

Inhoud

Preface	7
Deel 1 Algemene inleiding	9
1 Wilsbekwaamheid in de medische praktijk <i>Irma Hein, Adger Hondius</i>	11
2 Juridische aspecten in Nederland <i>Rembrandt Zijderhoudt</i>	17
3 Juridische aspecten in België <i>Marc De Hert, Martien Wampers</i>	29
4 Ethische beschouwing <i>Astrid Vellinga, Joris Vandenberghe</i>	47
5 Bijwerkingen van wilsbekwaamheidsbeoordeling <i>Sander Welie, Andrea Ruissen</i>	59
6 Toerekeningsvatbaarheid en wilsbekwaamheid: grote overeenkomsten, belangrijke verschillen <i>Gerben Meynen</i>	79
Deel 2 Specifieke thema's	87
7 Wilsbekwaamheidsbeoordeling in het algemeen ziekenhuis <i>Adriaan Honig, Joyce van Grinsven, Pieter Scholten</i>	89
8 Psychiatrische stoornissen <i>Astrid Vellinga</i>	97
9 Anorexia nervosa <i>Isis Elzackers</i>	105
10 Mensen met een verstandelijke beperking <i>Inge Koopmans, Brenda Frederiks</i>	113
11 Minderjarigen <i>Irma Hein</i>	121
12 Ouderen met dementie <i>Saskia Teunisse, Henk Geertsema</i>	129
13 Zwangerschap <i>Kathelijne Koorengel, Hilmar Bijma</i>	135
14 Euthanasie <i>Astrid Vellinga</i>	141
15 De vertegenwoordiger bij bewindvoering, mentorschap en curatele <i>Kees Blankman</i>	149

Deel 3	Praktijk	155
r6	Klinische toepassing	
	<i>Irma Hein, Adger Hondius, Christiaan Vinkers</i>	157
r7	MacCAT-handleiding	
	<i>Irma Hein</i>	169
r8	MacCAT-voorbeeldinterviews	
	<i>Irma Hein</i>	187
r9	Tot slot	
	<i>Adger Hondius, Irma Hein, Pieter Troost</i>	203
	Auteurs	207
	Register	209

Preface

Few legal constructs carry the real-world impact of decision-making competence. In liberal democratic societies, people who are deemed competent are generally entitled to make most personal decisions for themselves. By way of contrast, people who are found to lack decision-making competence may be deprived of the rights to decide about the most fundamental aspects of their lives. They may, for example, lose the power to sign a contract, convey a gift, write a will, choose where to live, marry, vote, and dispose of criminal charges. When it comes to health care, patients found to be incompetent will yield the right to decide about their medical treatment, and even their participation in research, to a third party charged with representing their interests and desires.

Given the critical nature of decision-making competence – which has been called the ‘queen’ of concepts in mental health law – its relative neglect for many years is surprising. Until the late 1970s, there was almost no literature, either theoretical or empirical, on decisional competence in the context of healthcare and medical research. Only then, stimulated by growing interest in the doctrine of informed consent to medical treatment, were the first efforts made to conceptualize an operational definition of decision-making competence. This seminal work by Loren Roth and his colleagues at the University of Pittsburgh in the U.S. set the stage for explosion of interest in the concepts associated with decisional competence that was soon to follow.

Our collaboration on decision-making competence, which began in the late 1980s, was built on a modified version of Roth et al.’s operationalization of decisional competence, using the four criteria that are familiar to most health professionals today: the abilities to understand relevant information, to appreciate its implications, to reason with it, and to evidence a choice. We developed a set of research instruments that embodied this quadripartite standard for the MacArthur Treatment Competence Study (funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation), the most extensive empirical study of the subject to that point in time. However, as that study was concluding, it was apparent to us that the time-consuming instruments we had developed would be extremely difficult to use in clinical settings. What was needed was a tool that allowed a brief but thorough assessment of the four functions underlying decisional competence, could be customized to the particular treatment decision at hand, and could be used clinically and for research purposes as well.

From this insight, the MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool for Treatment (MacCAT-T) was born. Recognizing a similar need for clinical research settings, a few years later we developed a companion MacCAT for clinical research (MacCAT-CR). What has happened in the years since has been enormously gratifying to us. The availability of the MacCATs triggered an efflorescence of research on decision-making competence. Scores of studies have been performed with each of the MacCATs, producing extensive data that have helped to identify those conditions and circumstances most likely to lead to impaired competence. At the same time, creative approaches have been developed to

support the decision making of persons with some degree of decisional impairment so that many of them can make competent decisions for themselves, rather than surrendering that power to substitute decision makers.

Moreover, the conceptual model and structure of the MacCAT has had resonance for decisions beyond those found in medical treatment and research settings. The MacCAT model has been adapted for assessing competence to participate in criminal proceedings, complete an advance directive and select a proxy decision maker, manage finances and activities of daily living, and make decisions about where to live. Modified versions have been developed for use with minors, and the MacCATs have been translated into Spanish, Mandarin, Hebrew, Dutch, and French, among other languages. The MacCAT's conceptual model has proven useful for teaching trainees in medicine, psychology, law and other disciplines about decision-making competence. And the MacCAT instruments themselves are routinely used to screen participants in clinical research and to assess the capacities of patients whose decision-making competence is in question.

This book introduces the Dutch versions of the MacCAT-T and MacCAT-CR, based on the work of Irma Hein and her colleagues, embedding them in the legal and ethical context of the Netherlands and Belgium. The chapters also illustrate the role of assessments of decisional competence in a variety of contexts, ranging from psychiatric treatment to end-of-life decisions, to care for the elderly. Given its scope, it should be of immense assistance to Dutch-speaking clinicians and researchers, who will now be able to draw on a body of comparative research using the MacCATs from around the world. We are delighted to see the reach of the MacCATs and the model on which they are based extend to our colleagues in the Netherlands and Belgium, in the hope that the instruments will help to improve the assessment process for decision-making competence to the benefit of clinicians, patients, and family members alike.

Paul S. Appelbaum, MD
Thomas Grisso, PhD

Auteurs

- Dr. H.H. (Hilmar) Bijma, gynaecoloog, afdeling verloskunde en prenatale geneeskunde, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam.
- Mr.dr. K. (Kees) Blankman, universitair docent familie- en gezondheidsrecht, juridische faculteit VU, Amsterdam.
- Prof.dr. M. (Marc) De Hert, psychiater, ZP psychose, UPC KU Leuven.
- Dr. I.F.F.M. (Isis) Elzackers, psychiater, voorheen Altrecht Eetstoornissen Rintveld, nu zelfstandig gevestigd psychiater.
- Mr.dr. B.J.M. (Brenda) Frederiks, universitair docent gezondheidsrecht VUmc, Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Centrum voor Wilsbekwaamheidsvragen VUmc, Amsterdam.
- Drs. H. (Henk) Geertsema, gezondheidszorgpsycholoog, afdeling huisartsgeneeskunde & ouderengeneeskunde, Centrum voor Wilsbekwaamheidsvragen VUmc, Amsterdam.
- Drs. J. (Joyce) van Grinsven, arts-assistent in opleiding tot psychiater, OLVG Amsterdam.
- Dr. I.M. (Irma) Hein, kinder- en jeugdpsychiater en postdoc onderzoeker, De Bascule en Academisch Medisch Centrum, afdeling Kinder- en Jeugdpsychiatrie, Amsterdam.
- Dr. A.J.K. (Adger) Hondius, psychiater, geneesheer-directeur GGz Centraal, RVZe Veluwe&Veluwevallei, Flevoland, Kinder&Jeugdpsychiatrie, Ermelo/Almere.
- Prof.dr. A. (Adriaan) Honig, psychiater, bijzonder hoogleraar ziekenhuispsychiatrie VUmc/OLVG Amsterdam.
- Dr. I.M.(Inge) Koopmans, geneesheer-directeur en kinder- en jeugdpsychiater, Koraal, Sittard.
- Dr. K.M. (Kathelijne) Koorengel, psychiater, geneesheer-directeur, afdeling psychiatrie, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam.
- Prof.dr. G. (Gerben) Meynen, bijzonder hoogleraar forensische psychiatrie, Tilburg Law School, Tilburg University en bijzonder hoogleraar ethiek en psychiatrie, faculteit Geesteswetenschappen, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Tevens psychiater bij ggz inGeest.
- Dr. A.M. (Andrea) Ruissen, psychiater en filosoof, Amedea en FACT, Emergis, Goes.
- Drs. P. (Pieter) Scholten, maag-darm-leverarts, OLVG Amsterdam.
- Dr. S. (Saskia) Teunisse, klinisch psycholoog, klinisch neuropsycholoog, afdeling huisartsgeneeskunde & ouderengeneeskunde, Centrum voor Wilsbekwaamheidsvragen VUmc, Amsterdam.
- Dr. P.W. (Pieter) Troost, kinder- en jeugdpsychiater/opleider, De Bascule, academisch centrum voor kinder- en jeugdpsychiatrie, Amsterdam.
- Prof.dr. J. (Joris) Vandenberghe, faculteit geneeskunde, KU Leuven en psychiater-psychotherapeut in UZ Leuven (liaisonpsychiatrie) en UPC KU Leuven.
- Dr. A. (Astrid) Vellinga, psychiater en plv. geneesheer-directeur, Wijkteam Oud West Mentrum, Arkin, Amsterdam.
- Dr.mr. C.H. (Christiaan) Vinkers, psychiater, UMC Utrecht Hersencentrum, Utrecht.
- Dr. M. (Martien) Wampers, psycholoog, ZP psychose, UPC KU Leuven.

Mr.dr. S.P.K. (Sander) Welie, jurist, psycholoog en filosoof, Exdoctrinatio, Nonsense Consultancy en Stichting PVP, Utrecht.

Mr.drs. R.H. (Rembrandt) Zuiderhoudt, gezondheidsjurist bij Zuiderhoudt Consultancy, Den Haag.