

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

WESP JEUGDZORG  
Componistenlaan 79-81  
2215 SP VOORHOUT  
T 0252-372053  
F 0252-371152  
E [jeugd zorg@wespweb.nl](mailto:jeugd zorg@wespweb.nl)  
*5012\subreport II*

*April 2004*

# **‘According to plan?’**

research into the plans and follow-up  
of Eigen-kracht conferences

(subreport 2)

## Colofon

Title: Eigen Kracht according to plan?  
Research into the plans and follow-up of Eigen-kracht conferences  
(subreport 2)

Author: Fiet van Beek, project manager of WESP

Commissioned by: OKS/WESP in cooperation with Eigen Kracht *Centrale*

Financed by: Stichting Kinderpostzegels The Netherlands, Leiden

Translator: Sonja Noorman

with thanks to: Cees Elzinga, Machteld Guijt, Alinda Hegger, Hannie van der Horst, Lineke Joanknecht, Jorien Meerdink, Rob van Pagée and the 29 Eigen-kracht coordinators who organized the first Eigen-kracht conferences in 2001/2002 in The Netherlands.

ISBN: 90-76027-37-4 (NUR: 840)

This report is part of a series of four researches into Eigen-kracht conferences in The Netherlands.

subreport 1: Eigen-kracht conferences, the first experiences in The Netherlands.

subreport 2: Eigen Kracht according to plan? Research into the plans and follow-up of Eigen-kracht conferences.

subreport 3: This is about my future, right? Research into the opinion of children and adolescents regarding Eigen-kracht conferences

subreport 4: Is this the future of child care? Research into the measure of satisfaction that (adult) participants derived from Eigen-kracht conferences.

Voorhout, April 2004

©2004 WESP BV

No part of this report may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from WESP BV.

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

This report and other reports from this series may be obtained from:

Bureau WESP  
Componistenlaan 79-81  
2215 SP VOORHOUT  
E: [jeugdzorg@wespweb.nl](mailto:jeugdzorg@wespweb.nl)  
F: 0252 - 37 11 52  
T: 0252 - 37 20 53

Eigen Kracht *Centrale*  
Componistenlaan 55a  
2215 SN Voorhout  
E: [kantoor1@planet.nl](mailto:kantoor1@planet.nl)  
F: 0252 - 22 52 29  
T: 0252 - 21 91 11

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Framework of the research.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	Introduction.....	6
1.2	Object.....	6
1.3	Research Questions.....	6
1.3.1	Research questions regarding the plans.....	7
1.3.2	Research questions regarding the execution of the plans.....	7
1.4	Research Method.....	8
1.4.1	Research method regarding the plans.....	8
1.4.2	Research method regarding the follow-up.....	10
1.5	Progress of the research.....	10
1.6	Terminology.....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Eigen-kracht conferences: the context.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The plans.....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Introduction.....	17
3.2	Background characteristics.....	17
3.2.1	Number of plans and non-response.....	17
3.2.2	Number, age, gender and ethnicity of the children.....	18
3.2.3	Number of family and social network members.....	18
3.2.4	Concerns and questions.....	18
3.2.5	Referrers.....	19
3.2.6	Region.....	20
3.3	Contents of the plans.....	20
3.3.1	Child raising.....	21
3.3.2	Social Network.....	24
3.3.3	Housing.....	26
3.3.4	Education.....	28
3.3.5	Leisure activities.....	29
3.3.6	Health.....	31
3.3.7	Finances.....	33
3.3.8	Employment.....	34
3.3.9	Juridicary.....	35
3.3.10	Miscellaneous.....	36
3.4	Change of residence.....	38
3.5	Evaluation.....	39
3.6	Emergency plan.....	39
<b>4</b>	<b>Follow-up after three months.....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1	Introduction.....	41
4.2	Background.....	41
4.3	Extent of execution of the plans.....	41

4.3.1	Child raising.....	42
4.3.2	Social Network.....	43
4.3.3	Housing.....	44
4.3.4	Education.....	45
4.3.5	Leisure activities.....	46
4.3.6	Health.....	47
4.3.7	Finances.....	48
4.3.8	Employment.....	49
4.3.9	Juridicary.....	50
4.3.10	Miscellaneous.....	50
4.4	Evaluation.....	51
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion and recommendations.....</b>	<b>52</b>
5.1	Conclusions.....	52
5.1.1	Introduction.....	52
5.1.2	Conclusions regarding the plans.....	52
5.1.3	Conclusions regarding the execution of the plans.....	54
5.2	Recommendations.....	56
<b>Annexes:</b>		
annex 1: Eigen-kracht 'plans, decisions and recommendations form'		
annex 2: Eigen Kracht 'follow-up of the registration after 3 months form' .....		
annex 3: Plan made by family X.....		
annex 4: Plan made by family Y.....		
annex 5: Plan made by family Z.....		
annex 6: General survey of executors of the agreements in the plans .....		
annex 7: General survey of the extent to which the plans were executed .....		
annex 8: General survey of reasons for not executing agreements .....		
annex 9: General survey of reasons for partially executing agreements.....		
<b>Bibliography.....</b>		

# 1 Framework of the research

## 1.1 Introduction

From the beginning of 2001 Eigen-kracht conferences are being held in the Netherlands at a limited scale. Eigen-kracht is a way of decision making, in which families decide for themselves what help and support they need to solve problems regarding children in their family (see also chapter 2). During this process there is close cooperation with a referring institution, but the plan is forged by the family, not by the professional. To execute this plan use is made of resources from within the family as well as from outside. Eigen-kracht is a Dutch name for 'family group conferencing'<sup>1</sup>. This is a new model for The Netherlands, but in New Zealand, Australia, the USA, Great Britain and Sweden it has been tried and successfully introduced. Implementing this model in The Netherlands will require a change of culture in child care (project proposal Eigen-kracht conference, 2000).

The research on Eigen-kracht conferences is small in volume, because of the limited number of conferences up to now. By processing data that were acquired during Eigen-kracht conferences in 2001 (van Beek, 2002), the first urgent questions regarding the course of action during the conferences have been answered. Nothing is known yet about the contents of the plans that were made by the families and their network, or about the way the plans worked out in the short term. What do families ask for? What do they need and from whom? To what extent are the plans executed? In order to implement the Eigen-kracht model it is important to gain more knowledge regarding these questions.

## 1.2 Object

The object of the research is to find out the contents of the plans that are made during Eigen-kracht conferences by family and network; and the extent to which they are executed.

## 1.3 Research Questions

The object of the research is twofold: define the contents of the plans and the extent to which they have been executed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Not to be confused with 'family network counselling' as described by Portengen, 2002.

### **1.3.1 Research questions regarding the plans**

The research questions regarding the plans are:

- What are the contents of the plan?
- What support, care and help requirement is formulated by the family?
- What resources does the family have?
- Which services are required from Child Care, according to the family?
- Which services are required from other sectors, like education and housing, according to the family?
- What sectors are mentioned?
- For how long is the service required? Temporary? Permanent?
- In what measure will family members be actively involved in the execution of the plans?
- For which matters is professional help required? Which matters require help from within the family?
- For whom is the help required? Children, parents, both, others?
- To what extent do the plans cater for changes in circumstances?
- How definite are the plans?
- Is an evaluation included in the plan? If yes, who will be involved?

### **1.3.2 Research questions regarding the execution of the plans**

The research questions regarding the executions of the plans are:

- To what extent are the agreements kept that are mentioned in the plan?
- To what extent are the agreements kept by the family?
- To what extent are the agreements kept by the professionals (referrers)?
- What are limiting factors in the execution?
- What are stimulating factors in the execution?
- In how far is this due to cooperation with institutions outside Child Care?
- How do families respond to changing circumstances?
- How do professionals (referrers) respond to a change in circumstances?
- When evaluation was included in the plan, does it take place?
- What agreements are usually kept? By whom?
- What agreements are usually not kept? By whom?

## 1.4 Research method

### 1.4.1 Research method regarding the plans

The research into the plans took place by analyzing written sources. These written sources consist of the plans laid down by the family and their network. During Eigenkracht conferences families and members of the network make a plan, consisting of agreements, decisions and recommendations. The plan is worded and written down by the family. In some families use was made of a form developed by Eigenkracht Centrale (see annex 1).

WESP decided not to use a model for testing a hypothesis, this being the first Dutch research into plans resulting from Eigenkracht conferences. Also, a choice was made against using existing models for analyzing care plans. The source material deviated too much from a standard care plan. The framework for the analysis was developed in an exploratory way. An exploratory analysis took place, and, based on research on trends, a number of frequently occurring categories was defined. These categories (domains of life) have been named in an unambiguous way in order to make them comparable. Next, the components of the plan have been scored, fed into Quatro Pro and straight counts have been applied.

As a help with defining the categories and to fit in with customary divisions, literature orientation took place. Due to the fact that the families referred to Eigen Kracht already make use of care for a period of time (van Beek, 2002), about 65 % of the referrals originates from child protection (van Beek, 2003) and initial analysis shows that the contents of the plans partly goes beyond child care, literature was studied that involves several care domains. Problems often extend to many and different domains of living and are interconnected. Dogan, van Dijke and Terpstra (2000), who wrote about 'difficult to access' adolescents and families, chose to define four categories: social-economical problems, problems within the family, problems regarding the social context and problems concerning care. This division proved too coarse for the plans that were researched. Noom and De Winter (1999) take the position of youngsters as a starting point and arrive at nine distinctive domains of life: housing, physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing, contact with family, contact with friends, education, work, income, contact with police and judiciary. They do not take into consideration the parents' point of view. This view is often expressed in the plans of Eigenkracht conferences. This is also the case in the division made by the national Steunpunt Randgroepjongeren (Support Centre Marginal Youth}, which is described in a report published by the VNG (Vereniging Nederlandse Gemeenten, the association of Dutch municipalities, 1986) which deals with domains of administration (education, employment, care, judiciary and sports) that are relevant to marginal youth.

Based on literature orientation *and* the trends that were found, a choice was made to link up with a division used in community work <sup>2</sup> when working with multi-problem families. This division is similar to the one used by Noom and De Winter. Nine domains of life are distinguished: *child raising, housing, education, work, leisure time, finances, health, social network, justice*. For this research a tenth category has been added: '*miscellaneous*'.

The agreement as formulated by the family determined into what category a decision or agreement should be scored,. If the formulation was ambiguous, the researchers took the context of the plan into consideration.

For example:

One plan states 'Starting this Saturday child A will live with uncle and aunt'. This decision is classed in the category '*housing*'.

The same plan states: 'Uncle and aunt will get support with raising the child, from foster care'. This agreement is classed in the category '*child raising*'.

Another agreement from the plan: 'the referrer will see to it that uncle and aunt receive foster compensation'. This agreement is classed in the category '*finances*'. Another plan states 'the referrer will see to it that the placement in a foster family is made official'. This decision is classed in the category '*housing*'. Although the researchers are aware that formalising a placement in a foster family entails financial (foster compensation) as well as child raising (counselling by foster care worker) factors, these have not been classed as such. This is because from the context of the plan it is clear that the main issue for the family is that the home where the child is raised will get an official status. Only when explicitly mentioned in the plan, the foster compensation and the counselling aspects are classed in the categories child raising and finances.

When all agreements had been classed in one of the ten categories it proved that some categories held so many items that it was feasible to introduce subcategories. Based on the contents of the agreements, trends were looked for; these trends have been clustered in subcategories.

It is described per category for whom the agreement is meant, by whom the agreement will be executed, whether the agreement is permanent or temporary and at what date the agreement will come into effect. When an agreement concerns several children, the number of children is reflected in the number of agreements that has been classed.

---

<sup>2</sup> This classification in domains of life is described a.o. in a memorandum of district networks in Zwolle (1998). The original source of this classification is not mentioned. All attempts to identify this source have failed.

For example;

'the neighbour will take child A and child B to their club on Wednesdays' was classed as two agreements in the category 'leisure time'.

To state the number of people executing the agreements, all people are counted that have to take action to put it into effect. In the above example the neighbour (network) has to take action. If the agreement had been that child A and child B are taught by the neighbour to cycle to the club by themselves, both children and the neighbour would have been counted.

#### **1.4.2 Research method regarding the follow-up**

Research into the execution of the plans (follow up) took place by analyzing written sources. These written sources consist of follow up forms that were filled out by Eigen-kracht coordinators (see annex 2). The Eigen-kracht coordinators get in touch with the referrer and the family members approximately three months after the Eigen-kracht conference to inquire about the status of the execution of the plan.

The analysis framework as described in 1.4.1 has been extended with some categories regarding the follow-up. It concerns the extent to which the plan has been executed and why, according to family and referrer, agreements from the plan have not been effected.

### **1.5 Progress of the research**

The research was done from December 2002 to June 2003. The written sources that were researched had been collected by WESP in the years 2001 and 2002. At the start of the research all plans that were to be researched were available. This was not the case with the follow-up forms. In order to obtain the missing follow-up data of the plans that were researched, contact was made with the Eigen-kracht regional managers and a number of Eigen-kracht coordinators. Thus a great number of missing follow up data became available: the follow up data of 42 out of 48 plans were obtained eventually.

The initial framework for analyses was developed from literature orientation. This test frame has been tried out on some five plans and was revised taking into account the experiences gained from the try-out. Thereafter the plans were scored and fed into the computer.

During the analysis of the plans it was remarkable to see how divers families and networks have formulated their agreements. There were very elaborate plans, but also very concise ones. There was no standardization at all concerning the plans of 2001. One plan was hand written, another in print. It occurred regularly that the requests that had been made were not mentioned in the plan, which meant that the registration data had to be consulted to find out what the request had been. This

meant a lot of investigation and puzzle-solving for the researchers. However, almost all missing data were obtained.

During 2002 the Eigen-kracht *Centrale*, at the request of the Eigen-kracht coordinators, developed a model for standardizing the plan. Consequently, during 2002 a growing number of plans was registered in line with this model. The model plan itself is very plain, without any subjective categorization (see annex 1).

From the very first Dutch Eigen-kracht conference, coordinators have filled out their follow-up data on a form that was developed by WESP. At that time, however, it was yet unknown in what way the data would be analyzed, nor had the framework for analysis been developed. This meant that, for the actual analysis, data from the follow-up forms had to be rearranged. How elaborate the follow up form have been filled out depends on the Eigen-kracht coordinator. Some coordinators have registered meticulously to what extent each of the agreements has been carried out. Others reported in a more general way and only referred to the most important agreements in the plan. This means that it remains unknown for a number of agreements whether or not they were executed.

## 1.6 Terminology

When 'Eigen Kracht' was introduced, a number of new terms saw the light. For better understanding we give a concise description of these terms<sup>3</sup>.

### **Eigen-kracht conference:**

A procedure to let the responsibility for drastic decisions concerning problems within the family rest with the family. It gives them the opportunity to come up with a plan using their own resources and asking for support from outside. The core of this procedure is a 'family conference' in which family and members of the network together create a plan for the future (see also 'phases of an Eigen-kracht conference').

### **Eigen-kracht *Centrale*:**

A national institute which initiates Eigen-kracht conferences and stimulates and supports the use of Eigen-kracht conferences. The Eigen-kracht *Centrale* takes care of recruiting, selecting and training coordinators and contracts these coordinators for the duration of a conference. Referrers may obtain an 'Eigen-kracht conference' from the Eigen-kracht *Centrale*.

### **Eigen-kracht coordinator:**

A trained person who, in close concert with the family concerned, organises and facilitates an Eigen-kracht conference. An Eigen-kracht coordinator is an

---

<sup>3</sup> Source: Handbook Eigen-kracht conferences (2002) and leaflets of the Eigen Kracht *Centrale*.

independent individual. He/She is not in the employment of, or working for an institution that has decision-making powers or is care giving.

**Eigen-kracht region manager:**

A person employed by an organisation that aims at introducing Eigen-kracht in a region. Referrers get in touch with the region-manager when they consider setting up an Eigen-kracht conference. The region manager is able to help them to decide whether an Eigen-kracht conference is an appropriate means in this situation, what the formulation of the question should be, which professionals should be involved and how to arrange financing. The region manager will enlist a coordinator from his/her region to initiate the conference and will also provide immediate support. The region manager keeps in touch with the coordinators in the region and works along the guidelines of the national Eigen-kracht *Centrale*.

**Referrer:**

The person who, in most cases on behalf of a care provider, offers the possibility of an Eigen-kracht conference to the family.

**Family and social network:**

Relatives to the first and other degrees; people who are important to the family. This includes family members, neighbours and friends.

**Phases of an Eigen-kracht conference:**

Preparation	Period preceding the family conference
Information phase	First part of the family conference, in which professionals provide family and network with information.
Private time	Second part of the family conference. When the family and the members of the social network have received the necessary information, the referrer and other professionals, as well as the coordinator, leave. The family and the social network members discuss the questions put before them and draw up a plan.
Presentation of the plan	Third part of the family conference. When the plan is ready, the coordinator and the referrer are summoned. The plan presented by the family is accepted by the referrer, unless it is obvious that the safety of the child is not guaranteed, or that (part of) the plan is illegal.

## 2 Eigen-kracht conferences: the context

In the Netherlands Eigen Kracht is relatively new. The implementation started in child care. What makes Eigen Kracht special is that it is not a care program, but exclusively a decision making model for families to decide what help they need. The introduction of this model does not only imply a change in family structures, but also in the provision of child care.

According to the Eigen-kracht *Centrale* which works nationwide, it concerns a shift in paradigm (van Pagée, 2001). In order to place the research into Eigen-kracht in the context of recent developments, this chapter dwells on its origin and its consequences.

'Eigen-kracht conferentie' is the Dutch name for a decision making model that is known elsewhere as 'Family Group Conferencing'. It originates from and is inspired by the New Zealand Maori-culture. Family Group Conferencing became embedded in the law in New Zealand in 1989<sup>4</sup>, as a right that families have to discuss a problem first within the family and to try to reach a solution. Family in this context does not only mean close relatives, it also includes distant relatives, friends and members of the social network. The concept of tribe- and neighbourhood relationships perhaps gives a better indication of the persons involved than the word 'family' does (Handbook Eigen-kracht, 2002).

From 1999 onward the model has been gradually introduced in The Netherlands. Once the basic questions 'does this model fit in the present child care' and 'is this the right time to introduce this model' had been positively answered by a group of initiative-taking experts, the practical implementation was started<sup>5</sup>. The initiators were the Op Kleine Schaal (At Small Scale) institute and bureau WESP, who cooperated with four pilot institutions in two towns (Amsterdam and Groningen) and two provinces (Drenthe and Gelderland)<sup>6</sup>. The first Dutch Eigen-kracht conferences were held in these regions in 2001.

---

<sup>4</sup>Children, Young Persons and their Families Act.

<sup>5</sup>This process was described at length in the chapter written by van Lieshout in the book 'Eigen Kracht. Family Group Conference in The Netherlands. Van model naar invoering' (2002, redactie: van Pagée).

<sup>6</sup>These organisations are the Sociaal Agogisch Centrum (Amsterdam), Stichting Jeugdzorg Groningen, Werkmaatschappij Ontwikkeling Jeugdzorg Drenthe and Jeugdorp the Glind (Gelderland).

To gain insight in the development and in order to support the implementation of Eigen Kracht, WESP collected data for research from the very beginning. The research was meant to find answers to the questions that were harboured by the child care sector as well as by the initiators:

- is this work method right for the Dutch society which is held by many as being individualistic?
- what kind of support and help will families require if they are given the opportunity to come up with a plan of their own?
- to what extent will these plans be effectuated?
- what consequences will this working method have for the services of service providing institutions, the position of the client and the relation between professionals and family?

The orientation on the possibilities of Family Group Conferencing was triggered by the growing dissatisfaction with the results of child care (see also the publication of Slot, 2002 and 'the Roermond case') and the position of the client.

It was expected that systematically engaging family and network would lead to more effective care which was endorsed and mandated by the people involved. On top of that better use could be made of resources available within the family itself. The first results do indeed point in this direction (van Beek, 2002).

It was this 'innovating' aspect that earned Eigen-kracht the Simon Slootenprize<sup>7</sup> in 2002. The fact that Eigen-kracht mobilizes the network around the youngster to come up with solutions, rather than leaving all initiative with the professionals, appealed to the jury. The jury report (2002) states that the Eigen-kracht conference aims at child protection by means of maximizing the cooperation of all people directly involved with the child. The fact that those closely involved come up with and commit themselves to solutions increases the chances of success.

The meaning of the term Eigen-kracht bears relation to the wish to strengthen the autonomy of parents and family regarding the care for their children. It emphasizes the responsibility for solving the problems and the families' ability to do so.

This is in line with the developments in the child care sector in which there is a growing interest in improving the clients' position and where by now almost everyone is familiar with terms like 'empowerment' and 'directed by demand' or 'working according to demand'. The general idea is that clients should not have their mind made up for them, but rather that they should be cooperated with. Portengen (2002) remarks that care workers and organisation hold empowerment in high esteem, however, the question remains how to effectuate it in real life. The same goes for 'working according to demand' which turns more and more into a containerbegrip. According to Baartman (2002), the client should not only regain control over his situation, but should also be the owner of his own problems, rather than having his

---

<sup>7</sup>The Simon Slooten award is granted bianually for an innovating initiative in child care. It was founded by Vediovo and the Council for Child Protection.

problems taken from him and subsequently returned after being rearranged in a way that suits the professional. Baartman also states that the professionals lay down the rules, whereas parents ask care workers to be of service. Care workers diagnose the situation and they decide what help is required.

According to Portengen (2002) 'empowerment' means that people have a maximum say on their own life. This definition concurs with the demands of parents and youngsters. From research into what comprises 'working according to demand' in child care according to the client, power, information and cohesion are found to be key notions (van Beek, 2002a). Parents and youngsters wish to be informed by experts, so they can form a well founded decision on what help they need, and from whom. They choose coherence, help on several domains domains of life that does not isolate them from the people they live with.

This borders on the shift in paradigm mentioned earlier. Clients are no longer regarded as people who need help, but as citizens who might require services offered by social care organisations. Van Pagée (2001) states that in the tradition of 'working according to demand', the main focus is on equipping the social care workers to enable them to formulate the care need. Thus equipping professionals does not contribute to an equal position of client and social care worker. In an Eigenkracht conference all resources around a family system are brought together by an independent coordinator. Those present discuss in seclusion, without referrer, social care worker and coordinator, what the issue is and what plan is fitting, using their own resources. The benefit of this is that it does not depend on the capabilities of the case manager and social care worker to formulate the care need, but allows the family to retain the responsibility for its own problems and solutions. Based on the plan as formulated by the family, the social care worker may offer the services required. Social care becomes more like providing services.

This working method may have far reaching consequences. It entails that families will commission care. The question immediately arises whether this is possible within the present youth care system. At the heart of this discussion is the needs assessment. May the plan the family made be regarded as needs assessment or does the assessment have to be made and validated by a professional? How can it be brought about that families are offered the help they ask for? Should this be carried into law or does the new law on child care provide enough space? Interesting in this context is the discussion that was started in the 'The Netherlands Tijdschrift voor Jeugdzorg' (Dutch Magazine for Child Care) (Joanknecht 2003; Kok, 2002a/b; Mehlkopf 2002; van Yperen 2002).

That this working method may have far reaching consequences for the care offered by organisations, may be learned from the experiences in New Zealand. Doolan (in: van Pagée, 2003) describes how remarkable changes occurred because Family Group Conferencing (FGC) in New Zealand was carried into law. Families first get a chance to make a plan in a family conference to solve the problems. The government may only intervene if that plan is considered insufficient. Over 85 % of the FGC's led to a result that was endorsed by the legal authorities, the number of children in government care was reduced by 60 %, the number of law enforced measures was

also reduced significantly. Doolan comes to the conclusion that the introduction of FGC in child care is extremely difficult when it has no legal status; there is a fair chance that no fundamental changes will take place. Also Nixon (in: van Pagée, 2003) emphasises this: in the UK FGC have no legal mandate. It is a paradox that social workers can use FGC as a tool or trick to play on a family instead of consequently implementing the core principles and values of FGC in daily practice for the work at hand as well as in the institution itself.

The Eigen Kracht *Centrale* is of the opinion that also in The Netherlands a legal status will offer citizens the best opportunity to obtain the care that they and those around them deem necessary. This vision was put forward in the document 'Met recht vraaggestuurd' (Justified care on demand, 2003) that was sent to the Tweede Kamer (the Dutch lower house of parliament). In the new law on child care the client obtains a stronger position than before in more than one way. The government offers people who need care a.o. a right to child care: they can claim it. According to the *Centrale* this does not necessarily mean that citizens get what they ask for. For example, what happens when citizens require help from non-child care organisations?

Finally, a quotation from the previously mentioned document: 'The new law on child care aims at forms of social care that are connected like links. But who chooses the links? Who forges the chain? To obtain a social care system that is truly directed by the clients demand, it is imperative that clients together with their family and social network can take initial responsibility for their own problems and their solution'.

## 3 The plans

### 3.1 Introduction

In an Eigen-kracht conference family and network draw up a plan to improve the situation of a child that they have worries about. The referrer has formulated these worries as a number of questions for the family to work on. The agreements that family and network reach on these items are laid down in a plan. This plan contains the decisions taken by the family and the agreements they reach to effectuate these decisions.

The plans that were researched are the result of the deliberation of family and network in the private time. The attempt of Eigen Kracht to let the family be owner of the process as much as possible and the result of the Eigen-kracht conference are reflected in the plans. There is no uniformity, like there is in professional social care and treatment plans. The family plans are very divers, in looks as well as in contents. The length of the plans varies strongly, as does the language used.

To give an impression of the way a family plan may look, three examples have been included (see annexes 3, 4 and 5). They consist of a long (annex 3), a medium sized (annex 5) and a short plan (annex 4). The plans included in the annexes are stripped of names, for reasons of privacy; however, wherever possible, they are presented in the way they were formulated by the family.

The researchers devised the categorization in domains of life used in this chapter. In the plans the demands and agreements are not grouped by category. The majority of the families have clustered their agreements around the question that was to be answered or the decision that had to be taken.

The categories (domains of life) used in this research are: *child raising, housing, education, employment, leisure activities, finances, health, social network, judiciary and miscellaneous.*

### 3.2 Background characteristics

#### 3.2.1 Number of plans and non-response

In 2001 and 2002 a total of 50 Eigen-kracht conferences, in which family and network came together, took place. Of these conferences 48 resulted in a plan (van Beek, 2003). These 48 plans have all been analyzed for this research. This means that non-response is 0 %. Therefore the outcome is representative for the plans the families made during Eigen-kracht conferences.

N. b.: all plans were considered safe for the child by the referrers and accepted as such as a basis for social care. This excludes the two cases in which the family itself acted as referrer.

### 3.2.2 Number, age, gender and ethnicity of the children

The 48 Eigen-kracht conferences took place because there was cause for concern regarding 88 children, an average of 1.8 children per Eigen-kracht conference.

#### Age

age	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
number	2	2	3	3	5	5	4	3	3	7	6	9	8	10	7	6	2	4	0	1

age 0-4	15	(17 %)
age 5-12	44	(50 %)
age 13-18	28	(32 %)
over 18	01	( 1 %)
<i>Total</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>(100 %)</i>

#### Gender

It concerns 46 girls and 41 boys. The gender of 1 child was not mentioned on the registration form.

#### Ethnicity of the children

	Number
Both parents Dutch	35
One or both parents not born in The Netherlands	52
Unknown	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>88</i>

Non-Dutch backgrounds occurring most frequently are Surinam, Antillean and Moroccan respectively.

### 3.2.3 Number of family members and members of social network

In the private time of an Eigen-kracht conference no professionals are present. A total of 562 family members and 104 members of the social network cooperated on making the plans. This is an average of 11.7 family members and 2.1 members of the social network per plan.

### 3.2.4 Concerns and questions

Referrers formulate their concerns regarding the children's situation. They clearly state the issues for concern. The open questions they formulate regarding these

concerns are laid down before the participating members of the family and the network during the Eigen-kracht conference. Often there is more than one question per Eigen-kracht conference. Based on these questions the family comes up with a plan. One of the criteria which determines if the referrer accepts the plan or not, is whether the plan provides an answer to the question asked. The referrer also checks if the plan is safe and legally acceptable. The plans that were researched have all been accepted by the referrer.

The referrers of the plans that were researched have laid a total of 95 questions before the families, this is an average of 2 questions per situation.

In the plans of the 48 conferences that were researched, the questions dealt with:

Child raising	33
Education	06
Housing: where should the child live?	29
How to help the adolescent to become independent	01
Behaviour of the child	02
Visitation arrangements	13
Medical issues	02
Miscellaneous	<u>09</u>
<i>Total</i>	<i>95</i>

Most questions concern housing and child raising. The other questions mostly concern matters that are related to housing or child raising.

### 3.2.5 Referrers

The greater part of the referrals (73 %) is from a Bureau Jeugdzorg (child care unit). When the decentralized nationwide operating organisations<sup>8</sup> are included, the part of the Bureau Jeugdzorg even adds up to 81 %.

Child Protection is the largest referrer, 56 % of the referrals is made by a guardian or family guardian.

Referrers:

Child Protection (guardian/family guardian)	27
Social care worker (voluntary)	14
School	03
Family member	01
Other (a.o. lawyer, police)	<u>03</u>
<i>Total</i>	<i>48</i>

---

<sup>8</sup>Source: Nieuwsbrief Jeugdzorg, nr 5, february 2003, issued by the department of VWS.

### 3.2.6 Region

Eigen-kracht conferences took place in the following regions:

Region	Number of plans researched
Amsterdam	25
Groningen	09
Friesland	02
Drenthe	02
Gelderland	08
Zuid-Holland	02
Total	48

### 3.3 Contents of the plans

The agreements made by the families have been divided into 10 categories. Each category is a domain of life. The families do not limit themselves to one domain in their plans. Their agreements cover an average of 4 domains per plan. The minimum number of domains in a plan is 1; there is 1 plan that deals with only 1 domain. The maximum number of domains of life in a plan is 7; this occurs 6 times.

The plans contain a total of 853 agreements; an average of 17.8 agreements per plan. Most agreements are aimed at improving the child raising situation (32 %), the housing situation (22 %), contact with family and social network (11.0 %), leisure activities (9 %) and education (9 %).

Domains of life	Number of agreements	% completed
Child raising	270	32 %
Housing	183	22 %
Social network	94	11 %
Education	81	9 %
Leisure activities	75	9 %
Health	53	6 %
Finances	33	4 %
Employment	9	1 %
Judiciary	3	0 %
Miscellaneous	52	6 %
Total	853	100 %

In the next paragraphs the results of the analysis of the various domains of life is described per domain.

From each domain of life the following items are described:

- What are the contents of the agreements (what help is required)
- With whom in mind have these agreements been made
- Who takes responsibility for the effectuation of the agreements (resources)<sup>9</sup>
- When will the execution of the plans start.

### 3.3.1 Child raising

In 34 of the 48 plans (70.8 %) agreements occur to improve the child raising situation. It concerns a total of 270 agreements that are directly or indirectly related: direct care for children in the family (224 x), external contact with institutions related to child raising and social care (32 x) and miscellaneous (18 x).

In the direct care for children in the family the agreements mostly are about schedule and rules (61 x), presence of the parent (27 x), assistance for the parent (26 x), teaching the child skills (17 x), body care and hygiene (15 x), giving positive attention to the child (15 x) and checking whether the agreements are kept (12 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

About *schedule and rules*:

- child is allowed once a month to come home at 03.00 h.
- child asks permission to take food from the fridge

---

<sup>9</sup>A general summary of the executors of the agreements is published in annex 6

- child has to be home at 22.30 on weekdays
- improve daily structure with the help of X
- mother makes list with home rules

About *presence of the parent*:

- father is present daily and takes care of the children when they come home from school
- parents discuss how to arrange co-parenting
- when mother wants to be absent she will arrange that children are not left alone

About *support for the parent*:

- when mother cannot handle the situation, she calls uncle for help
- aunties (foster parents-red) are counselled by foster care worker
- father consults sister.

About *teaching the child skills*

- child learns in a playful way to clean its own room
- child learns to take care of bird
- family trains the child to say 'no'

About *body care and hygiene*:

- child brushes teeth mornings and evenings
- child takes shower every day at 19.00 h.
- sister takes care of clothing and hair
- aunt talks with child about sexuality

About *giving positive attention*:

- mother and child will also undertake nice things together
- during meals there will be no talk about problems, only pleasant subjects
- mother divides her attention more evenly between all children

About *checking whether the agreements are kept*:

- aunt checks homework
- uncle checks monthly if arrangements are kept

About *external contacts with institutions*:

- the referrer acts as contact for social care
- request for extra afternoon GGV

Most agreements concern the child, like: child takes a shower each day at 19.00 h. and sister takes care of clothing and hair. Almost one fourth of the agreements is meant for parents and child. For example: brother-in-law is contact for stepfather or a house meeting will take place every week. Examples of agreements that are aimed at parents: inquire after a course in parenting skills or aunt coaches mother in house keeping. In the category 'other' it mostly concerns primary care providers like foster

parents.

Support/care for	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	14	157	74	25	270

Agreements are being executed by 432 persons, an average of 1.6 person per agreement.

The greater part of the agreements (81.7 %) is being executed by family (parents, child and family members) and network. It is remarkable that many agreements are executed by family members not being parents or child: uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces and grandparents. In 16.6 % of the agreements help or support from professionals is required: 12.5 % from professionals in child care (especially the referrer and foster care) and 4.1 % from professionals outside child care (especially home care).

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of persons <sup>10</sup>
Parents <sup>11</sup>	99
Child	107
Professionals in Child care	54
Professionals outside Child care	18
Family members	109
Members of the network	38
Unknown	7
Total	432

The greater part (199 x) of the agreements is of a permanent nature. It concerns e.g. agreements on house rules or support for child raisings. The agreements mentioned under the category NA (not applicable) are mainly agreements concerning a once-only activity, like applying for home help or buying an agenda.

---

<sup>10</sup> In the plans, active participation of parents and children needing care and support is required to (help) execute the agreements.. Therefore they are regarded as actively cooperating and not as 'passive' subjects.

<sup>11</sup> Contrary to the previous table the parents were counted per person. In several cases the parents are divorced. When father and mother both contribute to the execution of an agreement, they are counted as two. Stepparents have been counted as parents in this context.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	199	9	58	4	270

The greater part (253 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Eleven agreements are effectuated after more than three months. For six agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### 3.3.2 Social Network

The category social network requires some elucidation. According to Baartman (1991) the social surroundings may be seen as an entity of resources for the parent: it can provide the parent with advice, support, diversion and appraisal. The same goes for the children to be raised. In the framework of this research the category social network is used for agreements that aim at improving or preserving contacts with people with whom there are emotional ties. It does not include contacts with social care workers or organisations.

In 22 of the 48 plans (45,8 %) agreements occur aimed at improving or preserving contacts within the social network. A total of 94 agreements concern the social network, directly or indirectly: 90 x it concerns contact with family members, 4 x contact with others from the social network.

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

- S continue mothers visitation arrangement, increase number of visits if all goes well
- S father gives child a phone call once a week
- S friends call or visit mother daily
- S brother does not sleep at home when little sister is home
- S grandparents visit mother with the child
- S when mother is sober child stays all day
- S father will no longer be excluded, contact to be made by guardian
- S referrer is contact for visitation arrangement
- S child wants contact with family of deceased father
- S family members exchange telephone numbers so they can keep in touch
- S child keeps in touch with 9 year old sister
- S evaluation of visitation arrangement in the summer
- S contact for fathers family is elder brother

Most agreements are meant for child and parents. Members of the network and family members other than parents and child are mentioned in the category 'other'. For example, the elder brother who is contact for the fathers' family is categorized as 'other'.

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	6	21	59	8	94

The agreements are executed by 269 people<sup>12</sup>, an average of 2,8 person per agreement.

The greater part of the agreements is executed by the family (parents, child and family members) and network itself. It is remarkable that many agreements are executed by family members not being parents or child: uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces and grandparents. In 6 % of the agreements only help or support from professionals is required, mainly from the referrer.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of persons
Parents	51
Child	62
Professionals in Child care	17
Professionals outside Child care	0
Family members	117
Members of the network	18
Unknown	4
<i>Total</i>	<i>269</i>

The greater part of the agreements (69 x) is of a permanent nature. It concerns for example visitation arrangements or phonecall arrangements. The part of the agreements mentioned under the category NA, are mainly agreements concerning a once-only activity, like exchanging telephone numbers, making appointments, informing or consulting a parent.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	69	4	19	2	94

The greater part (88 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference.

---

<sup>12</sup> When counting the number of people an estimate was made a number of times. When the plan mentioned e.g. 'the family keeps in touch', it was derived from the registration data used for subresearch 1 (van Beek, 2003) how many family members were present at the Eigen-kracht conference. The number of adult family members was taken as basis for the above count.

Three agreements are effectuated after more than three months. For three agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### 3.3.3 Housing

In 28 of the 48 plans (58.3 %) agreements occur to improve the housing situation. A total of 183 agreements is related directly or indirectly to housing:

(starting to) live in a known or unknown foster family (69 x), (starting to) live with parents (39 x), the need for other living accommodation (26 x), (starting to) live in a group (15 x), discuss accommodation (13 x), prepare a dwelling (5x) and miscellaneous (16 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

About (starting to) *live with parents*:

- S child lives with mother on weekdays, with father during the weekend
- S at a later time the children will start living with mother
- S the goal is that mother takes care of her children herself.

About (starting to) *live in a known or unknown foster family*

- S the four children go to three host families (friends of mother)
- S until January 15th the children stay with uncle and aunt 1, thereafter they move to aunt and uncle 2
- S as long as there is no foster family, the children stay with grandma and granddad

About a *different dwelling*:

- S find home for mother and children in a drugs-free neighbourhood
- S write a letter to the housing association
- S child stays with mother until aunt has better living accommodation
- S arrange social assessment for other accommodation

About the *preparation of a dwelling*:

- S a room at grandma's is redecorated
- S mother makes list of chores to be done in the house

*Miscellaneous*:

- S mother goes to women's refuge house
- S after the exams child child discusses living elsewhere

Most agreements concern the child. The agreements that concern both parents and child are about children and parents living in or wanting to live in one house. Others, in this case mainly host or foster parents, are mentioned in the category 'Other'

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	5	103	69	11	188 <sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup>This number is 5 higher than the total number of agreements on housing. This is because in about five situations the support/care was for the child as well as for someone

The agreements are executed by 316 people, an average of 1.7 person per agreement.

The greater part of the agreements is executed by family (parents, child and family members) and network. A little under one third of the agreements is executed by professionals: child care workers (in these cases mainly the referrer, foster care workers, listed foster parents and employees of residential institutions) and non-child care professionals (in this context mainly employees of housing associations). Foster parents from the network have been mentioned either in the category family or the category members of the network, depending on their relation to the child.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

<b>Persons</b>	<b>Number of persons</b>
Parents	51
Child	80
Professionals in Child care	73
Professionals outside Child care	19
Family members	76
Members of the network	14
Unknown	3
<i>Total</i>	<i>316</i>

A great part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, for example writing a letter to the housing association, redecorating a room or moving elsewhere. These agreements are neither permanent nor temporary. They are mentioned in the category NA. Most other agreements are of a permanent nature, like starting to live in a foster family or with parents. Temporary agreements are mostly agreements to bridge a certain periode, like a child that stays with grandma until mother has found accomodation.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	72	41	69	1	183

The greater part (152 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Sixteen agreements are effectuated after more than three months, for example a child will start living somewhere else after six months. For fifteen agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

---

else. In these situations the support/care was counted twice, both in the category 'Child' and 'Other'.

### 3.3.4 Education

In 17 of the 48 plans (35.4 %) agreements occur to improve the situation regarding education. A total of 81 agreements directly or indirectly concerns school: talks with school (24 x), looking for a school or training (18 x), home work (10 x), absence (7 x), transportation to school (5), miscellaneous (17 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

*About talks with school:*

- S host parents talk with school;
- S the family guardian and the teacher agree to keep each other posted
- S referrer requests 10 minute-talk at school
- S

*About finding a school or training:*

- S child stays at this school
- S child goes to ROC (Regionaal OpleidingsCentrum, regional training centre) once a week
- S if the training does not work out, BBL is next.

*About transportation to school:*

- S arrange transportation by schoolbus
- S aunt looks up timetable for bus to and from school

*About absence:*

- S mother reports children ill only when they really are ill

*About home work:*

- S child gets assistance with doing home work
- S uncle and sister help child twice a week with home work.

*Miscellaneous:*

- S aid the child with using agenda
- S take care that school books are available in time

Most agreements are meant to support or help the child. In the agreements aimed at the parents it concerns for example an uncle who will help the parents in the contact with school or a mother who wants to attend language lessons.

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	7	71	3	0	81

The agreements are executed by 149 people, an average of 1.8 person per agreement. The greater part of the agreements is executed by family (parents, child and family members) and network. A little under one third of the agreements is executed by professionals: child care workers (in these cases mainly the referrer)

and non-child care professionals (in these cases mainly school employees).

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of persons
Parents	29
Child	33
Professionals in Child care	31
Professionals outside Child care	31
Family members	37
Members of the network	5
Unknown	2
Total	149

A large part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, for example arranging a talk with the teacher. These agreements are neither permanent nor temporary. They are mentioned in the category NA. Most other agreements are of a permanent nature, e.g. visits to a certain school or support with making home work.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	36	4	38	3	81

The greater part (70 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Five agreements are effectuated after more than three months, for example a child will go to another school after the summer holidays.

### 3.3.5 Leisure activities

In 19 of the 48 plans (39,6 %) agreements occur to improve the situation regarding leisure activities.

A total of 75 agreements concerns directly or indirectly leisure activities: staying in weekends and holidays (36 x), communal activities (9 x), other activities (15 x), deliberation (8 x), miscellaneous (7 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

About *staying in weekends and holidays*:

- in the summer holidays the child stay with father for three weeks and another three weeks with mother
- next year the child will go to the Dominican Republic for the holidays
- when mother is ill, the children will stay with friends over the weekend

S family takes care of the children in the weekends until date x.

*About communal activities:*

- S child rejoins badminton club
- S child will be enrolled for activities summer care
- S child goes swimming twice a week
- S stepmother enrolls child for summercamp.

*About other activities:*

- aunt will take children along when she has an outing with her own children
- S make a schedule for celebrating holidays and birthdays

*About miscellaneous:*

- S child does not go out for the time being
- S when child goes out at a later time, cousin will accompany child
- S aunt helps mother with finding occupation during the day.

Most agreements are meant to improve the leisure activities of the child. Some agreements are meant for parents and child both, like joint activities or activities for the child that unburden the parents.

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	1	59	15	0	75

The agreements are executed by 167 people, an average of 2.2 person per agreement. Over 90 of the agreements is executed by family (parents, child and family members) and network. The professionals concerned are in most cases involved with sports- and other clubs.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of persons
Parents	35
Child	44
Professionals in Child care	1
Professionals outside Child care	6
Family members	55
Members of the network	18
Unknown	9
Total	167

A part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, like enrollment for the summer camp or making a schedule for holidays and weekends. These agreements are

neither permanent nor temporary and are mentioned under the category NA. Most other agreements are of a permanent nature, like attending a sports club or staying at aunt and uncle's for the weekend once a fortnight. The agreements of a temporary nature are mostly about staying with family or network for a while until the child moves to a permanent residence elsewhere.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	43	9	20	4	75

The greater part (65 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Seven agreements are effectuated after more than three months, mainly agreements on holidays later in the year. For three agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### 3.3.6 Health

18 of the 48 plans (37.5 %) contain agreements to improve the educational situation. A total of 53 agreements concern mental and physical welfare, either directly or indirectly: physical illness of child (12 x), mental health of child (17 x), mental health parent (18 x, including 3x addiction of parent), deliberation (4 x), miscellaneous (2 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

#### About *physical illness of child*:

- S everyone writes down in a special notebook when and what the child eats and time of insuline-injections;
- district nurse gives injections in the mornings and evenings

#### About *mental health of child*:

- S obtain information and maybe enlist the children for KOPP-course;
- S children will get psychological counselling
- S child will be tested for Borderline syndrom
- S child will be treated in group of children with PDD-NOS and ADHD.

#### About *mental health parent*:

- S father will go to AA on date x
- S enlist professional help to get mother off drugs
- S hang notes around the house to help mother remember to take her medication
- S mother gets help to deal with aggression
- S mother goes to meeting for women who have experienced violence

#### About *deliberation*:

- S when there are signals that mother is turning psychotic, the family meets
- S uncle is contact person RIAGG (Regionale Instelling voor Ambulante Geestelijke Gezondheid: regional institute for outpatient mental health care).

Most agreements are meant to improve the health of the child, also quite a number of agreements are meant to improve the health of a parent. A limited number of agreements concerns both the child and the parent

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	20	30	3	0	53

The agreements are executed by 95 people, an average of 1.8 person per agreement. A little over 60 % of the agreements is executed by family. It is remarkable that this is done mainly by the parents and children themselves. Almost 35 % is executed by professionals; the participation of child care workers is relatively low (6 x). Professionals outside child care are mainly therapists, doctors and nurses from the RIAGG, employees from institutions for care and treatment of drug addicts or from home care.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of Persons
Parents	35
Child	12
Professionals in Child care	6
Professionals outside Child care	27
Family members	6
Members of the network	5
Unknown	4
Total	95

A part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, for example requiring into the KOPP-course or trying to get therapy closer to home. These agreements are neither permanent nor temporary and are mentioned under the category NA. Of the other agreements most are permanent, like giving injections by home care and taking medication. The agreements of a temporary nature are about e.g. treatment or going in therapy.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	17	7	28	1	53

The greater part (46 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Two agreements are effectuated after more than three months, mostly agreements concerning holidays later in the year. For five

agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### 3.3.7 Finances

In 16 of the 48 plans (33.3 %) agreements occur to improve the financial situation. A total of 33 agreements are related directly or indirectly to the financial situation: debt restructuring and learning how to handle money (9 x), enabling stay in a foster family financially (8 x), buying items for child (4 x), get information about financial schemes (2 x), deliberation (1x), miscellaneous (10 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

*About debt restructuring and learning to handle money:*

- S helping with debts;
- S financial support of mother until social benefits are arranged
- S girlfriends help mother financially
- S debt restructuring with the help of X
- S talks about finances at office SPD (sociaal pedagogische dienst: social pedagogic services) between mother and SPD.

*About enabling stay in a foster family financially:*

- get foster care compensation
- S part of child allowance goes to aunt for taking care of the children
- S an amount of Euro 24,50 per day for the children up to and including date x.

*About buying items for the child:*

- S child buys cellphone with first paycheck
- S family guardian tries to find budget for decorating child's room
- S father pays for new clothes for the children

*Miscellaneous:*

- S arranging individual budget
- S father gives money to mother instead of directly to daughter
- S child opens saving account for salary

The number of agreements concerning the financial situation of the child (14 x) is almost the same as the number of agreements concerning the parents (19 x). The agreements about finances mentioned under Other concern foster parents who take care of the child.

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	11	14	1	7	33

The agreements are executed by 51 people, an average of 1.5 person per agreement. A little over half of the agreements is executed by the family, mainly the

parents. A little under half of the agreements is executed by professionals; relatively often by professionals in Child care (referrer, foster care). The professionals outside Child care are from organisations that deal with debt restructuring.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

<b>Persons</b>	<b>Number of Persons</b>
Parents	19
Child	3
Professionals in Child care	17
Professionals outside Child care	5
Family members	6
Members of the network	0
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>

A part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, like inquiring into study financing or opening a savings account. These agreements are neither permanent nor temporary and are mentioned under the category NA. Of the other agreements most are permanent, like financial compensation for foster parents and counselling a parent with handling money. The agreements of a temporary nature are about temporary financial support, like foster compensation for a temporary stay in a foster family or helping out financially until social benefits are arranged. Of one third of the agreements it is not stated whether they are of a temporary or permanent nature.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	12	5	5	11	33

The greater part (29 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. One agreement takes effect after three months. For three agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### **3.3.8 Employment**

One percent of the total number of agreements concerns employment. Five of 48 plans (10.4 %) contain agreements aimed at improving the employment situation. A total of only 9 agreements.

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

- S aunt helps mother to find a job the
- S child will work four days a week in car business
- S child will look for job to earn holiday money
- S if child cannot find work by itself, stepfather helps.

The agreements about employment are mostly meant for children (7 x), sometimes for parents (2 x).

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	2	7	0	0	9

The agreements are executed by 15 people, an average of 1.7 person per agreement. These agreements mostly involve family members.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of Persons
Parents	1
Child	7
Professionals in Child care	2
Professionals outside Child care	1
Family members	3
Members of the network	0
Unknown	1
Total	15

Most agreements are of a permanent nature:

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	5	0	2	2	9

The five permanent agreements are effectuated within three months from the Eigenkracht conference.

### 3.3.9 Judiciary

Less than one percent of the total number of agreements concerns judiciary. N.B.: this does not include matters concerning supervision orders. Because of the purpose of supervision orders these are mentioned in the category child raising. Only three of the 48 plans (4.1 %) contain agreements concerning judiciary.

A total of 3 agreements: twice about the way in which the contact between parents and child in a government institution is conducted, once about a special condition in a verdict.

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	0	2	1	0	3

The agreements are executed by 8 people, an average of 2.6 person per agreement. In these agreements only parents, children and professionals in Child care are involved.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of Persons
Parents	2
Child	2
Professionals in Child care	4
Professionals outside Child care	0
Family members	0
Members of the network	0
Unknown	0
Total	8

Two of the three agreements are of a permanent nature; they apply as long as the child remains involved with the governmental institution.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	2	0	1	0	3

All agreements take effect within three months following the Eigen-kracht conference.

### 3.3.10 Miscellaneous

Agreements not mentioned under the categories described above are mentioned under miscellaneous. In 20 of the 48 plans (41.6 %) such agreements occur. A total of 52 agreements: about implementing and evaluating the Eigen-kracht conference plan (19 x), general intentions (12 x), various arrangements (11 x) and miscellaneous (10 x).

A number of examples made anonymous is given next, using the words of the families wherever possible:

*About general intentions:*

- S live up to rules and agreements
- take a positive stand towards each other
- S mother says 'no' more often
- S family expresses confidence in foster family
- S care given by institutions will not be deminished
- S child asks mother to have confidence in child
- S family makes it clear that child is always welcome

*About various arrangements:*

- S find out if children have third-party insurance
- S find out if children have to be registered at town hall
- S find out who has legal authority over the children when mother dies

*About implementing and evaluating the Eigen-kracht conference plan:*

- S inform father about the plan
- S mother writes down the agreements
- S if child does not keep agreements: in case of small transgressions  
deliberation with at least 5 family members, family will stop all help if greater  
offences are committed.
- S family gaterings at regular intervals to exchange experiences and for  
the fun of being together  
all agreements made at the first Eigen-kracht conference are  
void
- S evaluation scheduled after three months

*Miscellaneous:*

- S the dog stays with grandpa and grandma.

Most agreements are to support both parents and child. The agreements mentioned under 'Other' are to support foster parents. The agreement about the dog is also mentioned under 'Other'.

Support/care for:	Parents	Child	Parents/child	Other	Total
Number:	10	16	22	8	56 <sup>14</sup>

The agreements are executed by 217 people, an average of 4.2 persons per agreement. This is mainly because general intentions are subscribed by nearly all persons present. Over 90 % of the agreements is executed by family and network. A large part is taken on by family members not being the parents or the child. The professionals in Child care are mostly the referrers, who will inform others about the plan or who will take part in the evaluation of the Eigen-kracht conference plan. The

---

<sup>14</sup> This number is 4 higher than the total number of agreements on miscellaneous. This is because in four situations the Support/care was counted twice, e.g. when the Support/care was meant for the child/parent as well as for someone else.

professionals involved from outside Child care, are from institutions dealing with matters mentioned under *various arrangements*, like insurance companies and local authorities.

Executors of the agreements in the plans:

Persons	Number of Persons
Parents	31
Child	14
Professionals in Child care	14
Professionals outside Child care	7
Family members	131
Members of the network	18
Unknown	2
Total	217

A part of the agreements concern a once-only activity, like evaluating the plan after three months or finding out if the children have a third-party insurance. These agreements are mentioned under the category 'NA'. Of the other agreements most are permanent, like general intentions and the agreements to meet at regular intervals. For about one fifth of the agreements it is not known whether they are meant to be temporary or permanent.

	Permanent	Temporary	NA	Unknown	Total
Number of agreements	23	1	26	11	52

The greater part (44 x) of the agreements takes effect within three months from the Eigen-kracht conference. Five agreements take effect after three months. For three agreements it is not stated when exactly they take effect.

### 3.4 Change of childrens' residence

Of the 88 children for whom an Eigen-kracht conference was held, 51 do not change residence. This is 55 %<sup>15</sup>. They remain with (one of) their parents (35 x), in a network foster family (14 x) or in a registered foster family (2 x). Three of them will stay with (one of) their parents for the time being but the plan states that they will take up

---

<sup>15</sup> N=93, this is 5 more than the number of children. This is because five plans contain a temporary new address until a new permanent residence is available.

residence somewhere else at a later date.

In 42 cases the residence does change:

- six children who live with (one of) the parents move in with another parent (1 x), move to a network foster family (2 x), to a registered foster family (2 x) or elsewhere (1 x)
- S ten children who live in a communal group move in with (one of) the parents (4 x), a network foster family (5 x) or elsewhere (1 x);
- S twelve children who live in a network foster family move in with (one of) the parents (4 x, of which 2x in the long run), move to a communal group (2 x), to another network foster family (3 x), a registered foster family (2 x) or elsewhere (1 x);
- S eleven children who live in a registered foster family move in with (one of) the parents (3 x of which 1 x in the long run), to a network foster family (6 x) or to another registered foster family (2 x);
- S three children move to another residence.

The question arises whether the children, by changing residence, make use of more intensive (and more expensive) child care or if more use is made of less intensive child care.

	More intensive	No change	Less intensive	Unknown	Total
Number	6	14	16	6	42

Sixteen times a choice is made for less intensive (expensive) care, six times for more intensive (more expensive) care. Eleven of the sixteen children who move to less intensive care, will live with (one of) their parents; consequently Child care does no longer have to pay for their fostering out.

In the table above placement in a network foster family is regarded just as intensive as placement in a registered foster family. From a financial point of view this is correct. One variety is just as expensive as the other. Family members generally experience a network placement as less drastic than placement in a registered foster family. In the following table this element has been included

	More drastic	No change	Less drastic	Unknown	Total
Number	8	6	22	6	42

### 3.5 Evaluation

The greater part of the families (41 out of 48) has the intention to evaluate the plan. Six families did not make an agreement about evaluation, of 1 family it is unknown whether they want to evaluate.

Of the families that intend to evaluate more than half (24 x) wants to do so with referrer and family together. Fifteen times the family wants to evaluate in private.

### **3.6 Emergency plan**

Of the 48 plans 12 contain a part about what should happen if, unfortunately, things do not work out as expected during the Eigen-kracht conference. Some 'emergency plans' are very detailed (see for example annex 3). Other plans only state what persons will meet when unexpected developments or setbacks occur.

## 4 Follow-up after three months

### 4.1 Introduction

About three months after the Eigen-kracht conference, the Eigen-kracht coordinator contacts the referrer and the family. The coordinator asks them about the progress in the execution of the plan. The data described in this chapter are derived from the form (see annex 2) the coordinator fills out, based on phone calls with those concerned.

### 4.2 Background characteristics

#### *Number of plans of which follow-up data are available*

Of 42 out of the 48 plans described in chapter 3, follow-up data are available. This is 88 %. Of the remaining six (12 %) the data were unavailable because too much time had passed since the conference, or because the follow-up time of three months had not yet passed, or because the people involved could not be reached.

#### *Persons involved*

A total of 153 people has been contacted, an average of 3.6 persons per plan. In the table below is stated who have been contacted

Persons	Number
Referrer	35
Child	8
Parents	39
Family	57
Network	11
Other	3
Total	153

### 4.3 Extent of execution of the plans

After three months, from the total number of plans (N=42), 7 % (3 x) of the cases was not executed at all, 69 % (28 x) was executed partially and 24 % (10 x) completely. N.B.: if one agreement of the plan was not executed and the rest was, the plan is mentioned under 'partially' executed.

If the number of individual agreements (N=753) rather than the complete plan is

taken as a starting point, it proves that more than half of the agreements (55 %) is executed completely, 23 % not at all, 5 % partially and of 17 % it is unknown to what extent they are executed (see annex 7).

Of the number of agreements of which is know whether they are executed and to what extent (N=629), 66 % prove to be executed completely, 7 % partially and 27 % not at all.

In the next paragraphs will be described, per living domain, in how far agreements have or have not been executed. Also the reasons according to family and referrer for not or partially executing an agreement will be mentioned. It is remarkably, by the way, that referrer and family do not contradict each other on this point. Only once do referrer and family disagree on the reason why an agreement was not executed.

#### 4.3.1 Child raising

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are available contain 229 agreements concerning the improvement of the child raising situation. Over half of the agreements has been executed according to plan. An ample quarter was not executed, or only partially.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	129
Not executed	54
Partially executed	7
Unknown	39
Total	229

The most important reasons why agreements were not executed, rest with either the parents or the children. Twenty agreements were not executed because of 'uncooperative family members'. In this case it mainly concerns agreements that were not executed by three youngsters for whom an Eigen-kracht conference was held. In spite of the agreement they did not stick to a certain house rule. Furthermore, it proves that in 9 agreements the abilities of one of the parents was overestimated, as in the case of a mentally handicapped mother who had reached the top of her abilities. In 9 other agreements the reason for not executing the agreement lies with professionals.

When agreements were not executed, this was because of:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	20

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Overestimation of parents' abilities	9
Change in circumstances	1
Child care worker left	1
Non-cooperation Child care worker	5
Non-cooperation professional from outside Child care	3
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	7
(Request for) procedure still in progress	1
Miscellaneous	2
Unknown	5
Total	54

When agreements were not, or only partially, executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	1
Change in circumstances	1
Non-cooperation Child care worker	1
Term agreed upon is not yet over	1
Procedure still in progress	1
Miscellaneous	1
Unknown	1
Total	7

### 4.3.2 Social Network

In the 42 plans of which follow-up data are known 87 agreements are mentioned that concern maintaining and improving the contacts in the social network. Over half of the agreements was executed according to plan. About a quarter of the agreements was not or only partially executed.

Extent of execution:

Extent	Number
Executed completely	49
Not executed	21
Executed partially	1
Unknown	16
Total	87

The most important reason why agreements were not executed is a change of circumstances within the family. It occurred six times that agreements were not executed by professionals.

When agreements were not executed, this was because of:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation of family member	2
Change in circumstances <sup>16</sup>	10
Child care worker left	2
Non-cooperation Child care worker	4
Unknown	3
Total	21

Under 'non-cooperation Child care worker' is mentioned that this concerns a guardian who did not live up to his agreements and therefore 'was taken from the case'.

One agreement was only partially executed because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation Child care worker	1
Total	1

### 4.3.3 Housing

In the 42 plans of which follow-up data are available 168 agreements occur that concern improvement of the housing situation. More than half of the agreements has been executed according to plan. About a third of the agreements was not, or only partially, executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	92

<sup>16</sup> The change in circumstances mentioned here concern a visitation arrangement that could not take effect as agreed, because a parent had been hospitalized (concerns 9 agreements) and a parent who had been arrested by the police (concerns 1 agreement).

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Not executed	35
Executed partially	19
Unknown	22
Total	168

A part of the agreements has not been executed because the date agreed upon is in the future or the situation described has not (yet) occurred. Six times the reason for not executing the arrangement rested with a family member, 15 times with a professional. That agreements were not kept because of the leaving of a social care worker, was the consequence of not transferring tasks resulting from the plan.

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	3
Overestimation of parents' abilities	4
Change in circumstances	2
Child care worker left	7
Non-cooperation Child care worker	6
Non-cooperation professional from outside Child care	2
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	9
(Request for) procedure still in progress	2
Total	35

When agreements were only partially executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	1
Procedure still in progress	8
Miscellaneous	3
Unknown	7
Total	19

Finding other accomodation takes more than three months. With ten agreements concerning obtaining other accomodation the procedure is still in progress.

### 4.3.4 Education

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are known contain 62 agreements that concern the improvement van the education situation. About half of the agreements has been executed according to plan. About a third of the agreements was not, or only partially, executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	32
Not executed	18
Executed partially	6
Unknown	6
Total	62

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	4
Overestimation of parents' abilities	2
Change in circumstances	1
Non-cooperation Child care worker	3
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	4
Unknown	4
Total	18

Of the agreements that were only partially executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	2
Change in circumstances	1
Procedure still in progress	1
Miscellaneous	2
Total	19

### 4.3.5 Leisure activities

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are known contain 69 agreements concerning

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

leisure activities. About two third of the agreements has been executed according to plan. About one fifth of the agreements was not, or only partially, executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	45
Not executed	14
Executed partially	1
Unknown	9
Total	69

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Change in circumstances	7
Non-cooperation Child care worker	1
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	6
Total	14

One agreement was only partially executed because:

Reason	Number
Change in circumstances	1
Total	1

### 4.3.6 Health

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are available 47 contain agreements concerning the improvement of the health situation. Over half of the agreements has been executed according to plan. About a quarter of the agreements was not, or only partially, executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	26
Not executed	9

Executed partially	4
Unknown	8
Total	47

The table below shows that is is mainly because of the professionals that agreements were not executed.

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	1
Child care worker left	4
Non-cooperation professionals outside Child care	4
Total	9

When agreements were only partially executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation professionals outside Child care	1
Miscellaneous	1
Unknown	2
Total	4

#### 4.3.7 Finances

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are known contain 30 agreements concerning improving the financial situation. Almost half of the agreements has been executed according to plan. Almost a quarter of the agreements has not, or only partially, been executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	13
Not executed	7
Executed partially	1
Unknown	9

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Total	30
-------	----

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	1
Change in circumstances	2
Child care worker left	2
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	2
Total	7

One agreement was only partially executed because:

Reason	Number
Request for individual budget not yet granted	1
Total	1

#### 4.3.8 Employment

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are available contain 9 agreements concerning improving the employment situation. About half of the agreements has been executed according to plan, the other half has not been executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	4
Not executed	4
Executed partially	0
Unknown	1
Total	9

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

	Number
Non-cooperation family member	3
Change in circumstances	1
Total	4

#### 4.3.9 Judiciary

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are available contain only 3 agreements concerning judiciary. Two of these agreements have been executed and resulted in not prolonging a court order. Of 1 agreement it is unknown whether or not it was executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	2
Not executed	0
Executed partially	0
Unknown	1
Total	3

#### 4.3.10 Miscellaneous

The 42 plans of which follow-up data are available contain 49 agreements concerning situations that do not fit in one of the above categories. About half of the agreements has been executed according to plan, a quarter was not, or only partially, executed.

Extent of execution:

	Number
Executed completely	24
Not executed	10
Executed partially	2
Unknown	13
Total	49

When agreements were not executed, this was because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	2
Non-cooperation child care worker	1
Date mentioned in agreement is in the future, or situation did not occur	5
Miscellaneous	1

## Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Unknown	1
Total	10

Two agreements were only partially executed because:

Reason	Number
Non-cooperation family member	1
Unknown	1
Total	2

### 4.4 Evaluation

About three months after the Eigen-kracht conference, in half of the cases an evaluation of the plan has taken place. This happened about as frequently by family and referrer together as by family members only.

by:	evaluation	no evaluation	unknown
family/referrer together	12	25	04
family without referrer	11	20	10

It remains unclear if and in how many families an evaluation will take place later than three months after the conference. More than one Eigen-kracht coordinator indicated on the follow-up form that a date has been set for the evaluation, but that it did not take place yet. Also, in some cases, it is indicated that no one has taken the initiative to arrange a meeting.

## **5 Conclusions and recommendations**

### **5.1 Conclusions**

#### **5.1.1 Introduction**

In The Netherlands, an Eigen-kracht conference is a new working method to let the responsibility for drastic decisions concerning problems around a child rest with the child's family and social network. Eigen-kracht is a decision-making model, it is not social care. It does not lay the responsibility for the making of a care plan with professionals but with those closely concerned: family and social network. After they have been informed by professionals, the family discusses in private time what needs to be done to help the child. The family puts this down in a plan, which is presented to the referrer. The referrer will accept the plan if it is safe for the child and legally permitted. When accepted, family and referrer work together on the execution of the plan, according to the way described in the plan.

The research is aimed at the contents of the first 48 plans that were made in The Netherlands by families during an Eigen-kracht conference and the extent of execution of the plans after three months. It concerns the plans made at the conferences in 2001 and 2002, the years in which Eigen Kracht gained its first experiences with introducing Family Group Conferencing in The Netherlands. These plans were made for children who were mostly referred by Child Protection (56 %) or another department of Child care (25 %). In most cases a plan had to be made for raising the child and/or the residence of the child. Of almost 60 % of the children at least one of the parents was born outside The Netherlands.

#### **5.1.2 Conclusions on the plans**

The research does give a representative view of the plans that families and network made during Eigen-kracht conferences. All plans that were made during the research period, a total of 48, are included in the research. No selection was made.

The plans of families are not standardized. They differ a lot in form, length and contents. Most plans are concrete and detailed. They describe what has to be done for whom, what care and support is needed from whom, what action child and parents take themselves, who does what and when. A plan contains an average of 17.8 agreements.

The plans were thought out and made up by family and network of the child/the children who are cause for concern. This means they came into being in a different way than is usual in present Child care, where professionals dominate the making of plans. Yet the quality of the plans is such that the professionals involved (referrers) consider the plans safe for the child. This is proven by the fact that the plans were accepted by the referrers. They considered all plans as adequate (giving an answer

to the question asked), safe and legal.

The intention is that the greater part of the agreements made by the families, takes effect immediately or within three months after the Eigen-kracht conference. This does not mean, however, that mainly short term agreements are made. The major part of the agreements is of a permanent nature and covers a longer period.

The greater part of the Eigen-kracht conferences that were researched concern care regarding child raising and housing: how can the child grow up safely? Where should the child live? This is reflected in the plans and agreements made by the family. They too mostly concern the life domains housing and child raising.

The family does not focus on one or two aspects of the child's life, but takes the whole picture as a starting point. The agreements in the plans concern an average of four domains of life. Most agreements are aimed at improving the situation in which the child is raised and lives. A lot of agreements concern the contact with family and social network, education and leisure time. Agreements are also made concerning health, finances and employment.

The core of the family plans is the child's situation. Over four in five agreements concern the situation of the child. These agreements may concern only the child (56 %), or child and parents both (29 %). The other agreements are aimed at the situation of the parents or others like foster parents. In most cases there is a link to the child's situation. This concerns improving the situation of parents or others for the benefit of the child at a later stage. Although an Eigen-kracht conference is organized with the child in mind, care and support that family members offer is not aimed at the child only. Parents and the family context are included. Here too it is shown that most families take the whole picture as a starting point for the solutions they come up with.

For the execution of an agreement an average of two persons is needed. The family assigns itself a large role in the execution of the plans<sup>17</sup>. In four out of ten agreements the parents and children take action, also in four out of ten agreements other family members and network take on the execution. This means that about 80% of the agreements is executed by family and network. In a little under 20% care or support is required from professionals, either in or outside of Child care. The family and the network are especially active when it concerns agreements regarding contacts in the social network, child raising, housing, leisure time and education. Greatparents, uncles and aunts for example are willing to try to maintain or improve the contact between child and parents or child and other family members, they offer parents support with child raising, they are willing to take the children into their homes either temporary or permanent, they want to undertake things with the children in their leisure time and offer to help with homework or accompany the

---

<sup>17</sup> See annex 6.

parents to talks at school.

Services from professionals in Child care are mostly required where it concerns the improvement of the living- and child raising situation. Most of this help is required from the institution that referred the child or from a foster care institution. This may concern formalizing the (new) residence of the child, looking for and counselling a foster family, aiding with obtaining other accomodation, giving advice on child raising and arranging home help.

Services from professionals outside Child care are mostly required when it concerns the improvement of situations regarding education, health, living or child raising. This help is required from schools, psychological and psychiatric care institutions, care and treatment of drug addict institutions, housing associations and home help.

The family doesn't look upon the Eigen-kracht conference as a once-only action. Together they want to remain responsible for the execution of the plan. In 85% of the plans an agreement is included to arrange a meeting for evaluation. More than half of the families want the referrer to be present at the evauation, one third does not. Not much thought is given to the possibility that situations may fall short of expectation or do not work out as expected. Only a quarter of the plans contains an 'emergency clause' in which is described what action will be taken if the execution of the plan is endangered because, unfortunately, matters do not work out as planned during the Eigen-kracht conference.

A trend toward less expensive and less extensive care may be noticed in the living domain 'housing'. Whether this is true for other domains of life as well has not been researched. A little over half of the children does not change residence as a result of the family plan. The majoritie of the children who do change residence moves to a less intensive method of care or moves back in with the parents. Children also move in more often with network foster families than with institutional foster families.

### **5.1.3 Conclusions on the execution of the plans**

It was researched to what extent the agreements of the family members were executed. Do people keep their promises? Is the care required available? Of nearly 90% of the 48 plans, the follow-up data of three months since the Eigen-kracht conference were researched.

To collect the follow-up data contact was made with an average of 3.6 persons per plan, referrers as well as family members. A relatively small number of children was interviewed. Family and referrer do not contradict each other where it concerns the extent to which the plan was executed or the reasons why an agreement sometimes was not (yet) executed.

Based on the above it may be concluded that the results of the research are representative.

After three months the execution of the majority of the plans is being worked on. Ten

plans (24 %) have already been executed completely, three were not completed at all (7 %), the rest was completed partially. Also when the number of agreements *in* the plans rather than the plan as a whole is taken as a starting point, it proves that the greater part has been executed. Agreements on leisure activities were executed two times out of three, agreements on child raising, contacts in the social network and health were executed a little less often. About half of the agreements on education, finances and employment were executed.

The plans of which the follow-up data are known, contain 753 agreements. Of these, the greater part has been executed (55 %). 213 agreements were not, or only partially, executed. This is 28 %. There are various reasons. In a little over a quarter the reason is related to the family (aimed too high or not keeping an agreement). In a little under a quarter the reason is related to professionals (departure of social care workers, non-cooperation of professional). In 16 % the agreement has not yet been executed because the situation for which the agreement was made did not (yet) occur, in 13 % the circumstances have changed drastically making the execution of the agreement irrelevant or impossible and in 7 % procedures are still in progress to obtain the required care.

How many and which persons were involved in the agreements that were not or only partially executed was not researched. Still something can be said in general about the way in which family members and professionals dealt with the agreements they made. Of the total number of agreements about eighty percent was accounted for by family and members of the network. Execution of the agreements involved 1717 people: 313 professionals, 1373 family and network members. When we relate these numbers to the agreements that were not, or only partially executed, it proves that of the 213 agreements that were not executed, 56 were not executed by family and 48 were not executed by professionals. Based on these numbers it may be concluded that the number of agreements executed by the family is both absolutely and relatively higher than the number of agreements executed by professionals.

It is remarkable that of the agreements that was not executed by professionals in Child care, about one in ten had to do with the departure of the social care worker (in most cases the referrer) who was involved in the Eigen-kracht conference. This may indicate that, as is more often the case with the introduction of new models, the introduction of the Eigen-kracht conference depends too much on the dedication and enthusiasm of the individual social care worker and has not yet become commonplace.

It seems that Eigen-kracht conferences are as yet insufficiently part of the integral care services that organisations offer.

85 % of the plans contained agreements on evaluating the plans. After three months that evaluation had taken place in half of the cases. It may be expected that a part of the good-evaluation-intentions will be executed yet, as a date for an evaluation meeting has been scheduled. In other cases this seems unlikely because no agreement was made on who would take the initiative and people seem to wait for

each other to do so.

## 5.2 Recommendations

### ***Recommendations for research***

As only a limited amount of research into Eigen Kracht could take place yet, it is recommended that further research is made into:

- S the effects of the Eigen-kracht conferences in the short and the long run on the situation of the child and the cooperation of families and social care
- S the way parents and other members of the family feel with regards to the Eigen-kracht conference, the execution of the plan and the cooperation with social care workers
- S the costs of the care required in the family plans, as compared to the plans that were made by professionals
- S the contents of the plans and the extent of execution some years from now, when the implementation of Eigen Kracht has progressed further

It is also recommended that subresearches take place, e.g. into the contents of the plans, the extent of execution and into bottlenecks in certain domains to gain more insight in the results per region.

### ***Recommendations for Eigen Kracht***

Make it standard to ask the family to include one or more persons who should be informed or consulted if things do not work out as planned in the execution of the agreements.

Make it standard to ask the family to include in the plan who will take the initiative to make concrete arrangements for a meeting where family members and/or referrer evaluate the plan.

When the Eigen-kracht coordinator contacts people after three months to inquire into the execution of the plan (follow-up), the child for whom the plan was made should be interviewed more often, taking the child's age into consideration. Improve the information to referrers and/or other social care workers about what is expected of them after the Eigen-kracht conference and how to handle when bottlenecks occur.

### ***Recommendations for executors of professional care***

More initiative from social care workers to cooperate with family and network members. This is not only worthwhile during the execution of the plan following an Eigen-kracht conference, but also in cases in which no Eigen-kracht conference will be held.

When a social care worker hands over a case in which an Eigen-kracht conference was held, the work method of Eigen-kracht and the agreements made in the plan should be explained to the colleague or successor. Organisations that work with Eigen-kracht conferences should take care that cases are adequately transferred to prevent the family from being dependent of 'a new one who knows nothing about anything!'.

When the execution of the plan stagnates, when important agreements are not kept or when there are drastic changes in circumstances, the family should be called for a meeting to adjust the plan. This can take the form of an evaluation meeting or a second Eigen-kracht conference. It is important that the social care worker continues to involve, activate and respect the family.

### ***Recommendations for policy makers***

Within Child care a discussion is taking place on the introduction of a family coach. This discussion should include the possibility that the family coach could be a member of the family or network and from what position the family coach can help the family to obtain the care required from various organisations.

More cooperation between sectors; more cooperation and better tuning between Child care institutions and organisations outside Child care. To provide the family with the care they need it is especially important that there is close cooperation in the domains of housing, education, leisure time, health and finances. This could be in the form of (preferably binding) agreements between housing association, schools, home care and institutions for psychological or psychiatric care.

Increase the status of the plans, in order to give family members a right on the care they require and deem necessary. This right can be carried into law, regional policy and institutional policy.

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 1: Eigen Kracht conference form; plans, decisions and recommendations**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 2: Follow-up form van the registratie Eigen Kracht**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 3:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 4:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 5:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 6:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 7:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 8:**

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

Eigen Kracht according to plan?

## **Annex 9:**

## Literatuurlijst

Achtergrondinformatie Eigen Kracht. *Family beslist zelf over hulpverlening*. (2002)  
Folder Eigen Kracht Centrale.

Baartman, H. (1991) *Praktisch-pedagogische thuishulp in bewerkelijke gezinnen*.  
Houten: Bohn Stafleu VanLoghum.

Baartman, H.E.M. (2002) *Wie maakt the dienst uit*. (Waterinklezing). Amsterdam:  
Vrije Universiteit

Beek, F. van (2002). Eigen-kracht conferences 2001. *Verslag van the data uit the registratie*. Voorhout: WESP.

Beek, van F. (2002a). *'Gewoon questions wat er is en wat ze voor je kunnen doen.'*  
Vraaggericht werken volgens jongeren en parents; trends in childer en ouder  
kwaliteitscriteria. Deelrapport 1 van the LPJ Monitor 2002. Den Haag/Voorhout:  
LPJ/WESP

Beek, F. van (2003). Eigen Kracht conferences. *the eerste ervaringen in The Netherlands*. (Deelrapport 1) Voorhout: WESP.

Dogan, G, Dijke, A. van, Terpstra, L. (2000). *Wie zijn er 'moeilijk bereikbaar'?* Aan-  
knopingspunten voor ondersteuning en begeleiding van 'moeilijk bereikbare'  
gezinnen en jongeren. Utrecht: NIZW.

*Een wijkgerichte samenwerking voor the aanpak van meervoudige problematiek in  
buurten*. Notitie van the wijknetwerken in Dieze Oost, Dieze West, Holtenbroek,  
Kamperpoort en Indische buurt. Zwolle (1998): Maatschappelijke dienstverlening the  
Kern, Politie IJsselland, Stad en Welzijn.

*Eigen Kracht is the kern*. Information voor organisations. (Folder) Voorhout: Eigen  
Kracht Centrale.

*Eigen-kracht coördinator. Iets voor u?* (Folder) Voorhout: Eigen Kracht Centrale.

*Handboek voor Eigen-kracht conference coordinators* (2002). Voorhout: OKS/WESP.

Joanknecht, L. (1998). *the familycirkel: een sluitend plan*. In: The Netherlands  
Tijdschrift voor Child care 6, pagina's 10-16.

Joanknecht, L. (2003). *Wettelijke positie client cruciaal voor toekomst child care*.  
Recht van citizens hoort in Wet op the child care. In: The Netherlands  
Tijdschrift voor Child care 3, pagina's 132-139

*Juryrapport Simon Slootenprijs (2002)*. Utrecht: Vedio/Raad voor the Childerbescherming

Kok, H. (2002a). *the assessmentbesluit: een illusie?* In: The Netherlandss Tijdschrift voor Child care 5.

Kok, H. (2002b). *the new wet behoeft een houdbaarheidsdatum*. In: The Netherlandss Tijdschrift voor Child care 6, pagina's 285-289

Notitie '*Met recht vraaggestuurd*' (2003). Voorhout: Eigen-kracht Centrale.

Mehlkopf, P. (2002). *Wet op the child care is slechts overgangswet*. In: The Netherlandss Tijdschrift voor Child care 6, pgs 278-284

Pagée, R. van (2001). *the Eigen-kracht conference*. the shift van hulpverlening naar dienstverlening. In: The Netherlandss Tijdschrift Child care 3, pagina's 154-162.

Pagée, R. van (redactie) (2003). *Eigen Kracht. Family Group Conference in The Netherlands*. Van model naar invoering. Amsterdam: SWP

Portengen, R. (2002) *Dichter bij huis*. Networkpleegzorg in The Netherlands. Utrecht: NIZW/Trillium

Projectvoorstel Eigen-kracht conference. *Family beslist zelf over hulpverlening*. (2000) Voorhout: WESP/OKS.

*Randgroepjongeren uit the marge: een knelpuntenanalyse van vijf voor randgroepjongeren relevante beleidsterreinen* (1986). Den Haag: VNG.

Slot, N.W. e.a. (2002). *909 zorgen*. Een research naar the doelmatigheid van the ondertoezichtstelling. Amsterdam: VU.

Yperen, T. van (2003). *the assessment-besluit: aanpakken of verhullen?* In: The Netherlandss Tijdschrift voor Child care 1, pagina's 16-21.