRUG AGENCY

Course site(s): BUCHAREST

Contact person: DANIELA GEORGESCU  
Project Manager  
CĂTĂLINA NICULAE  
Prevention expert

## I. Basics

### 1. Are there any differences between the intended target groups for FreD goes net and what was actually achieved?

Below is a summary of the intended target groups as originally defined. Please delete the entries in the column "planned" and replace them with the correct information for your country in the new column "implemented".

Criterion	PLANNED (according to 2008 RAR)	IMPLEMENTED (Pilot phase 2009)	brief comment if necessary
Age	14 to 21-year-olds	14 to 21-year-olds	Not necessary.
Access route	– Police – School	School	Although we had an agreement with Police, neither one youngster was referred to the project.
manner of (first) coming to notice	It is possible to also include youths that have come to notice several times on account of their drug use	First or multiple noticing (in the past) about illegal drugs or alcohol use	Not necessary.
Substances	– Illegal drugs except heroin – Alcohol	– Illegal drugs except heroin – Alcohol	Not necessary.
classification of drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	Not necessary.

### 2. Meeting the main aims

#### 2.1. Was it possible to implement FreD goes net in the pilot regions?

yes  no

#### 2.2. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to improving access to drug-consuming adolescents and young adults?

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*It has improved the schools capacity to recognize the drug use among own pupils and the capacity of collaboration for facilitating the access of pupils to the specific intervention of this project.*

2.3. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to developing or improving cooperative relationships between the chosen settings (police, schools etc) and drug counselling organisations/institutions (course sites)?

yes for Schools       no for Police

Reasons for this:

*Yes for schools- We established good long term relationships with the schools involved in the project.*

*No for police- Although the collaboration was desired on both parts, in reality no youngster was referred. We collaborated very well with the Prevention Police which promoted the project in high schools by talking with the managers and spreading the FreD posters and flyers.*

2.4. If cooperation as set out in 2.3 was successfully established/developed, will it be sustainable and continue beyond the pilot phase?

yes       no

Reasons for this:

*The collaboration will be continued by the specialists from the Drug Prevention, Evaluation and Counseling Centers (territorial branches of the NAA) after they will be trained to apply the FreD method.*

2.5. Were there any specific conditions/changes (political, economic) in your country during the first two years of FreD goes net that affected the implementation of the project?

yes       no

*In 2009 the Status of the NAA was changed to lower levels which lead to a long period of institutional incertitude and confusion in the staff. The new status within the General Inspectorate of Romanian Police implied longer and harder administrative procedures along with the formal undertaken of the project by the Project Implementation Unit within GIRP.*

*All these changes lead to the increasing of the number of hours dedicated to the project in order to respect the deadlines of the project and to overcome the administrative barriers.*

## II. RAR

---

In the first project year all partners used the method of RAR to carry out a stocktake of the current situation and current needs. This consisted of three elements:

- Background research,
- Interviews with key persons
- Identifying „good practice projects“.

Results were documented in country reports.

**1. Did you identify good practice projects in your country that met the agreed criteria?**

yes  no

**2. Looking at it retrospectively after concluding the pilot phase: Was the method of RAR useful in identifying suitable settings for your site(s)?**

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*It was useful because a lot of connections were made.*

**3. Judging by the results it achieved, and based on your professional perspective, was the time spent on the RAR exercise justified?**

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*The RAR was useful because it organized the stage for the implementation of the project (administrative and psychological preparation). A lot of connections were made and used later.*

*Also, RAR was useful in research about the target group of the project.*

**4. Would you recommend this method of stocktaking to other early intervention projects?**

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*It is a very appropriate introduction of the project; it permits raising questions and makes space for acknowledging the drug use problem in order for further drug prevention activities to be implanted in specific institutions.*

---

### III. Cooperation

---

1. Implementation of FreD goes net requires **viable cooperative relationships between the participating institutions. What methods of establishing/maintaining these have proven successful in your pilot region?** (e.g. informal verbal agreements, formal written agreements, regular meetings, agreements at certain levels of hierarchy) Please describe these.

*Although we had formal written agreements with our partners, we think that the most important aspect of the cooperation was the informal relationships between the prevention experts and the partners and also the perseverance of the prevention experts.*

2. **What difficulties were encountered in developing and maintaining cooperative relationships?**

Please describe these.

*A difficulty was the excessive bureaucracy, meaning that although we had an Agreement with the Bucharest Schools Inspectorate, the high schools wanted also Cooperation Agreements or awarding letters in order to cooperate within the project. In spite the Agreement with police, the referral system did not work in fact. Formally the cooperation was assumed at institutional/high level, but we suspect that the unprecedency of the approach and also the police focus on drug use countering lead to a low involvement in the project that affected the referrals.*

3. **Did you enter into any written cooperation agreements?**

yes     no

If yes: How many such agreements did you have and with which cooperation partners?

– Site 1: BUCHAREST

1. *Agreement between National Anti-Drug Agency, Bucharest General Police Department (the Police for Countering the Trafficking in Drugs, the Proximity Police, the Traffic Police, the Public Order Police and the Criminality Analysis and Prevention Police) and the Bucharest Schools Inspectorate*
2. *Agreement between National Anti-Drug Agency and a NGO called the International Anti-drug Brigade*
3. *Agreement between National Anti-Drug Agency and Anghel Saligny Construction High School*
4. *Agreement between National Anti-Drug Agency and Miron Nicolescu High School*

4. Was there a local steering group for implementing the FreD approach?

yes  no

If yes, please list the members and rate the work of the steering group in implementing FreD goes net for each of the pilot sites.

– Site 1:BUCHAREST

1. *After the RAR we organized the first Round Table with possible partners from Ministry of Interior (anti-drug police, proximity police, prevention police and arrest units police), Ministry of Education and other Romanian experts in the field of drug prevention and treatment.*
2. *After the workshop in Iceland, we organized the second Round Table with representatives from partners in order to discuss the content of the cooperation agreement.*
3. *In 3 of February 2009 we organized the most important meeting with representatives from partners. A number of 24 people attended the meeting which was lead by the project manager. The participation list is in the annex.*

5. Please list those institutions/organisations/services that really did refer young persons to the courses.

**Police / judicial system**

Which institutions and divisions exactly were these? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? Why was cooperation successful in these specific cases?

*No referral.*

**School**

What types of school? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? What characterises the schools that were willing to cooperate/where cooperation was successful?

1. *Anghel Saligny Construction High school- Contact person: Executive Manager Mrs. Mirela fistman and School Counselor Psychologist Mr. Mihai Scarlat*
2. *Miron Nicolescu High school- Contact person: School Counselor Sociologist Mrs. Mihaela fitirbu*
3. *Dimitrie Gusti High school- Contact person: School Counselor Psychologist Mrs. Ionela Viflan*  
*The most important aspect of the willingness in the cooperation was the openness of the leadership to cooperate with the NAA (because of former good cooperation projects), its capacity to recognize the drug consumption among own pupils and its strong determination for appropriate interventions.*  
*Also, the responsibility of school counselors to facilitate or to organize drug prevention activities for own pupils has played an important role. We motivated the School Counselors by giving them books edited by the NAA and recommendation letters needed for annual evaluations.*

6. Chapter 4.4 of the manual gives recommendations for successfully establishing structures of cooperation. Did you find these tips helpful?

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*It was helpful for orientating us in our cooperation approach.*

7. Do you have any further suggestions or comments on the topic of “cooperation”?

yes  no

## IV. Access

---

**1. The role of the respective legal provisions in facilitating access to FreD courses:**

The manual presents an overview of the legal provisions that currently apply in each country. After completing the pilot phase, would you say these facilitate or obstruct access to drug-using youngsters?

**Police context / judiciary system:**

Current provisions facilitate access       obstruct access

**School context:**

Current provisions facilitate access       obstruct access

reasons for this:

*Because there were no legal interferences.*

**2. Were there any differences between these legal provisions (and any other rules and agreements) 'on paper' and their implementation 'in real life'?**

yes       no

**3. Which flyer did you use for 'your' young persons? Please enclose 5 copies.**

yes       no  
Basically used the available flyer (the template)      or      developed our own flyer

**4. Did you change any of the main messages of the template?**

yes       no

If yes, which messages/statements did you change and why?

*We changed NOTICED with ARE YOU IN DEADLOCK?*

*We changed at the request of the project manager, who thought that the second is more appropriate.*



5. **Can the universal flyer for young persons (the emplate) be included as a recommendation in the handbook or does it need to be changed in any way?**

*We consider that the universal flyer was a very good model and must be included in the handbook.*

6. **What are typical situations for youngsters to come to the notice of a particular setting and be referred to FreD?**

**Typical situation of coming to the notice...**

of the police / judiciary system	Being cached by the police
of school	Being cached by the professors under the influence of illegal drugs or alcohol, being revealed by peers or parents
of another setting (please state which):	–

7. **What benefits** can young persons draw from taking part in a course that could motivate them enough to contact the course leader?

**gains or benefits obtained from participation**

Police / judiciary system	Formally none.
School	Motivation of absences, good grades in some subjects, maintaining a good grade in behavior evaluation, complying the request of professors
Other setting (please state which):	–

8. FreD goes net works to the principle that “coming to notice on account of legal or illegal drug use is followed by intervention.” For your chosen settings, please describe a **typical chain of events/the individual steps from first being noticed all the way to completing the intervention** (bullet points; if needed refer to the chart “Alex is caught...” from the ppt of the kick-off workshop – see attachments of the e-mail that was used to send out this questionnaire).

1. *Youngsters are noticed for his illegal drug/alcohol consumption by professors*
2. *Professors refer youngsters to the school counselor*
3. *School counselor inform youngsters about the possibility to take the FreD course*
4. *If minors, youngsters receive a letter for his parents to approve his participation*

5. *School counselor or youngsters call the prevention expert and schedule for an intake interview – usually we schedule more intake interviews in the same day*
6. *Prevention experts along with the school counselor schedule the dates for the FreD course- usually the FreD courses were taken in the perimeter of a school, not in a classroom (school information centers or counseling centers)*
7. *Participation to the FreD course*
8. *Handing the Certificates of participation*
9. *Youngsters receive benefits from school, if promised for participation*

**9. Were the parents involved in referring the youngsters to FreD?**

yes     no

If yes:

- How and in what form were they involved?

*The parents of minors were informed by a Letter about the project and the situation of their child being noticed by the professors/ school. The parents needed to agree with the participation of their child to the FreD courses. Only one parent called the contact prevention expert to ask more information.*

- Would you recommend parental involvement to new FreD sites?

yes     no

Reasons for this:

*No more than signing the Letter or phone conversation with the prevention expert if the referral is through the school.*

**10. Do you have any other comments on the topic of access? What measures do you find helpful in facilitating access to the intake interview and/or course?**

yes     no

---

## V. Implementing the intervention (Intake and courses)

---

1. After the intake interview, what were typical reasons for you to find that FreD was unsuitable for the adolescent/young adult in question?

*Inapplicable in our case.*

2. On average, how many weeks were there between the intake interview and the beginning of the course?

\_\_\_1\_\_\_ week

3. Up to this point, at which sites did you carry out how many courses with how many participants?

Name of site 1: BUCHAREST

\_\_\_10\_\_\_ courses with \_\_\_100\_\_\_ participants

105 youngsters had the intake interview

4. How many sessions did you divide the course into?

2 sessions       3 sessions       4 sessions

5. Did some of the sessions also take place at weekends?

yes       no

6. How satisfied are you generally with the exercises that currently make up the course?

Please rank on a scale from 1 to 4  
(1 = very satisfied, 4 = not at all satisfied)

1

7. Please name (up to 3) exercises that have proven particularly effective: The following should definitely remain in the manual (please give the exercise name and number):

6.2. - *Reasons – effects – consequences*

7.2.a. - *“My opinion”*

8.1.1. - *Drugs as stimulants and props/aids; drug abuse, habituation, addiction*

**8. Were there any exercises in the course that proved ineffective or too difficult to implement?**

yes     no

If yes: please list a maximum of three together with the respective name and number.

*10.1.- „Check yourself“  
15.1.- An encounter with your future self  
15.2.- A letter to yourself*

**9. Are there any other exercises you would like to be included in the manual?**

yes, We send them already.     no

**10. Was / is implementing the FreD courses something that enriches your work?**

Did you gain any particular insights? Did something unexpected happen?

*Yes.*

*There was such lack of information among pupils and such big drug consume rates among them and so much burning desire to find new information or just to speak with someone about it, that was motivating for us as professionals.  
In the same time, it was a very pleasant experience for us to work with youngsters, we felt useful and enriched with their energy and good humor.*

**11. What are your experiences with respect to group composition?**

(gender, age, different substances consumed, different patterns of consumption etc)

*The groups up to 10 youngsters and homogeneous regarding the substances consumed (illegal drugs or alcohol) and sex balanced worked more smoothly.*

**12. Do you have any further comments/ideas/recommendations on the topic of course implementation?**

yes     no

---

## VI. Summary

---

**1. Do you find the overall concept and approach of FreD goes net convincing?**

Please rate on a scale from 1 (yes, very) to 4 (no, not at all)

1

Reason:

*It seemed to be liked by youngsters and to be efficient.*

**2. If you had several pilot sites: Were your experiences at each site fundamentally different? (e.g. with respect to cooperation, access or course implementation)**

Skip this question if there was only one pilot site.

Not applicable.

**3. Please summarise the aspects you consider central for each of the thematic blocks.**

***aspects that obstruct...***

... cooperation	Bureaucracy, new approaching manner
... access	Fear of consequences
... course implementation	Having most of the courses inside the high schools area

***aspects that facilitate...***

... cooperation	Personal involvement, good institutional reputation
... access	Prevention experts being psychologists
... course implementation	Prevention experts being psychologists