



**ifsw**

**international federation of social workers**

fédération internationale des assistants sociaux  
federación internacional de trabajadores sociales

## **Europe**

### **European Delegates Meeting**

**Dubrovnik, Croatia**

**24 - 26 April 2009**

**Minutes**

#### **Countries being represented:**

1. Austria
2. Armenia
3. Bulgaria
4. Croatia
5. Denmark
6. Finland
7. France
8. Germany
9. Ireland
10. Israel
11. Malta
12. Norway
13. Portugal
14. Russia
15. Spain
16. Sweden(with proxy for Iceland)
17. Switzerland
18. Turkey
19. United Kingdom

#### **Observers**

Kosovo  
Serbia

## **Agenda items**

1. Welcome and Formalities .....	3
2. Minutes of the Delegates Meeting 2008 .....	3
3. Minutes of the Informal European Meeting, August 2008 .....	4
4. Matters arising from the minutes .....	4
5. Presentation of the Executive Committee's written report for approval .....	4
6. Report from the Permanent Committee on EU Issues.....	5
7. Report from the Representative to the Council of Europe .....	6
8. Reports from representative of IFSW Europe to other organisations and IFSW global committees .....	6
9. Approval of the annual accounts and the report of the auditors .....	11
10. Report from the IFSW President and General Secretary (IFSW Global) .....	11
11. Social policy issues .....	14
12. Consideration and amendments to the articles and bylaws of IFSW Europe ..	22
13. Considerations and amendments to the Mission Statement and the European aims (IFSW Europe Policy Platform) .....	25
14. World Social Work Day 2010.....	25
15. European Conferences.....	26
16. Delegates Meeting 2010.....	27
17. Statements .....	28
18. Adoption of the Work Programme 2009-10 .....	29
19. Ratification of the general and financial policies of IFSW Europe.....	34
20. Elections.....	35
21. Appointment of external and internal representatives related to IFSW Europe	35
22. Any Other Business.....	36

<p><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Welcome and Formalities</b></p> <p><u>1.1 Welcome from the Croatian Association</u>  Tatjana Katic Stanic gave a welcome to the Delegates Meeting on behalf of the Croatian Association. She said that the Croatian Association of Social Workers are very proud to host the Delegates Meeting and the first ENSACT Conference. Lijama Stojamovic, the President of the Dubrovnik branch of the Croatian Association also extended her welcome to Dubrovnik.</p> <p><u>1.2 Approval of the agenda and timetable</u>  The European President, Nicolai Paulsen thanked the Croatian Association for their welcome and welcomed members to the meeting. He gave apologies from Dalija Snieskiene (Lithuania), Valio Hristov (Bulgaria) and Veronique Barre from the executive.</p> <p>The President outlined the meeting timetable, explaining that the agenda had been circulated prior to the meeting and no comments had been received.</p> <p>The Executive proposed that Brian Auslender from Israel be appointed as Parliamentarian for the meeting. Brian was elected unanimously.</p> <p>The President explained that two tellers were also needed – Titti Frankel from Sweden and Kaj Skov Frederiksen from Denmark volunteered.</p> <p>The President explained that there will be an election for the executive committee at the end of the meeting – 2 members and 2 deputies need to be elected. More nominations are welcome. Appointments will also be made for IFSW representatives – nominations are welcome. The nomination deadline is 17.00 Saturday 25 April.</p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of the Delegates Meeting 2008</b></p> <p><u>2.1 Delegates Meeting Porto 16-18<sup>th</sup> May 2008</u>  The minutes of the Delegates Meeting in Porto which were circulated following the meeting were discussed. There were no comments. The President asked if the minutes could be approved.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Israel</i>  <i>Seconded: Ireland</i>  <i>Agreed unanimously</i></p>

<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of the Informal European Meeting, August 2008</b></p> <p>3.1 <u>The informal meeting held in Salvador de Bahia, Brazil on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008</u></p> <p>As this was not a formal meeting the minutes do not need to be formally approved. The President gave delegates the opportunity to comment on the minutes. No comments were made.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Matters arising from the minutes</b></p> <p>There were no matters arising from the minutes.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Presentation of the Executive Committee’s written report for approval</b></p> <p>5.1 <u>General Report on the Work Programme 2008-2009</u></p> <p>The written report was circulated prior to the meeting and the President presented this. The President said that he felt that the executive had achieved a lot since the last Delegates Meeting. The work plan was very ambitious and some items have needed to be prioritised. The President feels the executive is a good working team who have been working effectively on the work plan.</p> <p>The President said that the executive have worked extensively on communication this year, including drafting a paper on working with representatives. A copy of this would be circulated during the meeting.</p> <p>The President also explained that further work has taken place towards becoming a registered legal body. If the amendments are accepted during this meeting registration can take place. Barbara Molderings has taken the lead on this within the executive.</p> <p>The President invited comments from member organisations. Austria questioned the fact that the work programme refers to a paper from Austria on neo-liberalism – Austria do not know what this refers to. The President referred to the minutes of Porto and promised to look into this. [Austria clarified later in the meeting that the paper mentioned in the work programme was the Vienna declaration.]</p> <p>5.2 <u>Reports on specific policy areas</u></p> <p>5.2.1 <u>Communication</u></p> <p>Cristina Martins and Siobhan Maclean make up the communications team within the executive. They gave a presentation on their work over the last year. They said that they</p>

	<p>need ongoing active feedback from member organisations in order to improve their work on communication.</p> <p>The UK said they feel that communication has improved considerably in the last year. They noted that the communication report refers to the fact that the honorary secretary receives several emails each week from social workers enquiring about moving across borders. They commented that their organisation also receives a great deal of these emails and these take a considerable amount of time to respond to. They asked whether there may be a role for IFSW to produce a directory of some kind for use in these situations. This could be a Global issue. The Executive agreed to look into the possibilities of this.</p> <p>The President said that communication is a constant challenge in social work, especially internationally, and that the executive rely on feedback from members.</p> <p>The UK commented that the Executive Committee report lists 12 areas that will be followed up in the Delegates Meeting and asked how the outcomes will be reported. The President explained that the issues will be followed up through discussion in the meeting and the outcomes of the discussions will be reported in the minutes, or the issues shall be reconsidered for the new work programme.</p> <p>The President asked if the Executive committee's report and the additional report on communication could be agreed by the Delegates Meeting.</p> <p><i>Proposed: UK</i>  <i>Seconded: Sweden</i>  <i>Agreed unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the Permanent Committee on EU Issues</b></p> <p>Executive committee member, Barbara Molderings explained that the report had been distributed. She explained that the main focus this year has been on applying for membership of the Social Platform. This has created a great deal of work, with requirements to produce a great deal of information. Barbara thanked Marjut Kosonen for her work on this. The Social Platform will make a decision at their General Assembly this same weekend about whether IFSW Europe will be admitted to the Social Platform. If we are accepted then we will receive financial support to attend meetings etc.</p> <p>Barbara explained that the EU committee communicate their work by providing an update on EU issues in each edition of the</p>

	<p>European Social Worker and by sending out additional information as required.</p> <p>The UK said that individual countries may already have links with the EU and asked how these can be linked into the work of the permanent committee. The President said that this gave a good example of one of the themes the executive had discussed in advance of the Delegates Meeting, how the executive can work together with member organisations. He feels that member organisations could inform the executive if they are working on EU issues and see if IFSW Europe is also working on this area, so that efforts can be combined.</p> <p>The President asked if the report from the Permanent Committee could be accepted by the meeting.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Finland</i>  <i>Seconded: France</i>  <i>Agreed unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the Representative to the Council of Europe</b></p> <p>Gabriele Stark-Angermeier explained that the report had been sent out just before the meeting.</p> <p>Gabriele explained that Antonina Dashkina (Russia) now has a new role within the Council of Europe, having been nominated by IFSW Europe. She is now the vice chair of the social cohesion and eradication of poverty committee.</p> <p>Gabriele feels that the website of the Council of Europe would be very useful for member organisations to look at.</p> <p>The President thanked Gabriele and the Council of Europe support team Bruno Keel and Antonina Dashkina for their work.</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Reports from representative of IFSW Europe to other organisations and IFSW global committees</b></p> <p><b>8.1 <u>To receive report on ENSACT</u></b></p> <p>The President explained that ENSACT is an umbrella organisation and that IFSW Europe has been working as part of this. The first ENSACT Conference will take place in Dubrovnik following the Delegates Meeting. ENSACT also aim to work together towards common themes on common issues within Europe. Based on some migration and human rights issues a request was received from Italy for ENSACT to produce a statement on a particular human rights issue – this has been challenging because there are</p>

six very separate organisations who first now are developing their collaboration.

The President feels that ENSACT will remain only a part of the collaborative work that IFSW Europe undertakes.

#### 8.2 To receive reports on the IFSW work on Human Rights and Ethics

Graca Andre's report had been circulated prior to the meeting. Graca explained that she had been appointed in Brazil. She has been very involved in developing the pre-conference on human rights and has also spent time linking with Ruth Stark as the IFSW Global Human Rights commissioner. Graca explained that the human rights network may be able to develop Globally and links have already been made with colleagues in Brazil.

Dalija Snieskiene sent her apologies to the meeting. She has sent an email to say that she has not been able to do very much work on her role this year. The President explained that Richard Hugman, the global representative on ethics has written a short request published in the latest edition of the European Social Worker seeking feedback on the ethical documents of IFSW. The President asked member organisations to respond to these questions. Tom Johannesen said that Richard Hugman is very concerned that he has had very little feedback on this issue and more is needed so that this work can be continued.

A discussion took place about the feedback requested. The Honorary Secretary, Siobhan Maclean, will email all members with a copy of the questions, which are:

1. To what extent does the current statement of principles adequately address the underlying values and ethics of the social work profession?
2. To what extent are the principles contained in the statement relevant in different contexts? In particular, are these principles culturally specific?
3. How may the statement of principles be further strengthened to assist the continued growth of good practice?

Germany said that they are currently reviewing their ethical statement and this is a very difficult task so it is understandable that there are difficulties with completing this task globally.

#### 8.3 To receive report from the global group on Definition of Social Work

The President gave a presentation on the work of the IFSW Global review of the global definition of social work. (A joint document

with IASSW – International Association of Schools of Social Work). It was agreed that this joint definition agreed in 2001 would be reviewed at the General Meetings of the two organisations in 2010. Therefore a process has started to review the definition in preparation for this. The outcome of the review could mean anything from writing a new definition to making no change at all depending on the feedback received. As part of the review a great deal of work is taking place on a national basis. The executive have decided that it would be good to have groupwork on the definition, the aim being to receive feedback from delegates and to motivate delegates to return to their organisations and countries to discuss the definition and feedback into the review.

The President explained that there has already been feedback from some countries. There is a challenge about how to ensure the definition is inclusive and can be used across the World.

There is an expert group looking at the review of the definition which is co-chaired by the President on behalf of IFSW.

The President will be co-facilitating a symposium at the conference on the review of the definition and feedback will be sought throughout the conference.

Group work then took place in cross country groups, looking at the following questions:

- Does the definition cover your actual understanding of social work?
- Is there anything missing in the definition?
- Would you like to add something to the definition?
- Would you like to change something in the definition?

Group 1: Sweden, Norway, France, Switzerland, UK, Denmark

Could we find a definition with everything included? Is this possible? The group felt the definition was good and nothing needs changing but maybe it needs something else adding to the paper – could some examples of good practice be included? Some words need changing for example dysfunction. How can all countries be represented? How can leaders be included? Can the economic crisis be used to help bring people together?

Group 2: Croatia, Portugal, Switzerland, Kosovo

The definition is used to develop professional identity, when talking to the press to show who social workers are. The definition is useful. There are some words which people don't agree on – what is meant by social change? What is meant by wellbeing? More collective perspectives are needed in this definition. When it was written there was a lot of criticism that it is too individualistic, some of the group agreed with this, some did not. They feel the

definition needs to be more assertive and clearer. The definition needs to be more political (not in belonging to a particular group but in the sense of it being used in policy development). The group feel that the review process will be useful in stimulating debate about what social work is and what it does.

Group 3: Austria, Turkey, Bulgaria, Sweden, Germany

The group had a great deal of debate and disagreement. They posed the question how should the definition be used – should it be seen as an instrument for public relations or is it about practice or planning? It cannot be all these things. There are 2 options – to leave it as it is, as any change could make it weaker. The other option is to start to develop a framework at a global level – so that each country can then develop its own specific definition. The positive and very valuable thing is that the definition is currently accepted by lots of international bodies, the risk of changing it is that it will then not be agreed by these bodies. Also some countries are trying to develop legislation based on the definition – if the current definition is enshrined in law it is very risky to change it. One opinion was that it is a waste of time to change the definition when we could use the time to work towards an aim of 75% members to have laws on social work. If we try to change the definition it would be like opening “Pandora’s box”.

Group 4: Norway, Denmark, UK, Germany and Sweden

At first the group discussed what they think about having a definition of social work. They felt it is very important in terms of having an identity and communicating what social work is all about. Denmark and Norway have different social work professions and it can be difficult sometimes to have agreements. The definition is currently used in these countries in official documents. It needs to be acknowledged that this is a global definition and differences in welfare systems etc need to be acknowledged. There is debate in some of the countries about how inclusive the definition is. The group feel that whilst currently it is an IFSW and IASSW definition – the review should bring in FESET (The European association of training centres for socio-educational care work). It is important to see childhood as important in itself within the definition. The WHO definition of health should be somehow included. It is important to bring into the definition or the commentary how important basic social and economic rights are for people. The political perspective and the family perspective should be brought in – these are integral to social work. It says profession in the beginning – it should say professions – as we are made up of different professions.

Group 5: Ireland, Finland, France, Denmark, Israel and Portugal

No one in the group felt that the definition should be thrown out. It could be slightly amended in some ways – the group talked about

both the definition and commentary. Within the definition there should be something about practice based research as this can generate tools when social workers are under pressure to prove best value etc. the group also talked about adding in something about confidentiality (this could go within the last sentence) – some of the countries have concerns about governments seeing themselves as having a right to demand information. France raised the issue that we should put a new emphasis on a practitioner’s right to say no and stand up for what they feel is the right course of action. In Denmark they have a project called “say no to illegal practice” the idea of this is to give practitioners the impetus to say no and challenge employers if they are being asked to do something which is illegal. This led onto a discussion about what workers could do if it was legal to do something which workers thought was wrong – what could be done then? There is also a need to add something in about hearing the clients’ voice and being an agent of social change – the central importance of involving clients.

Group 6: Malta, Spain, UK, Denmark, Portugal, Sweden

This group discussed how difficult it is to have the whole definition of social work squeezed into a couple of lines. The commentary should maybe become part of the definition rather than being separate. Rather than saying social work *promotes* be more active and say that social workers actually *do* those things – e.g.: empower etc. The group felt that the definition was individualistic. It needs to have a section on the professional relationship – working relationship, trust, confidentiality, empowerment etc. Prevention should also be included. It needs to refer to the process of social work not just the outcomes and it also needs to refer to identifying best interests. The group also discussed how friendly the definition is to service users etc. Maybe there should be other documents targeted to other groups.

The UK asked a question of group 4 when referring to social work professions – would they like IFSW to consider changing its name to the International Federation of Social Work Professions? Group 4 said that they did not discuss that but they were thinking about issues like the way that health professions is used as an umbrella term for nurses, doctors etc.

Denmark said they feel that it is very important to think about whether the definition is understandable by service users. It should be understood and agreed by service users to add to its political strength.

The President concluded the session by thanking everyone for their comments and outlining what will happen next:

There will be a symposium at the conference – everyone is invited.

	<p>There will be discussions across the regions in the Autumn and then there will be a discussion on the definition at the Delegates Meeting in 2010 (when hopefully another paper will be available).</p> <p>During the autumn members will receive emails to invite them to be more involved in the review. The President invited all members to use their energies in looking at the definition within their own countries – are there problems in using the definition in each individual country? If the definition is to be globally useful, all member organisations need to be fully involved in the review.</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Approval of the annual accounts and the report of the auditors</b></p> <p><u>9.1 Report from the Honorary Treasurer, including the accounts for 2008</u>  Barbara Molderings, Honorary Treasurer, spoke about her report which was circulated prior to the meeting. She explained that the organisation’s finances are generally healthy. She has developed a new format for presenting the accounts to make the financial situation more transparent.</p> <p>Austria commented that the report was much more straightforward to follow but suggested that the savings are presented after the bank balance, Barbara said that this could be done next year.</p> <p><u>9.2 Report from the auditors</u>  Barbara presented the auditors report. There were no comments.</p> <p>The President asked if the annual accounts for 2008 and the report of the auditors could be approved.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Austria  Secinded Turkey  Agreed unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>25 April 2009</b></p>	<p>The President opened the day by welcoming Armenia and Russia to the meeting and by welcoming the observer from Kosovo.</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the IFSW President and General Secretary (IFSW Global)</b></p> <p><b><u>Tom Johannesen – Secretary General</u></b>  The Secretary General began by discussing the joint world conference in Hong Kong next year. The theme is the social</p>

agenda, this was also the theme of this years World Social Work Day. IFSW wants to develop an agenda because it is only through formulating an agenda that social workers can become more powerful and can contribute actively to policy development.

The Conference is organised jointly with IASSW and ICSW. Each partner is to identify three themes – IFSW has developed the following 3 themes – service users and consumers transforming practice, poverty eradication: the role of social work, and ageing and older adults. Each of the three themes will be presented in short (2 page) documents identifying the most pressing and current issues. These documents will form a background to promote debate. The aim of the conference is that each theme will be reflected in the programme for further debate. This should lead to a recommendation/guidance for each of the nine themes and a tenth document summarising the process. These will be presented to the General Meeting which will provide the platform for work in the coming years. This is why the General Meeting will be after the conference for the first time in many years. The whole process will continue ahead of the following Joint World Conference/General Meeting in 2012.

Visits to the IFSW web page continue to grow – with almost 1.6 million visits in 2008, an increase of 68% from 2007. The news service is very popular and it is now possible to subscribe to the news system. An update is sent out monthly to members and friends. A web poll was also introduced in 2008 to make the site more interactive. The poll at present is “did you participate in any event for World Social Work Day?”. Interactivity and forums are being introduced, advertisements have been introduced to see if income has been generated. A notice board which is open to everybody is now available and a translation service is available, it is not perfect but it is helpful.

#### **David Jones – Global President**

The Global President underlined the importance of the Joint World Conference in Hong Kong. He feels that it will give power back to social workers. He asked member organisations to use their newsletters and other systems to highlight some of the themes of the Hong Kong conference. Some very senior people from the United Nations will be involved in the Conference. The whole conference will focus on policy initiatives and on where we want the profession and the Federation to go. A team will be working each day to feedback on the ideas and themes that are emerging. This will be a new way for the organisation and a conference to work. He feels it is very challenging and very exciting.

The President invited members to think about what they want to happen, what their priorities are etc.

World Social Work Day this year was planned to begin the development of the agenda. Some of the podcasts films are very powerful and can be used in member countries. The next World Social Work Day will be on 16 March 2010. The theme will again link to the conference.

The President asked members to send reports on their activities for World Social Work Day this year if they have not already done so.

The President reported that the Federation is considering the structure of the organisation in the future and in particular the secretariat as Tom is due to retire in three years. Work is underway to consider this. Decisions will need to be made in Hong Kong. The strategy committee is working on this and met recently, the work is developing well although no decisions have been made.

Other matters of Global importance at present are:

- The review of the ethical statements and definition of social work.
- IFSW is active in the mental health revision process with WHO.
- IFSW has presented to the committee on the UN committee on the rights of the child on the role of social work, particularly best interest issues. There is more work to do here.
- IFSW has been present at the World Urban Forum. They are playing a very important role in the UN habitat.

The President said that a great deal is happening and it feels exciting to him.

The European President asked members if there were any questions, comments or feedback on the Global report.

Sweden said that they are working towards the Hong Kong plans through their National conference.

Germany said that the three themes are now clearer as they have been presented today. They feel that it needs to become more concrete and that so far the work towards Hong Kong has been abstract. They would like clearer direction about what can be discussed in member organisations. The more concrete this becomes the easier it is to work Nationally. The President commented that member organisations should feed in whatever are the main issues within their own countries. It does not need to have an immediate link with international issues; the agenda is really about bringing together what are the main themes in each country. The President acknowledged that the ideas need to be concrete but that the language also needs to be feeding into the

	<p>United Nations. The idea is that policy is built on real experience.</p> <p>Denmark asked for further clarification on the process of the review of organisation. The President said that planning has started early to think about a structure. He recognises that with the Global economic situation there may be a need to think about where offices can be based which will give best value. The strategy group has members from every region.</p> <p>Malta wonders if it is worth having a person within the Federation who is responsible for national liaison. Many times they feel that what member organisations need in order to make the global agenda real and concrete for each country is a clear link to the Federation. It would be better if there was a key person with this responsibility – what people very often want is someone to talk to or email in order to clarify issues.</p> <p>The President said he feels very excited that politicians are aware of and concerned about the forthcoming social crisis and this is an ideal time for social workers to reclaim their power.</p> <p>Finland asked where is the forum and the power for individual social workers. They feel that IFSW should spend more time acting on the working conditions of social workers. The President agreed that this should be a role of IFSW.</p> <p>The European President thanked David and Tom for their contribution to the meeting and said that this led very smoothly into the next agenda item which considers social policy issues.</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Social policy issues</b></p> <p>11.1 <u>Presentation of the results of the IFSW Europe Regional Project</u></p> <p>Anthea Agius, Executive committee member, gave a presentation about the project development. Anthea explained that the report which has been sent out is at this point a collection of all the information gathered through the questionnaires, the seminars and the literature. At this stage it is not ready for publication. It is not a statement at this point. She would like to draw special attention section 3 which she would like to consider further. This develops on from the comments made by Finland about working conditions.</p> <p>Anthea said she would like to return to the original title for the project – there should be reference to basic human rights not just what could be referred to as second generation rights.</p> <p>The project began with many aims. 21 member countries</p>

participated. Regional seminars took place in Bulgaria, Germany, Austria and Spain.

One of the issues that has come from the project for Anthea is that some countries need support to bring international issues and the international agenda into their own National contexts.

Anthea explained that the process is still ongoing. The report is far from complete and feedback is sought from member countries. She would particularly like member organisations to verify the figures relating to their country.

Information on sample caseloads has been collated – but this is the most challenging. For example the figures have not yet been verified, we do not know whether the cases are all active or dormant etc.

Section 3 of the draft report which has been circulated contains a possible common framework. Anthea feels that this is necessary for the identity of social workers and for member organisations to be able to say that this is what social workers need, which has been agreed within the profession on a European basis. The project contained a great deal of debate about creativity within the profession, dialogue and complexity. Social work is a complex profession and this should be reflected in any framework such that it can be clearly understood. Therefore any framework needs to be very flexible to reflect the differing national perspectives and the complexity of the profession.

The responsibility of social workers covered within the project prompted a great deal of debate. At the national level there are various different levels of accountability and it is certainly not the idea of the project and the framework to provide one statement for accountability.

Anthea explained that she feels the next steps for the project are:

- There will be a symposium at the conference.
- Feedback from this Delegates Meeting will be collated.
- A sub committee is formed to develop the project further.

The President invited comments on Anthea's presentation:

Sweden thanked Anthea for the presentation and the work on the project – they feel that the goal of social work is missing from the report.

Germany asked for clarification on the goal of the project. What is the link between the report and the workshops? They feel that the conclusions from the workshop they participated in are lost in the

current report.

Switzerland thanked Anthea for the report and presentation. They reflected on the experience of developing the standards for social work education – many countries said that the standards couldn't be met. We need to be careful of setting standards which might exclude people and countries. It needs to be recognised that there is a history of social work with the profession still developing and this needs to be recognised within any framework.

The UK commented that bringing together all of the information and reflecting all of the workshops was a tremendous amount of work.

Standards tend to come from business models which are alien to social work, therefore we tend to rely more on ethical statements.

Barbara Molderings of the executive committee commented that this report is the beginning and not the end of the project. We need to know how employers and service users view the standards of social work. She feels that the report will promote discussion.

Denmark said the work was very interesting to read. Within Denmark they have discussed the fact that many people are trying to set standards and that these are not discussed in the paper.

Anthea said that it is already clear from the initial feedback that another section would be required to cover the philosophical frameworks of standards. This will help us to engage with employers. Barbara is currently developing a questionnaire to send to employers.

Anthea said she will revisit the seminar reports to ensure that the feedback is fully reflected in the report – which is still a work in progress.

Some group work then took place with groups looking at the following areas:

- General Comments
- Section 3 – in detail
- Next steps

#### Group 1: UK, Spain, Portugal, Malta and Denmark

The group feel that this is a very important document exploring standards and expectations on the social work task although there are temptations to try and develop something which can be used in each country, this would be too big a task. So what we should aim for is for section 3 to become a framework that all members can agree. We should not be too ambitious to try to get something

on which we can precisely agree. But we should look to set some general occupational standards. The group working on the final report and framework should not get too bogged down in detail, the main aim should be to get a document which is easy to read. It will be important to have this ready soon – when we are working towards the Hong Kong agenda.

Group 2: Finland, France, Switzerland, Armenia

Guidelines on how to use the paper will be needed. Section 3 refers to agents of change in various situations – the group would like more detail there. The group feel that prevention should be referred to in section 3.2.

The work should be developed through a sub committee and then the paper should be circulated to members and organisations before it is finalised.

Group 3: Austria, Turkey, France Germany

Had a long discussion about comparing how education standards differ in different countries. This differs depending on which countries have accepted the Bologna process - the examinations at the end of social work training differ greatly. Work needs to take place on mutual recognition – it is important to know whether social workers can work in different countries with the same conditions. This is important for the profession – employers will need to accept this and the framework could help. This is currently missing from the report. One important point across Europe is that it is important that social work has a minimum salary, also the workload is so different across countries. Practical issues on a National level need to be considered more fully in the report. Countries feel that they need more time to work on it. A fourth main area should be added covering the main problems for social workers in different countries. There should be an international policy paper on this issue.

Group 4: Russia, Croatia, Kosovo, Denmark, Portugal

There are very big differences between countries – social systems differ greatly with different amounts of legislation. It is vital to recognise these differences when trying to produce a framework or standards. Those countries who do not have strong regulation through legislation are developing legislation gradually. In some countries this is very regional – e.g.: in Russia but it is clear that there is a tendency towards increasing legislation in social work. Some countries really need a framework to help them politically in their countries to improve standards. But the more detailed the standards are the more difficult they will be to implement. The conclusions from the workshops which reflect the differences in the countries are needed in the report. It is important to continue the work to understand how it can be used and formulated to reflect the diversity across countries.

Group 5: Norway, Sweden and Denmark

They feel that the project and report are really good work – to make it even better all the countries must make sure that the information needed is reported to Anthea. The report should say something about European challenges such as evidence based practice which may be in conflict with practice based knowledge. It needs to look at how European social workers are affected by global issues. It will be useful for the report to show what countries agree on. It will be useful for lobbying. One of the specific standards considered was education. The group feel that the minimum standards should be a goal for all countries to have a 3 year degree for qualification. To develop the project further there needs to be a sub committee working across regions

Group 6: Germany, France, Switzerland, Ireland, UK

It is important to think about what services users would expect from social work. Do we mean social workers, social work practice or social work services. We need to focus on practice and management and therefore the document needs to look at standards of professional leadership. In Scotland there is a Chief Social Work Officer who must be social work qualified but in lots of countries social work managers are not social work qualified. Ethical issues should not be resource influenced and everyone should sign up to that. Countries should work towards standards – they may need to be aspirational. Then regular reports could be made on how different countries are implementing the standards. The final document will also need to be provided in French and Spanish. In response to definitions it can be difficult as some of the meaning is lost in translation so some difficulties could occur. We need to maybe go back to the UN and see how big international organisations deal with such issues. In terms of going forward – we could develop groups working on sub headings.

The President thanked participants for the feedback and asked Anthea to respond on behalf of the executive.

Anthea said that it is very clear from the feedback that a section is needed on management issues. Anthea heard that there are some issues in section 3 which can be agreed on and developed following the feedback. She recognises that some countries would like to participate further. People can send further information for the next month or two. With the basic structure of the report in place it will be easier to add further information.

Anthea feels it would be useful to develop a working group. Countries are welcome to express their interest in joining the working group. Anthea feels that a discussion needs to take place within the executive committee about whether it is possible to have another meeting/seminar and what funds will allow in terms of the further development of the project. Anthea said that she is still very

keen to have information on caseload management – she recognises that some members cannot send figures but it would be good to have the thoughts of organisations on what would be reasonable. It is very clear that there are many social workers carrying too much work.

David Jones said that there is some global work taking place on the role of management in social work. David feels that the values of managers should be the same as those for practitioners – then we can have strength as a profession. Managers should be modeling good practice for those they manage. David feels that links could be made between the project and this piece of work.

The President thanked everyone for their comments and said that the feedback will be incorporated into the revised work plan which will be presented by the executive tomorrow.

#### 11.2 To discuss further collaboration with AIEJI Europe

Switzerland proposed that IFSW Europe move towards greater collaboration with AIEJI Europe (the International Association of Social Educators). In Switzerland it has been important for social workers to work closely together with other social professionals to increase power in influencing social policy development.

The President said that the executive committee have discussed this proposal and they suggest that this is added to the work programme. AIEJI is a member of ENSACT and so collaboration is occurring in that arena and AIEJI is discussing working in closer collaboration with IFSW Europe at their General Assembly next week. Tom Johannesen said that as a similar proposal from the Swiss Association was accepted on the Global level it would make sense for IFSW Europe to accept the proposal. Denmark explained that AIEJI has a different structure to IFSW – it has only a Global executive although it has elected regional officers. In Europe many organisations are members of both IFSW and AIEJI.

The President explained that this proposal will be voted on as part of the work plan tomorrow.

#### 11.3 Rights and Responsibilities – the safeguarding, sharing and disposal of personal information entrusted to social workers by those using their services

Ian Johnston gave a presentation about some joint work which BASW and ANAS has been doing on this area. On behalf of France and the UK a proposal was made that IFSW Europe look to formulate an IFSW policy statement and guidance for European members on rights and responsibilities – the safeguarding, sharing and disposal of personal information entrusted to social workers by those using their services.

The presentation covered the following areas:

A great deal of dialogue has been taking place about what social workers should be doing with the information they obtain as part of their work. This work came about as there were concerns in France and the UK that social workers are expected to contribute to agendas that threaten our basic values and principles and that information obtained for one purpose may be used in a way that breaches confidentiality and other basic social work values. There is a fundamental need to get the balance right between the right to privacy, the health and wellbeing of the individual and other people and the public interest.

It is vital that we make sure that we stand for the issues which matter to us as a profession. We are expected to engage in debates which are not social work debates and there is pressure for social workers to engage in activities which are against our basic principles and values.

It is important to recognise and respect the differences between countries etc but it is important to recognise that there are core issues which apply to us all. Some of the core issues are:

- Conflict – “careless talk costs lives”
- Failure to share information about abusers
- Ownership – information is power
- “Pillow talk” – people who are close and trusting. Sometimes social workers share information in a way that the people who the information is about would not be happy about.

Ian feels that it is important to be aware that information is owned by the person and that we need to be very clear about the sharing of information. The Human Rights Act contains conflicting advice in relation to this area. Data Protection also applies across the European Union and this provides a clear context.

There is existing guidance on this area within IFSW Global. It has been around for a long time and appears to be very out of date.

Generally there are also individual associations codes of ethics and guidance and legislation in national contexts.

The joint work carried out by BASW and ANAS has brought out a number of key principles.

The UK and France proposal is to develop a project group and a task and finish group and a draft policy.

Didier Dunasque explained that there is a real problem in France

about these issues and pressure at present to place information on a child protection database. This leads to questions about the role of a social worker – the database does not bring any solutions to the problems of abuse. It is purely an administrative task which is about managerialism rather than practice issues. It is concerning that trust within the working relationship will be damaged. Didier feels that the database is more about controlling the population rather than good social work practice. Within Europe it is very important to think about this issue and to develop a position on the area of confidentiality and information sharing.

The President said that there may be global links and asked Tom Johannesen for feedback. Tom said that he feels much of the context of the proposal is European so it would be better to develop a European policy paper which can then feed into a review of the Global documents.

The President invited comments from delegates:

Turkey said they feel that this is a really important issue not only on an European basis but also internationally. In Turkey there have been some cases recently where lawyers have read court reports and then used the information as a threat within the court. This has affected the way that social workers are writing reports.

The President said that the executive committee felt that the issue could go into the work programme. The meeting agreed with this. The proposal will therefore be voted on within the work programme.

IFSW does not currently have any policy papers, so consideration will need to be given to whether this should result in a policy paper or another type of document.

#### 11.4 Other European Social Policy Issues

In recent years other issues which have come up for discussion and debate within IFSW Europe have been –

- Financial crisis and impact on services
- Neo-liberalism
- Youth conflict and crime
- Cross border movement of social workers
- Induction, supervision and post qualifying support
- European year for combating poverty and social exclusion in 2010.

The President explained that most of these have been added to the work plan, but with time limitations and the need to prioritise, feedback is now needed from members on which of these issues should be prioritised.

	<p>Ireland said that induction, supervision and post qualifying support is an important issue which came up in the Madrid project seminars. The UK and Ireland would be willing to work further on this area.</p> <p>Austria said that it is important to address the threat of social work job losses because of the financial crisis, but a rapid response will be needed to this.</p> <p>The UK said that it is vital that the protection of children from physical chastisement is addressed. More than 18 countries in Europe have now legislated against hitting children – so giving children the same rights as adults to be protected from violence. A number of years ago the UK proposed that IFSW Europe looked at this. Malta, France and Ireland also still have legalised chastisement – would this be an area for some cross country work?</p> <p>The UK said that in relation to cross border issues some of this has been addressed within the project and some of the issues are being addressed by other organisations – such as the Association of Directors. However, it is important to look at developing cross cultural competence. It might be important to look at working in collaboration with ISS (International Social Services). Tom said that IFSW global have good links with ISS who would be open to collaboration.</p> <p>Anthea Agius of the executive committee said that it would be useful to know which countries are working on the issues and which countries would be willing to take certain areas forward.</p> <p>The UK said that it might be that some informal work could take place – for example those countries where physical chastisement has not been made illegal could talk together about how they could work together to increase power. Those countries which have had hitting made illegal could give some thoughts and advice. Ruth Stark said that this issue is also a human rights issue and therefore the human rights network could become involved.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Consideration and amendments to the articles and bylaws of IFSW Europe</b></p> <p>12.1 <u>Proposed amendments to the articles presented by the executive committee</u></p> <p>Barbara Molderings presented the suggested amendments from the executive committee. She said that she hopes it is the last time that she has to present this to the meeting – becoming a registered legal body has been on the agenda for some years.</p>

Court appointments have now taken place. All of the amendments and requirements of the courts have been written into these proposals. The court has now said that if everything is agreed IFSW Europe will become a registered body by May or June.

Once agreed the articles will be produced in French and Spanish as well but the translation will be done by an appropriate professional. The suggested amendments were sent out 90 days before the meeting and no comments were received.

A vote took place on the amendments:

*For: 20*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*Carried unanimously*

#### 12.2 Proposed amendments to the articles presented by AvenirSocial (Switzerland)

The Swiss Association proposes to add explicitly that all nominations for the executive and representatives have to be announced at least 90 days before the Delegates Meeting and that CVs and statements of nominations must be sent 60 days before the Delegates Meeting.

The President invited comments on this proposed amendment. Austria asked what would happen if no nominations were received in the 90 days. David Jones explained that at the Global level there is a similar arrangement to IFSW Europe for accepting late nominations. His view is that smaller organisations can be excluded where 90 days are required.

Barbara Molderings explained that IFSW Europe work to the Global constitution – so we need to think about keeping the articles in line with Global arrangements.

In the role of Parliamentarian Brian Auslender said that he feels he cannot answer the question about whether the regional by laws can be different to Global.

The President explained that the executive committee have discussed this proposal. They feel that expecting nominations in 90 days before would exclude some member organisations from nominating people. Currently IFSW Europe offer to distribute statements and CVs ahead of time if they are submitted ahead of the Delegates Meeting. This has helped to develop a culture where nominations are generally made ahead of time. This is why the executive is not recommending this amendment.

Germany said that the proposal is unclear as the language

sometimes refers to elections and sometimes appointments.

Austria said that they feel the Swiss amendment could be changed to allow late nominations where none are received by the deadline.

France agreed with Austria.

Israel feel they would like to maintain the status quo, they feel that the nomination system works well now.

Malta said that late nominations disadvantage the person so the Delegates Meeting already have the ability to respond to the behaviour of late nominations.

Barbara suggested that the amendment from Switzerland could be changed such that nominations are requested 90 days before but that if none are received a reminder can be sent out asking for "late" nominations.

Switzerland said they feel that the amendment is good and should stand but if it is not accepted by the meeting the Swiss Association would recognise that there are reasons for this.

The amendment was voted on:

*For: 1*

*Against: 15*

*Abstentions: 4*

*Not carried*

### 12.3 Proposed amendments to the bylaws presented by the executive committee

Barbra Molderings explained that as part of the work on the legal body there were some amendments which could not be placed in the articles. They were therefore made as amendments to the bylaws. These have been recommended by the executive.

The UK asked for clarification on section 3.12 – the Permanent Committee is appointed by the executive and not the Delegates Meeting whilst the CoE representative is appointed by the Delegates Meeting, the rationale for this was questioned. The President said that the reason for this is that the permanent committee is much closer to the work of the executive. It is also that a position on this committee is only open to EU members and therefore appointments would not be made by the Delegates Meeting.

Austria said that the rationale for the difference is that the Council of Europe representative has a vote and therefore needs to be

	<p>democratically elected to legitimise the role. Whereas the Permanent Committee have more a lobbying role and an extension of the work of the executive committee.</p> <p>Germany said that if the application for the Social Platform membership is accepted another representative role will be required as they will be able to vote.</p> <p>The amendments were voted on:</p> <p><i>For: 16</i>  <i>Against: 0</i>  <i>Abstentions: 4</i>  <i>Carried</i></p> <p>12.4 <u>To consider any proposals for amendments to be voted on in 2010</u></p> <p>The President invited comments. No comments were made.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>Considerations and amendments to the Mission Statement and the European aims (IFSW Europe Policy Platform)</b></p> <p>13.1 <u>Proposed amendments to the policy platform presented by the executive committee</u></p> <p>A document has been circulated. This lays out the work of IFSW Europe. It was last agreed in Parma in 2007. Some minor changes have been made. This document along with the bylaws and articles guides the work of the executive between Delegates Meetings. The President asked if the revised policy platform could be accepted:</p> <p><i>For: 20</i>  <i>Against: 0</i>  <i>Abstentions: 0</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>World Social Work Day 2010</b></p> <p>Cristina Martins of the executive committee explained that the communications team will continue to work on publicising this. She asked members to send us any information on national activities.</p> <p>The Executive would like to propose a sub theme linking to the 2010 European year for combating poverty and social exclusion.</p> <p>Denmark asked if the communications team could consider sending out info on World Social Work Day and what is happening in different countries prior to the day, to inspire others. Cristina</p>

	<p>responded by saying that the team would be happy to do this if members send information about planned activities.</p> <p>The UK said they would welcome the idea of the sub theme on poverty. It is an important issue</p> <p>Gabrielle, as the Council of Europe representative said it will be good to make the links with the year of poverty – links could be made to the COE website etc.</p> <p>Sweden commented that they liked the idea of the regional theme but asked how it fitted into the global theme. The President explained that the Global day can have a regional theme and the suggested regional theme also links into the Global theme – “setting the agenda”. It is up to National organisations to decide on what action takes place in their individual countries on the theme.</p>
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b>European Conferences</b></p> <p><u>15.1 The first Joint ENSACT Conference 2009 in Dubrovnik</u> Tatjana Katic Stanic gave a presentation about plans for the first joint ENSACT Conference which is due to take place after the Delegates Meeting. Tatjana explained that more than 700 people have now registered for the Conference. IFSW will be maintaining its profile during the Conference with two symposium sessions (one on the review of the definition of social work and one on the project), an open space session (covering the Hong Kong Conference and IFSW Europe communication strategy) and a stand in the Conference exhibition.</p> <p><u>15.2 The Second Joint ENSACT Conference 2011</u> Three offers were received to host this – from Finland, Belgium and Turkey (Finland withdrew before decisions were taken). ENSACT agreed on Belgium – which was supported by the IFSW Executive. The President explained that at this time we are building up links with the EU institutions in Belgium so it will be positive to have the conference there. However we do not currently have a member organisation in Belgium – but now we are in dialogue with a former Belgian member organisation who is preparing to look at whether they will ask for membership again. Part of the process of ENSACT collaboration will be that members will experience occasions where conferences are held where they have no member organisations.</p> <p>The first themes of the 2011 conference will be presented at the 2009 Conference.</p> <p>Austria commented that in Belgium where there is no member organisation it will be very important to maintain the profile of</p>

	<p>IFSW which will be difficult. The executive committee will need to work very hard on this to maintain the profile of IFSW Europe.</p> <p>Germany commented that holding the conference in Belgium will be helpful in that it will give the opportunity to have key note speakers from the EU.</p> <p>Bulgaria said that they understood it was agreed in Parma that no decision would be made about the 2011 conference until after the 2009 conference. The President explained that ENSACT needed to have a response before this time. Discussions therefore took place in Brazil and via email with member organisations.</p> <p>France said that they are concerned that French is not very present in conferences. Hopefully this will be addressed in Belgium.</p> <p><b>15.3 <u>Future Conferences</u></b>  Turkey has considered whether they are willing to host the 2013 conference and has presented a bid. This has not yet been considered by ENSACT but Turkey were invited to give a short presentation about their bid.</p> <p>Hakan Acar gave a brief presentation on behalf of Turkey. The President advised that the decision could not be made now, but he noted that the feeling in the room was very positive.</p>
<b>26<sup>th</sup> April</b>	<p>The President opened the meeting. He explained that he had been asked to announce that Armenia are in the process of developing their organisation and they would like some partners in this, as IFSW Europe is also a forum to develop links and partnerships – if people wish to develop partnerships they should talk to Mira from Armenia.</p>
<b>16.</b>	<p><b>Delegates Meeting 2010</b></p> <p>Malta offered to host the Delegates Meeting in 2010. The meeting accepted the offer.</p> <p>The executive propose that the meeting be from 14-16 May 2010. This will fit in well with the Global meeting timetable. Austria commented that 13 May is a holiday in many countries. The President explained that the problem with spring is that there are many holidays and this was the best proposal that the executive could make.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Norway</i>  <i>Seconded: UK</i>  <i>Agreed with one abstention</i></p>

<p><b>17. Statements</b></p>	<p>The President gave the opportunity to the meeting to make any statements they would like to. Following the training session, which took place after the Delegates meeting on Saturday, it has been made clear that one of the ways to influence the press and change is to make statements.</p> <p>The executive commented that there are many issues about human rights and racism. The latest issue came from Italy where the organisation made comment about the way in which the government treats migrants. This could be an issue to make a statement on.</p> <p>Another issue is the financial crisis and the impact of this on social work as a profession.</p> <p>The executive know that these are important issues but have not been able to make a statement.</p> <p>The President invited comments – should we make a statement from this meeting?</p> <p>Malta commented that in their country there are a number of issues about migration and human rights and conflict in detention centres. Recently there was a dispute between Malta and Italy and a boat was at sea for 10 days, a pregnant woman died. Last year a number of people were left hanging onto a tuna pen at sea as governments discussed who should rescue them. They would support anyone who would like to make a statement.</p> <p>France commented that they had a big problem with migration – if a person helps an immigrant then they can be given a big fine. If a social worker assists a person without papers they can be pursued. Social workers may only intervene in these situations for child protection purposes.</p> <p>Switzerland said that there has just been a United Nations Conference on racism. The papers from the different UN conferences are not widely seen by social workers. It would be useful for IFSW Europe to make a statement to members to read these important UN documents.</p> <p>Finland said that it is important to make some kind of statement but needs to be well thought out. Who are we sending the statement to? Why are we sending it? etc. It is important to draw on the examples given and then make a statement. It is important for the executive to think through the strategy. There is no point in</p>

	<p>making a rapid statement.</p> <p>Austria said it is also important to have a statement to socially discourage having detention centres for migrants with the goal to have them forbidden in each country.</p> <p>Ruth Stark, as Human Rights Commissioner, said that Rene has been highlighting human rights stories on the IFSW website. The Press do pick up on this. It is important to really think through the strategy – this is a long term story so we need to think it through well. Many times press releases are ignored. Ruth would therefore like to see a longer term strategy rather than just a statement.</p> <p>Sweden said it is important that as social workers we develop thoughts on this. It is important to have a longer term strategy.</p> <p>Tom Johannesen said that the secretariat would be happy to receive stories on issues such as these to highlight on the website.</p> <p>The President said that listening to the feedback he feels that the executive should look at developing a strategy and develop a statement based on the outcomes of the meeting. On behalf of the executive Anthea asked who should like to be involved. Malta would like to participate in the process, the Human Rights Commission would also like to be involved. The President explained that the executive would like to receive stories from member organisations but that learning the lessons from the training on lobbying it will be important to keep the statement simple.</p>
<p><b>18.</b></p>	<p><b>Adoption of the Work Programme 2009-10</b></p> <p>The President explained that the executive committee has looked at the work programme during the meeting. The President then presented the revised work programme to the meeting.</p> <p>New proposals following discussions at the meeting include:</p> <p><u>Policy issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To react to and monitor the Global financial crisis</li> <li>• To facilitate a policy discussion on confidentiality and information sharing – establishing a working groups</li> <li>• Facilitate a policy discussion on the violation of children’s rights</li> <li>• Facilitate a policy discussion on social work professionals crossing borders</li> </ul> <p><i>Global issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To link the regional project to the Global work on a document on managerialism</li> </ul>

### *Visibility in Europe*

- To collect National Reports on World Social Work Day for publication on the blog / in the ESW

### *Mutual Support*

- Develop the next steps of the regional project to include guidelines for practice
- Identify a working group
- Organise a workshop for the working group / representatives of member organisations
- Include work on service users

### *Strengthening profile*

- Develop ways to cooperate with the social platform based on the result of our membership application
- Monitor National Action plans as a common platform for policy development

The President invited comments. The UK and Ireland would like to work on supervision and induction issues. There was a proposal that this will be added as a separate point.

Tom Johannesen said that the policy statement on a global level is the role and conduct of employers.

Gabriele, as CoE representative, said that the action in relation to the European year of poverty also needs to involve the CoE.

### Organisational issues

- Develop the strategy for prioritising areas to engage based on the result of our application for social platform membership
- Follow up on organisational issues relating to CoE.

Germany said that co-operation with the schools needs to be improved and should be put on the agenda of the ENSACT meeting.

### Administrative

No new issues added.

The President then asked delegates to take some time to reflect on the new proposed work programme, thinking about:

- What should be prioritised?
- How can members be involved?
- Offers to take responsibility?

Each country gave feedback as follows:

Armenia

Is ready to be involved in any way they can. They feel it will add to the depth if IFSW Europe has information from countries in transition. It would be good to have promoting partnerships in order to help organisations in development to grow included in the work programme.

Austria

Feel that the main goal should be to regain the poorer countries of Europe in the Delegates Meeting and conferences. Most priority should be given to renewing contracts set with ENSACT – so that every four years IFSW Europe has its own conference and then every four years joint. Conferences should not be in 5 star hotels. Also it is a priority not to lose the IFSW friends programme which is important.

Bulgaria

The legacy of Hansrog Keller was given with the aim to strengthen the organisation and enable poorer countries to take part. This needs to be a priority.

Croatia

Feel the completion of the project is a priority. It is important to have common standards as it is the only way to push governments where standards are not met. They would also like further work on burn out. They would like to have a workshop on this area as it is an important issue for all countries. They also feel it is important to involve all countries in workshops.

Denmark

Are not satisfied with the way that the work programme is revised during the Delegates Meeting. They feel that the programme should be reviewed and revised in advance to allow more opportunity for informed comment.

Finland

Feels that the main priorities should be on standards of social work. They hope that the project continues and feel that it needs to be finished before other things. Alongside France, Russia, UK, and Croatia, Finland are keen to follow up on burnout issues. It was an important issue and should be followed up.

France

Have four areas for priority – standards and the review of the definition. They would like to continue their work on confidentiality with the UK but would also like to involve other countries to continue the work. Their third issue is burnout – they feel it is very important to work on this.

Germany

Hope we will find good action for next year on fighting against poverty. They feel it is important to finish the work started on standards. They suggest making something more or less 6 pages and the rest as appendix to the material. They also feel that the executive should develop a list of different contact persons in each organisation – so that we can link together more. This could detail the main issues in their countries.

Ireland

The project needs to be continued. Induction, supervision and continual professional development is important. It won't go very far if only Ireland and UK are involved so it would be good for other countries to join with us to make the work more meaningful.

Malta

Feel that the main priority should be concluding the work that needs to be done on the statements and developing a strategy for statements as part of the work plan.

Norway

Commented that it is a good and ambitious work programme. They also want to add human rights and racism in Europe – and consider the social work role. In Norway they want to do more work on International issues.

Portugal

Support the work plan. Will be engaged in statements and group work. Would like the project to continue and be completed.

Russia

Would like to be involved in a working group on professional burn out. Would like some special work to be done on promoting social work in and after disaster, any issue which is linked to death and major injury – it could be linked to burn out or separate work could be undertaken.

Spain

Accept the work programme in general but are particularly interested in confidentiality and in migration issues. In particular Spain are very involved with IFSW Europe as they have a representative on the EU permanent committee. Also Spain are looking forward to being more involved but are finalising their mandate through elections soon.

Sweden

Support the work plan. It is very interesting and ambitious over all. They would like to add one point – human rights and the growth of racism in Europe. This year Sweden is taking the chair of EU and

they are willing to connect the work where they can collect examples. They would like to consider the role of social work in relation to this growth of racism in Europe. They wonder if it would also be possible to link this with World Social Work Day. Sweden would like to be included on the work on supervision, induction and Continual Professional Development.

#### Switzerland

Like the programme and feel that a lot included. We should work with all the important work done within the UN where there are often very good papers produced. They feel that IFSW Europe should try to use these papers. It is important to join with issues like the year of poverty.

#### Turkey

Commented that the executive committee have produced a very comprehensive programme. Poverty is a growing reality in some parts of Europe so this should be a major priority. What is the role of social workers and what is the role of IFSW Europe within this. Unemployment is also a big issue in Turkey – with the highest rate of unemployment (15%) and the tendency for this to become higher and higher year by year.

#### UK

Support the programme. Very pleased to be given the support of the executive to continue the work on confidentiality and information sharing. Happy to take the lead on this and would be happy to host a project. There might be the opportunity to link this work into the work on supervision. The UK would also be keen to support some of the countries which want to build their capacities. One of the very important ways we can help each other is through the communications strategy.

The President thanked people for their feedback. He identified 3 new issues to add to the programme – to look again at the burnout issue, to look specifically at human rights and racism and the need to consider how the work programme is amended.

Some further changes were made following this feedback.

The President asked if the work programme including the changes could be adopted by the meeting

*Proposed: Germany*

*Seconded: Sweden*

*Carried unanimously*

The President thanked the meeting and said he feels that the work programme is very ambitious and clear. It will be placed on the website.

19.	<p><b>Ratification of the general and financial policies of IFSW Europe</b></p> <p>19.1 <u>Decision on the annual dues (regional fees)</u> The Executive propose this remaining the same (20 euro cent per member).</p> <p><i>Proposed: Sweden</i> <i>Seconded: Finland</i> <i>Agreed unanimously</i></p> <p>19.2 <u>Review of activities and accounts of IFSW Europe</u> To raise the budget for the project from 3,000 to 6,000 euros following the discussions about project continuation. We have funding to support members to attend the Delegates Meeting – this year some of those people who were given funds were not able to attend. The money to support people will be raised to 6,500 Euros as flights are becoming more expensive. Barbara said that she will place the savings directly under the income to show the assets at a glance.</p> <p>The President asked if the 2009 budget could be accepted by the meeting:</p> <p><i>Proposed: Austria</i> <i>Seconded: Germany</i> <i>Agreed Unanimously</i></p> <p>Barbara then moved on to presenting the 2010 budget – the same changes will be needed to place savings directly under income. The proposed draft shows money from Global for a project. We do not know if we will get this yet.</p> <p>The President asked if the 2010 budget could be accepted by the meeting.</p> <p><i>Proposed: UK</i> <i>Seconded: Malta</i> <i>Agreed Unanimously</i></p> <p>19.3 <u>Appointment of an independent auditor</u> The Executive propose that the current auditor is reappointed.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Austria</i> <i>Seconded: Turkey</i> <i>Carried Unanimously</i></p>

<p><b>20.</b></p>	<p><b>Elections</b></p> <p>John Brennan, election officer, explained that there are two positions up on the executive and two deputies are also to be elected. There are 5 candidates. Each country may vote for up to 2 candidates.</p> <p><u>20.1 Election of members of the Executive Committee and two deputies</u></p> <p>Each of the five candidates were invited to give a presentation, following which an election took place.</p> <p>Votes as follows:</p> <p>Anthea Agius (Malta): 15  Anna Egorava (Russia): 2  Ian Johnston (UK): 11  Tatjana Katic Stanic (Croatia): 8  Annica Skoglund (Sweden): 4</p> <p>Anthea Agius and Ian Johnston were therefore elected to the two positions on the executive.</p> <p>Tatjana Katic Stanic was elected to the first deputy and Annica Skoglund the second deputy.</p>
<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p><b>Appointment of external and internal representatives related to IFSW Europe</b></p> <p><u>21.1 Representative of IFSW Europe to Council of Europe</u>  A nomination was received from Germany for Gabriele Stark-Angermeier, who was appointed.</p> <p><u>21.2 An IFSW European contact person to the Global Human Rights Commission</u>  A nomination was received from Portugal for Graca Andre, who was appointed.</p> <p><u>21.3 An IFSW European contact person to the Global expert group on Ethics</u>  Three nominations were received. Ian Johnston from the UK, Brian Auslander from Israel and Titti Frankel from Sweden. As Ian Johnston was elected to the Executive Committee, he is no longer eligible. A vote took place as follows:</p> <p>Brian Auslander (Israel): 7  Titti Frankel (Sweden): 13</p> <p>Therefore Titti Frankel was appointed.</p>

	<p><b>21.4 IFSW Europe Election Officer</b>  One nomination was received from Ireland for John Brennan, who was appointed.</p> <p>The President thanked the election officer and welcomed Anthea and Ian as executive members. He said it was sad to lose Tatjana from the executive but he hopes that there will be other opportunities to maintain collaboration.</p>
<p><b>22.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>The President asked if there was any other business.</p> <p>The Swiss Delegate said it was his first time attending the meeting – he was impressed with the way the meeting was carried out. He thanked the executive for all their work. He feels the meeting was enriching for all.</p> <p>Bulgaria would like to remember Hans Ellenberger from Switzerland who attended IFSW Delegates Meetings for some time and died recently.</p> <p>David Jones said there is a section on the IFSW website for news about IFSW, developments in organisations like the UN and news from member organisations. If there is something happening in member countries in relation to social work Global would be very grateful to receive stories (just 100 words are needed) this will then be placed on the website and we will see how the social work profession is developing across Europe.</p> <p>Bulgaria gave a short presentation on a forthcoming regional conference (South-East-European Seminar on Social Work) this will be in Sibiu, Romania from 3-5 July 2009. All member organisations are invited.</p> <p>The President said that there will be an IFSW stand at the conference, the executive will take care of the stand but delegates are more than welcome to offer help on the stand.</p> <p>The President again thanked Tatjana for all of her work on the executive. She has been working very hard on the conference.</p> <p>The President explained that Siobhan Maclean was appointed as Honorary Secretary in 2007. The executive have recently reappointed Siobhan for a further two years.</p> <p>The President gave special thanks to Ruth Stark for doing the screen notes during the meeting.</p>

	<p>The President then concluded the meeting. He said it has been a good meeting, with lots of discussion and debate. We now have a good clear work program and the executive look forward to hearing from member organisations in the coming year.</p>
--	--

**22 June 2009**

***Siobhan Maclean / Nicolai Paulsen***