SUMMARY

Introduction

Since 1997 several experiments have been started in more locally organized and oriented offices of justice, in which there is a close contact between the public prosecutor and the police on one side and the rehabilitation workers on the other hand. Based upon these experiments, a policy was formulated in 2004, called 'Justitie in de Buurt - nieuwe stijl" (Justice in the Neighborhood - new style, hereafter referred to as JiB-new style). Between 2004 and 2007 this JiB-new style policy resulted in the establishment of several so-called "veiligheidshuizen". The Dutch government intends to create an nationwide network of about 35 veiligheidshuizen. In 2008 the scientific research department of the Dutch Ministry of Justice asked Adviesbureau Van Montfoort to conduct a reconstruction of the policy theory and a process evaluation of the Veiligheidshuizen.

Research goals and methods

The following research questions are leading for this study:

− How are the 'veiligheidshuizen' organized and what methods do they practice?
− To what extend are the varying ways of organization and methods consistent with the reconstructed policy theory?
− To what extend do the results contribute to the policy goals of JiB-new style?
− Which factors of success and failure have contributed to the results of the 'veiligheidshuizen'?

Several methods are used in this study. *First* of all a reconstruction of the policy theory is made, based upon a study of relevant documents (memo's, internal and external policy papers, discussion papers of the House of Parlement, et cetera) and interviews with policymakers. This reconstruction is not based upon scientific models, it aims to give a comprehensive understanding of aims and methods. The interrelations in the model should be logical and explicable. *Secondly*, a two-step process evaluation was conducted. In the first step of this evaluation the response of a representative proportion of seventeen 'veiligheidshuizen' to a general and specific questionnaire (response rates 74% and 65%) was analyzed. The second step focused on a selection of seven 'veiligheidshuizen', each participating in three interviews. These interviews gave a more in-depth-picture of the working practice of the cooperating partners of the 'veiligheidshuizen'. Among the three interviews were two individual interviews (with the managing director or coordinator and with the project leader of one selected project) and one group interview with all the workers of the participating organizations on the executive level of the selected project. A last research method consisted of the analyses of all relevant documents of the 'veiligheidshuizen'.

Reconstruction of the policy theory

The policy behind the 'veiligheidshuizen' that are in operation in 2008 has not been made explicit in concrete policy documents. The policy is a result of a political process that is founded in JiB-Old Style (before 2003) and in JiB-New Style (after 2003). The reconstruction shows that in the past decade the

policy developed in new goals and resulted in cooperation of justice and non-justice partners. The reconstruction of the policy of the 'veiligheidshuizen' results in a model that enhances the implicit policy goals and all instruments used to reach these goals and its underlying processes. Figure 3.1 shows the resulting policy model. In the chapters 5 and 6 two counter figures are presented from the conclusions of this study.

In the policy model the implicit policy goals are a personalized approach and a shorter period for the results to emerge. This second goal is divided into shorter throughput time and earlier problem recognition in neighborhoods'. The implicit final goal to be reached is the improvement of results. This fairly global formulation is in the model specified as the reduction of recidivism as the final goal. In the policy of JiB-Old Style two other goals had a central position. The first goal was increasing the visibility of justice (i.c. the prosecutors) by deconcentration and restoration of faith in justice and police. The second goal was to reduce the feelings of insecurity among the public. The main instrument to reach these goals lies in the cooperation of professionals within the same building: frequent contact between these professionals promotes mutual trust and this results in more information exchange. Eventually resulting in more easily intelligence sharing. This also provides the choice between more diverse reaction opportunities (i.c. interventions), enabling to react more specific to individual problems in specific cases. The fact that several justice organizations work closely together with care institutions on the executive level furthermore provides the opportunity to combine justice- with care-instruments in these personalized interventions.

Conclusions
In January 2008 the Netherlands counts 29 veiligheidshuizen. There is a variety in types of organization of these 'veiligheidshuizen'. The control over the policy of these 'veiligheidshuizen' can be in hands of both the local municipalities, the public prosecutor's office or a combination of both. More recently started 'veiligheidshuizen' are mainly managed by local authorities (most of the times in close cooperation with justice). Three variants of organization can be distinguished. The first, the sectoral variant which is mainly 'justice-driven' is not consistent with the policy theory and since January 2009 no longer exists. The second, the intersectoral 'veiligheidshuizen' are consistent with the theory. Both sectors (justice and care) work closely together. The third is the integral variant. Here the local authorities are leading and local new themes are added. This variant is also mostly consistent with the reconstructed policy theory. In both the second and third variant, the control can be in hands of justice but also shared control (justice and local authorities) is applied.
The' veiligheidshuizen' work primarily on the three main themes: youth, recidivists and domestic violence. But the scope is broader than that: a total of 93 subjects is mentioned by the 'veiligheidshuizen'. The number of partners that participate in a single theme, varies between four to twelve. Especially mental health institutions are in some 'veiligheidshuizen' a crucial partner and in other they are needed but not yet a member of the network.
The central method is the use of inter disciplinary teams for screening and action. The research shows that, as was expected, the use of a shared building where representatives of the participating

organisations have their own working place is crucial to make the cooperation work. All the hypotheses in respect with the mechanisms of cooperation mentioned in the reconstructed policy theory are confirmed. Coordinating actions are found to be crucial. And because all the relevant intelligence is shared and weighed by experts that look from a different point of view a really focussed approach of problems in individual cases is possible.

One of the crucial factors in 'veiligheidshuizen' are the professionals that work here. We can conclude that the domain of the 'veiligheidshuizen' are no longer the neighbourhood, a broader regional scope is chosen in 'veiligheidshuizen'.

The policy goal of achieving shorter throughput time, is not seen in the practice of most 'veiligheidshuizen' although some (the more justice driven) are likely to give more importance to this goal and measure progress of this goal as well. Earlier problem recognition is an important goal in theory but in practice few 'veiligheidshuizen' mention this goal explicitly. It seems that this goal is not so easily brought to practice. The most important aspect of the method is clearly that the cooperation brings about more personalized interventions. We can't investigate if final goals are achieved yet as few 'veiligheidshuizen' use explicitly formulated SMART-goals and there is a lack of insight in clear and measured achievements. Nevertheless there is important interdisciplinary cooperation between justice- and care-institutions on the executive level. This shows that 'veiligheidshuizen' are important network organizations where effective responses to criminality on the level of individual cases can be developed.