

SUMMARY

On behalf of the Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum (WODC, institute for scientific research and documentation) of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, the INTRAVAL bureau for research and consultancy has carried out a first inventory of the presumed surplus value of Inrichting voor Stelselmatige Daders (ISD measure, institution for repeat offenders) in comparison to the former Strafrechtelijk Opvang Verslaafden (SOV measure, court-ordered treatment of drug-dependent offenders).

For this research, the policy presumptions behind both measures have been recovered. Additionally, talks were held with the involved parties within four areas of research of the SOV and ISD mentioned above (staff members of rehabilitation centres staff members within the PI, public prosecutors, judges). Several topics were discussed with these people, such as the target groups, the intake, the different parts of the programme and the realization of the cooperation. Further information of the former SOV has been based on the process evaluation of the SOV (Van 't Land et al 2005). Quantitative data about the intake of former SOV and ISD have been gathered through the Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen. A file of Reclassering Nederland in which the RISc data of detained people has been collected, has been used for a description of the characteristics of the people participating in the ISD programme.

According to both the policy makers that were interviewed and the policy documents, the most important differences between the former SOV and the current ISD are: the wider target group of the ISD measure (also includes people who are not addicted to drugs, women and people with psychiatric problems), the higher detention capacity, the RISc screening to determine the factors that may lead to criminal behaviour, a flexible availability of interventions aimed at changing a person's behaviour in order to eliminate factors that may lead to criminal behaviour, and an improved observance of the national scope of chain collaboration for the intake (case discussions). All this leads to the following presumed surplus value of the ISD in comparison to the former SOV: a. Intake: more people effected by the measures, b. Target group: wider group of those effected by the measure and a more systematic screening of those effected by the measure; c. Supply: increased participation, interventions and a more flexible supply, and d. Organisation: stronger (feedback to the) chain for (legal) support and improved cooperation within these chains.

In real terms, it turns out that the presumed surplus value sometimes occurs and sometimes does not occur. As far as the *intake* is concerned, it turns out that the number of people effected by the measure is higher than for ISD. However, after a period of almost two years, the degree of utilization for ISD is almost the same compared to the same period for SOD. In general, the *target group* for ISD has become wider: the measure is also imposed on women and people with psychiatric problems. However, the intended expansion to non addicted persons has hardly been put into practice yet. Contrary to the former SOV measure, those effected by the ISD measure are systematically screened with the help of RISc. As far as the *supply* is concerned, bottlenecks are experienced with regards to the ISD measure in the connection between the intramural phase and the extramural phase (in particular the toilsome intake and stay in follow-up institutions), dealing with the psychiatric problems of those effected by the measure, the actual supply of modules in the PI and the limited capacity of those effected by the measure. Nevertheless, by those involved the supply is generally experienced as more flexible. As far as the *organisation* is concerned, both the stronger (feedback to the) chain of (legal) support and the improved cooperation within these change are experienced as such by those involved. However, the system of the so-called dual moment is not appreciated by everyone.

