

## Summary

Research was carried out for the WODC (Research and Documentation Centre) of the Ministry of Justice, with a twofold objective:

- 1 To describe the supervision product as carried out by the three rehabilitation organisations and – where possible – to distinguish execution variants in supervision.
- 2 Determine which factors contribute to successful supervision.

Originally the intention was also that the research would provide an insight into the long-term effectiveness of the different variants in supervision of the three rehabilitation organisations. Soon after the start of the research it became apparent that this objective was too ambitious; not least because there did not appear to be any clearly described supervision variants.

The research therefore acquired a descriptive character, focussing mainly on obtaining an insight into the way in which the rehabilitation organisations interpret supervision.

The three rehabilitation organisations, Reclassering Leger des Heils (Salvation Army Rehabilitation Organisation), Stichting Verslavingsreclassering GGZ Nederland (Netherlands Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Foundation) and Reclassering Nederland (Netherlands Rehabilitation Organisation), supervise around 12,400 cases in the Netherlands each year (2005). The rehabilitation organisations each have their own background, target group(s) and specialisations: The Leger des Heils is particularly geared to the homeless, the Stichting Verslavingsreclassering GGZ Nederland is mainly geared to drug addicts and Reclassering Nederland serves the general target group. On the instructions of the different judicial organisations (Public Prosecution Service, the judiciary and penitential institutions) the rehabilitation organisations supervise and monitor rehabilitation clients within a compulsory framework.

The aim of supervision is that the client adheres to the special conditions that are imposed, recidivism is prevented during and after supervision, and the client is helped with his resocialisation.

Supervision usually consists of supervision and monitoring. In concrete terms this means that the rehabilitation agency will in any case frequently meet with the client. At these meetings, checks are made as to whether the client has kept their appointments, and supervision is offered. Programmes geared to changing the client's behaviour may also be offered.

### *Theoretical framework*

After it became apparent that research into the long-term effectiveness of supervision was not feasible, a theoretical framework was set up by the researchers, in which a number of factors are differentiated that may influence the successful completion of supervision programmes. For the sake of brevity, we will deal with the effective factors here.

In setting up the theoretical framework, the following were used:

- Insights obtained from research into the literature, including in particular *Het delict als maatstaf; Methodiek voor werken in gedwongen kader* (The delict as criterion: Methodology for working in a compulsory framework) (Menger & Krechtig, 2004) .
- Handboek Reclassering (Stichting Reclassering Nederland, 2003). (Rehabilitation Handbook (Netherlands Rehabilitation Foundation, 2003)).
- Effectieve strafrechtelijke interventies (Ministerie van Justitie, 2001). (Effective criminal interventions (Ministry of Justice, 2001)).

In describing supervision, the extent to which the activities that are carried out correspond to the programme description in the Rehabilitation Handbook was looked at first.

In addition, the degree to which possible effective factors play a role in the way supervision is carried out was examined.

Finally, an attempt was made to determine whether there was indeed a relationship between the possible effective factors and the degree to which supervision programmes are successfully completed, or not started, or prematurely interrupted.

#### *Research instruments*

Five research instruments were used in this research:

- Literature study / document analysis
- Quantitative analysis of 8,354 supervision programmes written off in 2004 from the Client Follow-up System (Cliënt Volg Systeem).
- Extensive dossier analysis (106 dossiers)
- Interviews with key persons (16)
- Interviews with (ex) rehabilitation clients (12)

It should be noted here that the Client Follow-up System has a number of limitations. For example, the nature of the monitoring activities carried out is not always recorded. These methodological limitations apply to a lesser extent to the penetrating dossier analysis, which makes it the most important source of information in describing supervision.

The number of interviews held was limited. They do not, therefore, give a representative picture, although they do provide a context for the interpretation of the dossiers.

#### *Most important conclusions about execution of supervision.*

- From the dossier analysis and interviews it appears that no clear execution variants in supervision can be differentiated in rehabilitation in practice: the interpretation of supervision is particularly geared to the individual client. There are, however, particular supervision characteristics that can be linked to particular target groups. Drug addicts, for instance, generally receive specific care and clinical treatment. But for this target group the differences in interpreting the supervision are also greater than the similarities.
- Supervision is presently provided at the earliest possible stage, based on the legal framework, data from the CVS, RISc, consultation with the client, and the professionalism and expertise of the rehabilitation worker. The monitoring and welfare activities to be used are determined at the start of supervision.

The rehabilitation organisation has the option to define the content of the supervision programme within the bounds of the conditions set by the principle.

- In the What Works literature, the importance of an underlying programme theory is emphasised. This type of theory substantiates why certain activities are appropriate for interpreting supervision, and what the underlying mechanisms and effective factors are that determine the effectiveness of supervision. On the basis of this research it may be stated that a programme theory for the rehabilitation sector is still in development and that a specific programme theory is not explicitly endorsed within the three rehabilitation organisations.
- Of the dossiers examined, an objective was formulated in nearly all cases of supervision that were started. The aim of the supervision is to be found in the action plan that is set up at the start of supervision.

The nature of the objectives varies. There are short-term objectives, limited to the supervision period (including not relapsing during supervision), there are long-term objectives, often relating to the ability to function well in society after supervision has finished, social rehabilitation or resocialisation, or transference to the care sector. From the interviews it appears that there is a difference in this between the three rehabilitation organisations. The Stichting Verslavingsreclassering GGZ Nederland and the Leger des Heils are more geared to transferring to the care sector (care following the supervision period), while Reclassering Nederland focuses on preventing recidivism and on resocialisation.

The concepts objective, targets and measures are used interchangeably in practice, although this has improved since the arrival of RISc.

- In executing supervision, the programme description and the corresponding protocols from the Rehabilitation Handbook are generally followed, but in some cases these regulations are not adhered to.

For instance, during supervision an assessment must be made at the periodic client meetings (weekly/2-weekly if necessary, based on the diagnosis, but a minimum of once a month), of the way in which the agreements that have been made are fleshed out and observed. The required contact frequency is not achieved in many supervision programmes.

The fact that a criminal offence was committed is often also not reported to the competent authorities, contrary to the protocols in the Rehabilitation Handbook. There are signals that relatively small criminal acts do not consistently lead to a return of supervision by the rehabilitation worker (often in consultation with their manager) to the Public Prosecution Service. The programme may be continued – after consultation with the Public Prosecution Service – after adapting the conditions.

Finally, it has been found that the Public Prosecution Service does not always provide feedback on what happens with ‘returned’ supervision cases (supervision that was prematurely ended by the rehabilitation organisation and which was reported to the judiciary). This means that the rehabilitation worker is not always present at an enforcement hearing. This is confirmed in the ISt (sanctions inspectorate) report into implementation in the chain, 2006.

- On the basis of interviews with key persons, the cautious conclusion may be drawn that there is a reasonable level of cooperation between the different partners in the chain. One sticking point, however, is the progress of the programme in the criminal justice chain, which is slowed down because one organisation has to wait for another one. The judiciary sometimes has to wait for an information or advice report, which is often delivered just before the hearing. The rehabilitation organisations say they have to wait for the court’s verdict before they can make a start. These findings are confirmed in the recent report on the chain connection between rehabilitation organisations and the Public Prosecution Service from the Sanctions Inspectorate (Inspectie voor Sanctietoepassing), 2006.

#### *Conclusions on results of supervision*

- From the dossier analysis and the quantitative CVS analysis it appears that part of the supervision is impossible after the start and is therefore halted (12% of supervision cases were written off in 2004). From the dossier analysis it appears that the most frequent reason for not starting supervision is not being able to reach the rehabilitation clients. Not keeping appointments at an early stage of supervision is a second reason for not starting. This picture is confirmed by the interviews.

An even larger part of the supervision programmes is started but prematurely ended (26% of supervision programmes were written off in 2004).

In nearly *one third* of the dossiers that were ended prematurely a new offence has been committed.

- From the quantitative CVS analysis it appears that the frequency of supervision activities is highest in the programmes that were ended prematurely. From the dossier analysis it appears that this is partly explained because clients with a high risk of repetition are checked more frequently.
- The majority of rehabilitation clients are not offered a welfare programme; the dossier analysis shows that over one-third of clients followed a welfare programme. From the CVS analysis it appears that clients for whom supervision was successfully completed a welfare programme is offered slightly more often than clients for whom supervision ended prematurely. If supervision incorporating a welfare programme is successfully completed, the welfare programme is also completed in most cases (about 65%).
- Possible effective elements from the theoretical framework that are found in the method of working of rehabilitation organisations as standard are: in the interpretation of supervision, account is taken of factors conducive to crime (the need principle); the intervention programmes are geared to the diagnostics, and account is taken of a client’s responsiveness.

On the basis of our research, however, it is difficult to determine whether these three factors also contribute to a greater likelihood of successful completion of supervision.

- Furthermore, it is assumed that apart from the above-mentioned (possible) effective elements derived from the What Works literature, including prior to detention, the presence of an advice and information report and specified special conditions influence the likelihood of supervision being successfully completed. Research shows that there does indeed appear to be a small degree of correlation between these factors and successful supervision. It should be noted here that it is of course by no means always a case of prior detention, and in less than half of all supervision programmes of specified special conditions.

### *Recommendations*

The recommendations are split into recommendations for the execution of supervision and recommendations for management of the rehabilitation organisations.

The recommendations for management are particularly aimed at creating better conditions for acting as a watchdog on rehabilitation organisations.

## **Management**

- 1 Develop an unambiguous framework of concepts in respect of supervision for use by both the Ministry of Justice, the rehabilitation organisations and other judicial organisations.  
It is of primary importance that a definition is established that can be used by all the organisations. Furthermore, it is important that the specification of legal stipulations is used unequivocally by the different organisations. Thus, the specification of judicial stipulations in the Client Follow-up System must not be contrary to the formal legal specifications.
- 2 Work the existing programme theory for supervision out further, so that a cohesive structure is created that can help rehabilitation workers achieve successful execution of supervision.  
Factors from the What Works literature and specific factors for rehabilitation supervision can form the basis for this. The programme theory should contain descriptions with presumed effective components of supervision for the most important target groups. This can be linked to the programme theories that are worked out in the framework of the Adviescommissie Onderzoeksprogrammering Reclassering (Advisory Committee on Research Programming for Rehabilitation).
- 3 Control by the management of the rehabilitation organisations must be more result-oriented than is presently the case and as far as possible formulated in measurable terms. An evaluation of the effectiveness of supervision will thereby be made possible.

## **Executive level**

- 4 Arrangements on the execution of supervision must be met, for example in relation to the intensity of the supervision.
- 5 Supervision programmes must preferably start as soon as possible after sentencing or after the end of detention.
- 6 Objectives formulated for individual supervision programmes must relate to the intended results of the supervision activities and should preferably be set down in measurable terms.
- 7 The rehabilitation organisations must report all breaches that took place during supervision and which are known about back to the Public Prosecution Service. A reciprocal requirement to provide information is also helpful.