



REGIOPLAN
BELEIDSONDERZOEK



Assessment of small-scale detention facility pilot in Middelburg

- SUMMARY -

Authors

Marije Kuin
Britt van den Berg
Coco Bastiaansen
Niels Raaijmakers

Amsterdam, 10 september 2024
Publication no. 23055

© 2024; Regioplan. All rights reserved.

No part of this summary may be reproduced and/or published by printing, photocopying, microfilm, digital processing, or otherwise without the written permission of Regioplan.



REGIOPLAN
BELEIDSONDERZOEK

Summary

S

Summary

Background

The small-scale detention facility in Middelburg (*Kleinschalige Voorziening Middelburg, KVM*) is a pilot project that became operational in 2020. It is a detention facility for male self-reporters with a sentence of no more than one year, or with no more than one year remaining of their sentence. The detention facility is aimed at self-reporters who, prior to detention, were working toward full integration in society without offending, and who are motivated to continue doing so during their detention. At KVM, retribution — as an aim of punishment — is combined with retention of positive life domains. To ensure this is the case, self-reporters are given the option to continue their work or other meaningful and structured daily activities during their detention. This enables self-reporters to retain their income, pay their bills, continue any treatment they are receiving and maintain their social network. In doing so, KVM seeks to limit the harmful effect detention has on offenders given short sentences as much as possible. The expectation is that the ability to retain protective factors, such as work or education, income, housing and healthcare, will reduce the chance of reoffending and will promote reintegration after detention. On top of that, this system also helps prevent extra costs to society, such as aftercare programmes, benefits or housing. See Section 2 for more information on the background and purpose of KVM.

KVM is one of five pilots set up within the 'Local and flexible detention' innovation programme of Koers en Kansen [Direction and Opportunities], an element of the Ministry of Justice and Security. In 2021, Regioplan delivered planning and process assessments for these five pilots (hereinafter: the 2021 planning and process assessments).¹ In that publication, we drew up a planning assessment for KVM to provide insight into the structure of the pilot, the main and secondary objectives and the associated activities, the intake process, partnerships with other entities in the chain, the prerequisites and the effective and innovative elements. On top of that, we identified certain overarching obstacles, success points and learning points. This study builds on the findings from the 2021 planning and process assessments and provides insight into the population at KVM, the implementation of the project, people's experiences with it, and the resulting lessons as things stand in 2024.

KVM's pilot stage was concluded at the end of May 2024. The prisoners remaining at KVM at the end of May were allowed to stay at the facility up to the end of their detention. The self-reporters who had already been selected for a placement at KVM at that time were also allowed to complete their detention at the facility. A decision on whether to continue with this type of detention facility will be made at a later time.²

This section contains a summary and conclusion based on the study results. Before moving on to that, we will run through the objectives of the study and the research methods used in the paragraph below. We will then present the findings of the different elements of the study in the paragraphs that follow. This section then concludes with an overall conclusion and a reflection thereon.

Study objective and research methods

The objective of the study was to create a picture of the population at KVM, how the project was implemented, people's experiences with it, and the lessons that can be taken from it. To do so, we gained insight into the effective mechanisms of the small-scale, regional and open form of detention at KVM, we studied the demographics and living situation of the prisoners at KVM, we researched the experiences of professionals, current and former prisoners and other people involved in the project, we explored the evolution of KVM since 2021 and we took stock of any opportunities for KVM to improve and be continued. See Section 1 for a more detailed description of the research questions and study structure.

¹ Kuin, M., Verbeek, E., Mulder, E. and Homburg, G. (2021). *Evaluatie projecten 'Detentie lokaal en flexibel'*. [Assessment of 'Local and flexible detention' projects] The Hague/Amsterdam: WODC/Regioplan.

² Directorate-General for Sanctions and Protection (2024). *'6e voortgangsbrief Recht doen, kansen bieden.'* [Sixth Progress Update on 'Delivering justice, offering opportunities'.] The Hague: Ministry of Justice and Security.

To answer the research questions, the study started with a literature review, desk research and additional interviews. The **literature review** provided insight into the effective mechanisms, building on the 2021 planning and process assessment. **Desk research** created a clearer picture of how the insights from the academic literature on these effective mechanisms were applied in the context of KVM. To supplement the desk research, two **interviews** took place with the former project leader and project secretary at KVM.

Following this, we carried out a **case file and record analysis**. As part of this analysis, we collected data on the demographics of the population and the turnover at KVM. In preparation for the case file and records analysis, we set up a data frame with a list of indicators for which data were recorded from the case files. Using this data frame, we collected structured data from the case files for every prisoner who had been placed at KVM and had been discharged (both following completion of their detention period and following any transfer to intramural detention). Aggregate data were requested from the Custodial Institutions Agency (*Dienst Justitiële Instellingen, DJI*) on the demographics of the self-reporters placed at KVM and on the number of self-reporters who were called up to take part in the KVM project.

Following the case file and records analysis, sixteen **interviews** were held with professionals from different chain partners who were involved in KVM. These interviews offered insight into people's experiences with KVM. We interviewed professionals working for the following organisations: KVM, Central Judicial Collection Agency (*Centraal Justitiele Incassobureau, CJIB*), Individual Cases Division (*DIZ*) of the DJI, the Zeeland Care and Safety House (*Veiligheidshuis*), the Dutch Probation Service (*Reclassering*) and the Emergis mental health service. On top of that, six current and former prisoners were interviewed, and four interviews were held with current and former partners and one employer of these prisoners. These interviews provided insight into the experiences current and former prisoners and other people in their lives had with KVM.

Finally, a **validation meeting** took place. The department head of the location of KVM (De Nederhof) and the project secretary of KVM both attended this meeting. During this meeting, we discussed the completeness and recognisability of the preliminary findings and provided further clarification, and we explored the evolution with regard to the obstacles, successful elements and learning points in the 2021 planning and process assessment. Finally, any possible changes at KVM with a view to improving and continuing its working method were also covered during this validation meeting.

Effective mechanisms at KVM

The literature review offered insight into the effective mechanisms at small-scale, regional and open forms of detention. As part of this, we focused on the extent to which these insights from academic literature were applied at KVM. The findings from the literature review provided a response to our first research question:

1. What can the academic literature tell us about the effective mechanisms at small-scale, regional and open forms of detention? And to what extent were these insights applied at the KVM pilot?

The academic literature offered evidence for the effective mechanisms at small-scale, regional and open forms of detention:

- **the small-scale nature of detention facilities** has an impact on mental wellbeing by enabling a positive living environment;
- **the lower security level at a more open detention setting** has an impact on mental wellbeing by enabling a positive living environment;
- **a regional connection/detention close to someone's usual place of residence** has an impact on mental wellbeing through the opportunity to maintain a social network;
- **a job outside the facility and the ability to keep that job during detention** has an impact on staying in work after detention and mental wellbeing;

- the involvement of chain and collaborative partners in the detention process has an impact on finding or staying in work, the living situation of prisoners, their ability to get/keep their financial situation under control and their mental wellbeing;
- a positive living environment (i.e. a supportive, relational living environment) at the detention facility has an impact on mental wellbeing.

As such, it follows that a positive living environment at detention facilities is a mediating variable for the impact of small-scale detention facilities with a lower security level in a more open setting. The same applies to the impact of a regional connection/detention close to someone's usual place of residence: the impact of such a setting influences the mental wellbeing of prisoners through the resulting opportunity to maintain a social network.

A comparison between the insights from the literature and practical implementation at KVM showed that the effective elements were largely applied at KVM:

- **small-scale nature of detention facilities:** the way KVM has been set up shows that practical implementation of the KVM project is in line with the academic literature on small-scale detention facilities.
- **lower security level in a more open detention setting:** the setup and implementation of the KVM project, which is located outside the security perimeter of the correctional institution Middelburg, appear to be in line with the academic insights in this regard.
- **regional connection/detention close to someone's place of residence:** given the selection criteria for intake at KVM, the practical implementation of the KVM project appears to be in line with the literature on detention close to someone's place of residence in order to maintain a social network. No evidence was found in the literature on regional connections for the condition set by KVM from a practical perspective that any place of work must be located close to the project.
- **a job outside the facility and the ability to keep that job during detention:** as prisoners at KVM continue working outside the facility during their time there, the practical implementation of the KVM project appears to be in line with the academic literature on how working outside a facility during detention contributes to reintegration. No evidence was found in the literature for the knock-on effect of staying in work and retaining an income on other areas such as a healthy financial situation, both for the prisoner themselves, and by extension, their home situation/family.
- **involvement of chain and collaborative partners in the detention process:** the practical implementation of the KVM project appears to be in line with the insights from the academic literature on this point. Based on personal plans and partnerships with entities in the chain, support could be offered based on individual support requirements.
- **positive living environment (supportive relational living environment) at the detention facility:** the setting and working method at KVM appear to be in line with the academic literature on enabling a positive living climate at detention facilities.

Demographics and evolution of the population at KVM

General population demographics

The findings from the records analysis offer insight into various demographics of the population at KVM and its evolution over the period from 2021 to 2023. The outcome of the records analysis enables us to answer research question 2:

2. What are the demographics of the population and what is the turnover situation at KVM.
 - a. How many self-reporters were called up to take part in the KVM project? And how many prisoners has KVM hosted since the start of the pilot?
 - b. Which offences were the prisoners at KVM convicted of?
 - c. What is the average detention period that the prisoners at KVM were sentenced to?
 - d. How many prisoners spent their entire detention period at KVM?
 - e. How many prisoners were transferred to intramural detention later on?
 - f. What is the average time between receiving self-reporter status and being called up by the DJI for the prisoners at KVM?

Based on the records analysis, the following picture emerges:

- **General population demographics:** a quarter of the self-reporters referred to KVM by DIZ are effectively taken in by KVM, having completed the intake process in which they are assessed against KVM's admission criteria. In total, 40 prisoners were taken in over the period from 2020 to 2023. Data are available on the demographics of 34 of these people: they were all male, and more than half of them were born between 1980 and 2000.
- **Type of offence:** the most common offences of which prisoners at KVM were convicted were financial or property offences, followed by drugs offences and violence/crimes against the public order. The remaining prisoners were placed at KVM following a conviction for a traffic offence or on the basis of the Weapons and Ammunition Act.
- **Detention period:** the average detention period the prisoners at KVM were sentenced to varied between 110 days (in 2022) and 171 days (in 2021). In 2023, the average detention period was 231 days, but this figure was skewed by a single relatively long custodial sentence. Disregarding that one sentence, the average detention period was 164 days in 2023.
- **Full detention period at KVM:** the vast majority of prisoners who have since left KVM completed their full detention period at KVM. As some of the prisoners taken in over the course of 2023 have not yet completed their sentences, the figure for that year is just a handful of prisoners.
- **Intramural detention:** five of the 34 prisoners were transferred to intramural detention during their time at KVM. These transfers to intramural detention were spread across the period from 2021 to 2023.
- **Time between callup and placement at KVM:** an average of thirteen days passed between a person being called up for placement at KVM and that person effectively being taken in. In 2022, this average stood at fifteen days, and for 2023, the average figure was ten days. The date on which self-reporter status was granted by the DJI is not known, meaning the average time between being granted self-reporter status and being called up for placement at KVM cannot be worked out.

Living situation at the time of intake and discharge

The findings from the case file analysis offer insight into the living situation of the self-reporters at KVM at the time of intake and discharge and their evolution with regard to the DJI life domains over the period between 2020 and 2023. The outcome of the case file analysis enables us to answer research question 3:

3. How did the living situation (work/income/housing/care etc.) and the DJI life domains of the self-reporters at KVM evolve between the moment they were taken in and discharged?

Based on the case files in which data were available on the living situation of prisoners at the time of intake and discharge, the following picture emerged:

- **Work and income:** all prisoners were in paid work at the time of intake and discharge and received their income exclusively from this job.
- **Debt:** around half of prisoners were in debt at the time of intake and discharge, while the other half were not. If no comprehensive plans had been made at the time of intake on how to settle this debt, this had been arranged at the time of discharge. For one prisoner, no details were available.
- **Housing:** nearly all prisoners had permanent housing arrangements at the time of intake and discharge. At the time of intake and discharge, a few prisoners had temporary housing arrangements or had no housing arrangements.
- **Care:** around two-thirds of prisoners were not receiving any form of care at the time of intake and discharge, and did not have any care requirements. For the one prisoner who did have care requirements but was not receiving any treatment at the time of intake, treatment had been organised by the time of discharge.
- **Social network:** nearly all prisoners had a supportive, prosocial network at the time of intake and discharge. A few prisoners did not have a supportive, prosocial network at the time of intake and discharge, because their family and friends were involved in criminal activity, for example. This remained unchanged during their time at KVM.

Based on the case file analysis, it appears that debt problems among prisoners being taken in since 2023 have increased compared to the intake prior to 2023. Furthermore, it appears that among these prisoners, a debt settlement plan — for part of their debt — was largely absent at the time of intake. The case file analysis did not reveal any other evolution over the years in terms of living situation or the DJI life domains.

Of the four prisoners who were still at KVM at the time of the case file analysis, the living situation at the time of intake appears to be similar overall to the prisoners who had been discharged by this point. Among the three prisoners who did not complete their full detention period at KVM due to being transferred to intramural detention, their situation at the time of intake appeared to be relatively unstable in terms of debt and/or care.

Evolution of DJI life domains

From the case files in which data were available on the DJI life domains at the time of intake and discharge, it appears that nearly all prisoners had valid proof of identity and health insurance, as well as the prospect of accommodation and income from paid work or benefits after discharge. Aside from that, there is a positive evolution between intake and discharge in terms of arrangements to settle any debts: nearly all prisoners who were in debt at the time of intake had a debt settlement plan in place at the time of discharge. No data is available on whether such a plan was in place for the other prisoners. For four prisoners, this was not the case at the time of intake. Most prisoners did not have any need for healthcare. When it comes to this life domain, the situation at the time of intake and discharge is broadly comparable. One prisoner who was not actively in treatment at the time of intake, was in treatment at the time of discharge.

For the four prisoners who were still at KVM at the time of the case file analysis, the situation in terms of the DJI life domains was largely comparable to the prisoners who had already been discharged. However, relatively often, they did not seem to have any prospect of accommodation after discharge, and they appeared to have relatively significant debt problems (without any settlement plan in place). Among the three prisoners who were transferred to intramural detention during their time at KVM, the picture is similar to those who were discharged directly from KVM, except for the fact that for two prisoners with debts, no settlement plan was in place at the time of intake at KVM.

Overall conclusion from the case file analysis

The picture that emerged from the case file analysis is one of a group of prisoners who largely had their lives in order prior to detention. Generally speaking, they had jobs, an income, a home and a social network they could rely on when necessary, for example. Aspects such as proof of identity and health insurance had also generally been sorted by the time they arrived at KVM. When they left KVM, they were generally able to maintain this stable situation.

In terms of healthcare and debt, the situation of the prisoners was clearly less stable at their time of intake at KVM. A minority of prisoners at KVM had care requirements at the time of intake, but if no treatment had been arranged to address these at that time, arrangements for such treatment had been made by the time they were discharged. Furthermore, around half of prisoners had debts at the time of intake that had not been settled by the time they left KVM. Compared to the other life domains, debt was the domain in which the greatest amount of progress was achieved during the prisoners' time at KVM: if no comprehensive debt settlement plan was in place at the time of intake, such a plan was in place for nearly all prisoners by the time they left KVM. This element of KVM is all the more significant in light of the rise in debt problems among prisoners taken into KVM since 2023 for whom no debt settlement plan was in place at that time.

Practical implementation and experiences

The experiences of professionals

The findings from the interviews with professionals offer insight into their experiences with KVM. The outcome of these interviews enables us to answer research questions 4 and 7:

4. What are the experiences of professionals with KVM? This includes their experiences with the process, partnerships and policy developments, for example.
 7. How do the living situations and experiences referred to in questions 3, 4, 5 and 6 relate to the population and turnover of KVM prisoners in question 2?
- **General experience with value added by KVM:** the professionals are generally positive about both the basic principles of KVM and the implementation of the project in practice. Professionals could see that placement at KVM had a positive effect on the lives of prisoners. All professionals felt that the ability for prisoners to keep their jobs during their detention period at KVM contributed to a reduction in the harm done by detention, and probably the reoffending rate too.
 - **Experiences with the intake process:** generally speaking, all professionals had a positive experience with the intake process and the various steps this process involved. Some respondents expressed concerns about whether sufficient efforts were made to refer self-reporters to KVM and about consistency in the application of the admission requirements for placement at KVM.
 - **Experiences with partnerships:** during the intake process in particular, KVM works with partners in the chain to carry out a prescreening. All respondents experienced the collaboration needed to carry out this prescreening as pleasant and constructive. The fixed points of contact at the chain partners and KVM contributed to this, according to the respondents. Some professionals would have liked more feedback from KVM about whether or not prisoners were placed at KVM following the prescreening process.
 - **Experiences with achieving objectives:** all professionals working at KVM felt that the 'continuity of work, meaningful daily activities, training or care' objective was being achieved by all prisoners at KVM. If prisoners were in debt prior to detention, the respondents working at KVM felt that these debts did not get worse, but instead continued to be paid off. The professionals working at KVM barely experienced any issues in this regard. According to all professionals working at KVM, prisoners were generally motivated to work on a future without offending. The professionals felt the form of detention at KVM and its location delivered a positive contribution to this.
 - **Policy and social developments with regard to KVM:** all respondents felt that the combination of a limited security ward (*Beperkt Beveiligde Afdeling, BBA*) and the KVM project at the same site and the broadening of the conditions for placement at the BBA had no negative effect on the prisoners at KVM. They did not witness any problems in practice, and the professionals even believe that these two groups were learning from one another. In addition, the professionals believe KVM may offer a solution for the temporary enforcement of the detention of self-reporters, given the current nationwide issue of prison overcrowding. So far, plenty of spaces have been available at KVM, meaning placement at KVM would offer a solution for self-reporters to complete their custodial sentences in the short term.
 - **Demographics of the KVM population in relation to implementation and experiences:** the validation meeting revealed that the specific demographics of the population at KVM had an impact on the implementation of the project and people's experiences with it. The main thing contributing to the different experiences at KVM was the offending history of the prisoners: first-time offenders need a relatively long period of time to get used to being at KVM compared to the prisoners at KVM who had already completed a sentence in a closed setting. How KVM compares to a regular, closed setting is less palpable to them, and the remnants of 'jail culture' brought in by BBA inmates at KVM are more disconcerting to first-time offenders. On the other hand, the time spent at KVM appeared to be mentally tougher for prisoners who had previously spent time in a regular, closed detention setting. This can be attributed to the open, extramural character of KVM, compared to the relatively straightforward environment in a regular, closed setting.

Experiences of current and former prisoners and other people in their lives

The findings from the interviews with current and former prisoners and other people in their lives offer insight into their experiences with KVM. The outcome of these interviews enables us to answer research questions 5 and 6:

5. What are the experiences of prisoners with KVM? This includes their experience with keeping their jobs, maintaining social contact and reoffending.
 6. What are the experiences of other people involved with KVM? This includes their experience with keeping their jobs, maintaining social contact and reoffending.
- **General experience with the value added by KVM:** current and former prisoners had a positive experience with KVM, especially when comparing their experience at KVM with their actual or likely experience in a regular, closed detention setting. The main reason for their positive experience with KVM is that they were partially able to continue their normal lives during detention, by keeping their income and maintaining contact with family and friends. The other people in the lives of current and former prisoners also rated their experience with KVM as positive. Time spent at KVM reduced the concerns detention brings with it for the partners of prisoners. This includes practical concerns, such as concerns regarding finance, and concerns about the mental wellbeing of current and former prisoners.
 - **Experiences with keeping jobs:** all current and former prisoners were in paid work during their time at KVM. All the current and former prisoners were able to keep the job they had at the time of arrival at KVM without any problems. The current and former prisoners were less positive about communication with regard to the rules for keeping their jobs while at KVM. Around half of current and former prisoners found that the rules had changed during their time at KVM, and that they did not have a clear understanding of which rules were in place. Other people in the lives of current and former prisoners were positive about the prisoners' ability to keep their jobs. Even so, some of them also back the view that communication with regard to the rules for staying in work while at KVM was unclear.
 - **Experiences with maintaining social contact:** all former and current prisoners had a positive experience with maintaining social contact during their time at KVM, mainly because they were allowed to keep their phones with them all day long. Aside from the ability to maintain contact, current and former prisoners and their partners felt it was nice that they could reach out to the prisoners at any time. This constant option of contact, which is not available in a regular, closed setting, served to reduce stress and worries. If necessary, the staff at KVM offered support to re-establish and/or maintain a social network. They did so by helping prisoners apply for privileges to visit family members, or by starting conversations about re-establishing or maintaining ties with family members and friends.
 - **Experience with KVM support and reoffending:** the current and former prisoners indicated that they had little or no need for support from KVM with regard to the DJI life domains. As a point for improvement, they and the other people in their lives mentioned communication about the rules with regard to work, extramural privileges and visiting arrangements. All of the current and former prisoners and the other people in their lives believe the chance that they, their current or former partners or their employees will reoffend to be small to non-existent.

Evolution compared to the outcome of the 2021 planning and process assessment and further evolution

The outcome of the interviews and the validation meeting offers insight into the opportunities for improvement and continuation of KVM's working method and into the evolution of the obstacles, successful elements and learning points identified in the 2021 planning and process assessment. This enables us to answer research questions 8 and 9:

8. Which evolution has taken place in view of the obstacles, successful elements and learning points identified in the 2021 planning and process assessment?
9. Which changes are needed to improve or continue KVM's working method?

- **Obstacle – Intake process:** starting in 2021, the intake process was amended to better align with the working method of KVM and the regular operating procedures of DIZ. No issues have been reported with the intake process since.
- **Obstacle – Capacity and cofinancing of collaborative partners:** the commitment required from collaborative partners for the implementation of the KVM project can be delivered by these parties within the current working method. No financial contribution is required from KVM's collaborative partners.
- **Obstacle – Reaching out to the target group:** KVM, DIZ and CJIB have not been able to identify any explanation for the fact that the number of potential participants is lower than expected in advance, at the time the project plan for KVM was drawn up. One thing that has been identified is a relatively low response rate from potential participants in the KVM project.
- **Obstacle – Alignment with operating procedures of judicial partners:** prior to its opening, KVM reached agreements with DJI to overcome this obstacle.
- **Successful element – Early involvement of collaborative partners:** the focus group of collaborative partners (at board level) meets several times every year. The engagement of the collaborative partners is embedded in this focus group.
- **Successful element – Emphasis on protective factors:** KVM's working method, in which retribution is combined with retention and strengthening of protective factors, has constantly been developed since KVM opened.
- **Learning point – Intensive early-stage partnerships:** the partnerships with chain partners have been continued and expanded since the opening of KVM.
- **Learning point – Joint monitoring:** with regard to joint monitoring, the focus group meets on a regular basis, and the implementation of KVM is regularly assessed together with its collaborative partners.
- **Learning point – Cooperation with national judicial parties:** this learning point is no longer applicable, as KVM has been operational since 2020 and agreements on its cooperation with national judicial parties were made in advance.
- **Learning point – Solid foundation for project plan:** this learning point mainly pertained to the period in which the project plan for KVM was drawn up. As such, this learning point is no longer relevant at this time.

Potential changes to improve or continue KVM's working method

Communication and provision of information

- **More feedback to chain partners about the intake process:** no feedback is currently provided to employees of chain partners involved in KVM with regard to the placement of prisoners at KVM. Such feedback would give partners the opportunity to further optimise the requested checks for contraindications as part of the prescreening process.
- **Provision of information to employers:** the KVM could point employers toward sources of information or organisations that may support them with any employment law questions they may have about the consequences of employing a prisoner.

Monitoring the purpose and setup of KVM

- **Monitoring of admission requirements for intake into KVM:** monitoring must take place to ensure that the prisoners selected for placement at KVM are suitable for a low-security setting and to ensure that these admission requirements are consistently applied.
- **Clear rules on extramural privileges:** KVM constantly seeks to strike a balance between deprivation of liberty and facilitating protective factors. In doing so, it is important that the rules on extramural privileges during any time at KVM are consistently applied and explained, so that prisoners remain motivated.
- **Combination of KVM and BBA:** the combination of the KVM project with a BBA could pose certain issues, due to differences in culture or differences in the rules for both settings, for example. To facilitate a positive living environment, it is important to remain alert to the group dynamic.

Consolidating KVM's working method

- Legal grounds for placement at KVM: as it stands, the law does not provide any grounds for being placed at KVM from a position of freedom. Once the pilot status comes to an end, legal grounds will need to be arranged for placement at KVM.
- Expansion to other locations: the KVM working method could also work in other locations. Focal points for expansion to other locations include the partnerships between the parties involved, the radius within which any workplace must be located, and the impact of external issues on the positive living environment within the detention facility.

Conclusion

The KVM pilot provides criminal justice for self-reporters in which retribution — as an aim of punishment — is combined with the promotion of protective factors to prevent reoffending. KVM seeks to achieve this by promoting reintegration, and by preventing the harm done by detention. This setup is being implemented in a small-scale, regional and open form of detention at which innovative elements are being applied, such as extramural job retention during detention.

Based on the academic literature, it can be concluded that the setup and working method of KVM contribute to promoting reintegration and preventing the harm done by detention via a range of effective elements. These effective elements are as follows: prisoners are able to keep their jobs, keep their financial situation under control, maintain their living situation, stay in any treatment they are receiving, and their mental wellbeing is improved through a positive living environment and the ability to maintain their social network. As a result, it is expected that the practical implementation of the KVM project will have a positive impact on preventing the harm done by detention among prisoners, on their reintegration after detention, and on reducing their reoffending rate when compared to a closed detention setting. On top of that, broad support for the setup and working method of the KVM project exists among the chain partners involved in the project.

Based on this study, it can also be concluded that the population of prisoners who have effectively spent time at KVM corresponds to the target population toward which the setup and working method of the KVM project is geared. KVM is intended for male self-reporters from the southwestern region of Netherlands who were in work prior to the enforcement of their detention. Around a quarter of the self-reporters who are eligible for KVM is effectively placed at KVM. In total, around 40 prisoners have been placed at KVM since it opened its doors in 2020. The intake criteria for placement at KVM naturally have an impact on the demographics of the prisoner population at KVM and any evolution in their living situation during their detention. The population appears to have their lives largely in order at the time of intake. During their time at KVM, part of the population actually makes progress by making arrangements to settle their debt, and by organising treatment.

The professionals, current and former prisoners and others involved in the project also feel that the practical implementation of the KVM project generally works as intended. Professionals mention constructive partnerships and an intake process that works well, and witnessed a population of prisoners who were motivated to work toward a future without offending during their time at KVM. Current and former prisoners mainly value the ability to keep their jobs during their detention period, and to maintain contact with their positive social network.

In addition, this assessment provides insight into the potential changes that might be made to improve or continue the way KVM works. In turn, that offers certain starting points for any future decision on whether to continue or further develop KVM or a similar small-scale, regional and open detention facility after the recent conclusion of KVM's pilot stage.

These potential changes that might be made to improve or continue the way KVM works are mainly geared toward further optimising communication and the provision of information to chain partners and employers, and monitoring the purpose and setup of KVM. The main precondition for continuing the

KVM project following conclusion of the pilot stage is a legal foundation for the placement of prisoners at KVM from a position of freedom. This ties in with the Sixth Progress Update on 'Delivering justice, offering opportunities', which states that legal avenues are being explored to gain insight into the way in which a legal framework can be provided for the KVM project to be continued. No such legal grounds were provided for during the pilot stage. Besides, it is advisable to secure the engagement of chain partners in the intake process as part of any broader application of the KVM working method, and to tailor the intake criteria for the area in which any job must be located and the mutual relationships between prisoners to each individual site.

Finally, what follows from this assessment is several focal points for any future follow-up study into KVM or similar small-scale, regional and open detention facilities. To gain insight once more in the future into the functioning of similar detention facilities, it is advisable to carefully consider the demographics of the population spending time at the detention facility. This assessment suggests that the setup and working method of KVM help prevent the harm done by detention and promoting the reintegration of a specific population of self-reporters. Were the population of KVM to change in practice, this would likely also impact the functioning of KVM. To gain insight into the demographics of the population at a detention facility in future, we recommend that any researchers focus expressly on the identification and collection of the case files and records of the prisoners placed at the facility. During this study, it proved impossible to include all case files and records of the prisoners placed at KVM in our research. As the outcome of the case file and records analysis provided a relatively uniform perspective on the demographics of the population, we expect this outcome to be reliable. However, the number of prisoners involved is relatively small, so inclusion of all case files and records in any future study is bound to improve the completeness and reliability of any findings.



REGIOPLAN
BELEIDSONDERZOEK

Regioplan
Jollemanhof 18
1019 GW Amsterdam, NL
Tel. +31 (0)20 531 5315
www.regioplan.nl