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Current situation

Advisory panel since 2006
• Six members
• External
• Experts on
  ➢ Program activity
  ➢ Cognitive theory
  ➢ Research and evaluation

No scoring system – consensus
Advise – not accredit
The Panel’s tasks

- To give recommendations to the directorate on whether to accredit, preliminarily accredit or not accredit the program

- To deliver a preliminary assessment of programs that are proposed to be introduced in corrections
The Secretariat’s tasks

- Prepare cases for the panel
- Make a pre-assessment of the application as to whether it fulfills the basic requirements to be presented for the panel. If this should not be the case, points of improvement must be described and reported back to the applicants
- Propose to the directorate to have certain programmes apply for accreditation
Eight criteria for accreditation

1. A clear theory-based model of change
2. Target group selection
3. Targeting dynamic criminogenic factors
4. Effective methods
5. Skills oriented
6. Pedagogical aspects: sequence, duration, intensity
7. Program integrity and quality-control
8. Regular evaluation
Share of accredited programs (45%) and participants (32 %) unchanged from 2010 to 2011

- Programs:
  - General: 26%
  - Accredited: 27%

- Participants:
  - General: 25%
  - Accredited: 14%
Available programs

- Motivator (acc.)
- Stop Crime (acc.)
- Dad in prison (acc.)
- Women’s program (acc.)
- Sexual offenders (acc.)
- Coping with anger (acc.)
- Drug program NSAP (acc.)
- One to one (acc.)

- **Alternative to violence**
  - Traffic and drugs
  - Coping with stress
  - Building confidence
  - Traffic and speed
  - My choice
  - Drugs in prison
The case of Alternative to Violence

Developed by private foundation

Based on group discussions
Relatively many trainers
Relatively many deliveries
Dedicated and enthusiastic “congregation”

Rejected categorically by the panel:
• Not a program

→ Imminent need for a solution:

A working group!
Challenges and questions

- What do we do with non-accredited programs?
- How do we stimulate the use of accredited programs?
- How to avoid that accreditation has an inhibiting effect on program development and use?
- How broad should the definition of a program be?
- Should the working area of the panel be extended?
GENERAL OBJECTIVE: BEHAVIOUR CHANGE?

YES: PROGRAM

THEORETICAL BASIS (1)

EVIDENCE BASE (4)

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE (3)

TARGET GROUP (2)

METHOD (5,6)

EXPLANATION (1)

PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE (4)

EFFECT (8)

NO: INTERVENTION
Programs and case-management

- New assessment system
  - Refer to certain interventions
  - Professional, «clinical» judgment
- Embed in daily practice
  - Case-management
  - Making staff conscious
  - Programs in different settings
    - In prison
    - Community sentence
    - Electronic monitoring
    - Early release
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