



Netherlands Institute for the Study
of Crime and Law Enforcement

Enhanced Supervision of Juvenile HIC-Offenders

Summary

*Sjoukje van Deuren
Peter van der Laan
Frank Weerman*

Amsterdam, 2018

NSCR is part of the Institutes Organisation of the
Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

T +31(0)20 59 85 239

E nscr@nscr.nl

www.nscr.nl/en/

Summary

A pilot with enhanced supervision is part of a broader plan of action to prevent recidivism and stimulate resocialization of juvenile offenders of *High Impact Crimes* (HIC). Examples of HIC-offenses are mugging, robberies and home burglaries. Promising recidivism figures for adult perpetrators in the past, were reason to start a pilot 'enhanced supervision' of juvenile HIC-offenders.¹ Examples of enhanced supervision are electronic monitoring, a curfew, compulsory schooling, treatment and a contact ban.

Although enhanced supervision implies an intensive approach in combination with various measures, the focus of the pilot was on electronic monitoring. One of the objectives of the pilot is to examine if and how electronic monitoring - by means of the RfiD or the GPS ankle bracelet - can contribute to reduce recidivism and stimulate resocialization of juvenile HIC-offenders. The target group of the pilot consisted of juvenile repeat offenders of home burglaries and *first offenders*, repeat offenders of mugging and robberies. Starting point of the pilot is to consider enhanced supervision - with electronic monitoring - at all times for juvenile HIC-offenders. The pilot was conducted in Rotterdam, Central Netherlands and Amsterdam. Involved actors were the Dutch Probation Service, the Public Prosecutor, the Council for Child Care and Protection, Certified Institutes (organizations for juvenile probation), the police and municipalities.

The Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR), commissioned by the Research and Documentation Centre (WODC) of the Ministry of Justice and Security, conducted a process evaluation of the pilot. One of the objectives was to examine the impact of enhanced supervision on recidivism and resocialization. A main goal of the research project was to examine whether enhanced supervision was implemented according to the pilot memo 'Enhanced supervision of juvenile HIC-offenders' and to what extent an effectiveness study and implementation evaluation is possible. Another goal was to examine any bottlenecks and possible improvements in the implementation practice.

¹ Tweede Kamer 2014/15, 28741, 25

Research approach

The study examined the following questions: *is the pilot enhanced supervision implemented as intended by the pilot memo 'Enhanced supervision of juvenile HIC-offenders', and to what extent are there any bottlenecks and improvements possible in the implementation practice?* Finally, the process evaluation aimed to provide insight into the question *to what extent is an effectiveness study and impact evaluation possible according to the conditions of the pilot?*

Various research methods were applied. First of all, figures on the inflow of the pilot were requested from multiple organizations in participating regions. These figures varied greatly by region. The pilot in Rotterdam was well documented, whereas Central Netherlands and Amsterdam only partly documented the pilot. Furthermore, interviews (21) were conducted with staffs of the Dutch Probation Service, The Public Prosecutors, Council for Child Care and Protection, Certified Institutes and the police. In addition, interviews were held with two juveniles who were under enhanced supervision. Unfortunately, no more than two juveniles were willing to participate in an interview. Due to incomplete or even absent figures and a time-consuming process to get permission, files and reports of the Public Prosecutor and Council for Child Care and Protection were not available for analysis.

Results

Rotterdam

The pilot in Rotterdam was coordinated by 'Veiligheidshuis Rotterdam-Rijnmond'.² Although the focus of the pilot was on electronic monitoring, Rotterdam extended enhanced supervision with measures such as curfew and mandatory schooling. Enhanced supervision in Rotterdam included checking what kind of intensive measures were needed to reduce recidivism and stimulate resocialization of juveniles. This broad approach in Rotterdam was related to the fact that prior to the pilot, electronic monitoring was hardly used as a sentence modality for juvenile offenders and organizations such as the Council for Child Care and Protection and the Public Prosecutor had their doubts about electronic monitoring, not being pedagogically justified for juveniles. Public prosecutors

² 'Veiligheidshuis' is a so-called Safety House in which relevant partners such as the Prosecutor's Office, probation Service, local government and others cooperate to ensure security in the region.

were reluctant, because of negative experiences with electronic monitoring in the past. In addition, some actors were not convinced that electronic monitoring is a good punishment modality for juveniles. In order to create support for the pilot, other (intensive) measures were also used as enhanced supervision.

Methods implemented in Rotterdam met the conditions in the pilot memo.

However, there were some deviations from original regional methods. Initial contra-indications were gradually released. For example, electronic monitoring was also imposed at youngsters under the age of 16 who and juveniles dealing with mental problems or intellectual disabilities. Therefore, the target group in Rotterdam did not only consisted of juvenile HIC-offenders. It was also imposed on juvenile offenders of arson, attempted murder and sexual offenses.

In 2016, there were 325 cases in which juveniles were suspected of a HIC-offense (269 unique persons). Juveniles were mainly suspected of mugging (122 times) and home burglaries (75 times). In 2017, there were 266 cases in which juveniles were suspected of a HIC-offense (239 unique persons). Juveniles were mainly suspected of mugging (141 times), and robbery with violence (40 times). Electronic monitoring was imposed 26 times in 2017, compared to 11 times in 2016. Electronic monitoring was mainly imposed for home burglaries (14 times), mugging (14 times) and robberies (7 times). Electronic monitoring in Rotterdam was only imposed on boys. Two juveniles, who were interviewed, were relatively negative about electronic monitoring. Their complaints were related to charging times (three hours a day) and skin irritations. They were also ashamed of wearing an electronic device. The two juveniles also reported positive comments, because electronic monitoring – and week schedules - offered them structure and a possibility to go to school.

Central Netherlands

The pilot in Central Netherlands was coordinated by the Council for Child Care and Protection. Electronic monitoring was, prior to the pilot, to a small extent already imposed at juveniles with the age of 16 years. A new feature was electronic monitoring being used for juvenile HIC-offenders under the age of 16 years. There was also resistance to electronic monitoring in Central Netherlands. Several actors considered electronic monitoring too heavy to impose at very young juveniles. As a result, certain elements of the regional procedures were

vulnerable. For example, it is unknown whether electronic monitoring always considered and advised for juvenile HIC-offenders. This seems especially the case for first offenders. Organizations, like the Public Prosecutor, were of the opinion that other punitive measures should be taken into account first. Therefore, it is doubtful whether the pilot in Central Netherlands reached the intended target group. Disappointments with the progress of the pilot were noticeable. Not every actor seemed to feel the need of a pilot underlining the importance of support and dedication prior to and during a pilot. Moreover, due to capacity problems, the pilot was largely not monitored. According to numbers of the Dutch Probation Service, electronic monitoring was imposed 34 times in 2017 (32% of the 107 juvenile HIC-offenders), mainly on juveniles of aged 16 (12 times), 17 (10 times) and 18 (7 times). GPS-technology was used 12 times and RfiD-technology was used 21 times. In one occasion, both types of technology were used.

Amsterdam

The pilot in Amsterdam was coordinated by the Council for Child Care and Protection. Prior to the pilot, electronic monitoring was already used as a sentence modality for juveniles but since the introduction of the pilot also on juvenile HIC-offenders under the age of 16. According to regional procedures, employees of the Council for Child Care and Protection should motivate why a positive or negative advice regarding electronic monitoring was issued. However, from the interviews it can be concluded that reports were sometimes incomplete and could not be checked for completeness due to capacity problems. The target group in Amsterdam reached was greater than originally considered. The option of electronic monitoring did not only depend on type of criminal offense, but also on the number of criminal offenses.

In 2016, there were 492 cases in which juveniles were suspected of a HIC-offense. In 2017, the number increased to 352 cases. In 2016, the Council for Child Care and Protection only requested so-called partial advice on electronic monitoring in 21 cases (4% of all 492 juvenile HIC-offenders) and in 2017 in 63 cases (18% of all 352 HIC-offenders. How many partial advices resulted into electronic monitoring remains unknown. According to staff interviewed, this was due to a lack of investments (personnel, money) in registration. The Council for

Child Care and Protection and other organizations may have had too little room and time to conduct the pilot next to their usual activities. Organizations and staff involved in the pilot expressed the need for more information on the functional elements of electronic monitoring: what does it look like, what modalities are available, and what is (im)possible. Moreover, magistrates would like to have more information about the possibilities of electronic monitoring.

Implementation, bottlenecks and cooperation

Bottlenecks in implementation and cooperation occur to a greater or lesser extent in the three regions. Visions of the parties involved about electronic supervision do not always correspond. For example, in case of rapid follow-up of violations of the conditions, the visions of certified institutions (juvenile probation) and the Probation Service will sometimes conflict with each other. The Probation Service expects a decisive action in violation of the rules, while certified institutions believe that young people should be given the opportunity to learn from their mistakes. This may mean that a young person goes wrong four, five or even six times before a report is made. Another bottleneck - and also possible improvement - is the use of the information possibilities of an ankle band. The knowledge and information that, for example, a GPS ankle band can deliver are not optimally used by the parties involved. There is often a lot of useful information at the Probation Service. Information about the whereabouts of a young person is not only valuable when checking the conditions; it is possible to check where a young person often ends (school, sports clubs).

Furthermore, organizations emphasize the importance of communication. Not all partner organizations are equally well aware of the (im)possibilities of electronic monitoring. Communication also seems to run through multiple and sometimes different people, which is at the expense of decisiveness. Such bottlenecks can arise from a lack of sensitivity; every chain partner must understand that all links in the process are necessary to achieve a successful pilot. There are also indications that communication between partners has improved in the course of the pilot. This has led to parties finding each other better and easier; this has improved cooperation during the pilot. Interim discussions on bottlenecks, visions and expectations have contributed to an improved cooperation between

the chain partners in the three regions. Cooperation is now rated as good in the three regions.

Finally, continuous attention for the pilot is important. Due to organizational changes - for example the emergence of self-organizing teams at the Council for Child Care and Protection - the pilot did not always stand on the retina of the parties involved. Moreover, organizations such as the Council for Child Care and Protection and certified institutions have had to deal with the necessary personnel changes. Some interviewees in Central Netherlands and Amsterdam indicated that they would rather have seen another organization as the coordinator of the pilot. This has been confirmed by the Council for Child Care and Protection. The question is whether the Council had enough time for the coordinator's role and could give sufficient attention to the pilot.

Conclusion

In all regions, work paths have been drawn up which stipulate that by default electronic monitoring is considered by the Council for Child Care and Protection with a juvenile offender of an HIC fact. Due to incomplete records, it is not possible to determine how the process of imposing electronic supervision in the pilot has worked. Nor can it be determined whether the juveniles are under electronic supervision in accordance with the criteria. Based on the current registration data, it cannot be determined whether the pilot meets the preconditions of the pilot memo. It remained unclear when enhanced supervision was considered. Registrations in Central Netherlands show that electronic supervision has been considered to a very limited extent for juvenile HIC-offenders. Moreover, the regions still seem reluctant to impose electronic supervision on first-offenders and young people under the age of 16. Interviews also suggest that figures - particularly in Central Netherlands and Amsterdam - are (far) lagging behind expectations.

An effectiveness study is currently not obvious. For such a study, it is important that the pilot is carried out in accordance with the agreements and preconditions set. Moreover, it is important that the policy surrounding the pilot is clear to everyone. Due to organizational changes this does not seem to be the case. An effectiveness study is not obvious, but is not necessarily impossible. Assuming

there is a restart of the pilot in which there is sound and complete registration of the process of imposing electronic supervision and also taking into account the necessary conditions of an effectiveness study, the evaluation of such an experiment should be possible. At the moment, the situation is not like that.

The process evaluation has shown a number of aspects that are important in the proper execution of a pilot. First, central management - where there is sufficient time and resources - is crucial for carrying out a pilot. The central management position of the 'Veiligheidshuis (Safety House) in Rotterdam has most probably contributed to the pilot in this region getting off the ground considerably better than in Central Netherlands and Amsterdam. In Central Netherlands and Amsterdam, it lacked (large) partly continuous central control and sufficient financial resources, so that attention and dedication were not present from the start.