

## Illustrative guidelines for describing examples of good practice in crime prevention

Paul Ekblom

Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate

London UK

August 2002

*This note (prepared in collaboration with colleagues in the Crime Prevention Council in Denmark) seeks to supplement the guidance material circulated in the Call for Good Practice Examples for the European Crime Prevention Network Conference, Denmark, October 2002, which was circulated to Contact Points in July. In particular, it aims to clarify the broad headings in that guidance (based on the '5 Is'), and to illustrate the categories of detailed content which could be included in completing systematic project descriptions. This note is not prescriptive – and indeed Member States may already have completed their project descriptions by now. (If they have not reached this stage, they are of course welcome to use this material.) Nor are these guidelines seen as the 'last word' – indeed, the intention is to obtain feedback and suggestions for improvements and extensions from colleagues throughout EU and Applicant States, during the Conference itself and after.*

The aims of collecting examples of good practice in crime prevention are: to showcase good performance on the part of local practitioners, to inspire others to implement good quality crime prevention in policy and practice, and to add value by exchanging good practice ideas for projects which are **replicable** in other locations. The last aim is of course the most demanding. It requires us to capture sufficient information on each example project, which will enable practitioners in other places:

- **To select successful preventive methods, and other elements of good practice**, which are suitable to tackle their own crime problems in their own regional and local context. Having made their selection,
- **To plan and implement their own projects so as to successfully replicate, or reconstruct, the action.**

From these requirements it follows that the information necessary for successful selection and replication of preventive action by other users is rather more structured and detailed than one would usually expect to set out in a 'showcase' or an 'inspirational' description. But if the intention is seriously to transfer practical knowledge, nothing less will suffice. Indeed, it could be argued that good practice itself centres on a high degree of clarity and rigour in planning and implementing action.

Research has shown how the success of crime prevention heavily depends on how well generic, evidence-based principles are realised as practical methods attuned to a specific crime problem (or set of related problems) and its particular causes and context. 'Cookbook' copying doesn't work. Transferring and replicating good practice therefore requires much more information on successful projects than any superficial journalistic account would give. Synthesis of the information into a systematic and organised body of

knowledge can add further value to this effort and can cope with the many circumstances where the existing body of 'case-level' knowledge can offer nothing that exactly fits new requirements and new contexts – which will often apply. The whole exercise requires capturing knowledge of the operational **process** of prevention as much as the **end-product** of particular intervention methods which worked in one time and place.

Elements of good practice can improve performance at all stages of this 'Preventive Process', especially if they are combined in a systematic and rigorous approach. We can identify the key steps of the process. **They can be called the 'Five Is':**

- **Intelligence** – gathering and analysing information on crime problems and their consequences, and diagnosing their causes and (with longer-term, developmental prevention) the 'risk and protective factors' in young children's life circumstances associated with later criminality.
- **Intervention** – considering the range of possible interventions – both civil prevention and traditional law-enforcement – that could be applied to block, disrupt or weaken those causes and manipulate the risk and protective factors.
- **Implementation** – converting the in-principle interventions into practical methods, putting them into effect in ways which are appropriate for the local context, and monitoring/quality-assuring the actions undertaken.
- **Involvement** – mobilising other agencies, companies and individuals to play their part in implementing the intervention, because the professionals, like the police, often have to work through others rather than directly blocking crimes or catching criminals.
- **Impact and process evaluation** – assessment, feedback and adjustment.

Underlying the Preventive Process, and therefore supporting good practice, are 5 kinds of practical crime prevention knowledge (the 'Five Ks') deriving from immediate operational information, statistical and other records, practical experience, research and evaluation evidence:

- **Know-about crime problems** – crime types, patterns and trends, modus operandi, consequences, costs, causes and risk/protective factors.
- **Know-what works** in preventing which crime problem in which contexts – how cost-effectively, acceptably and sustainably.
- **Know-how to put into practice** – knowledge and competencies of the Preventive Process described above.
- **Know-who to involve** – knowledge of contacts for ideas and advice; potential partners in prevention and collaborators who can be mobilised as formal or informal preventers; service providers, suppliers of funds, equipment and other specific resources, and wider support.
- **Know-why** – knowledge of symbolic, moral, judicial, equity and emotional aspects of prevention.

These fields of knowledge underpin the 5 I's of the Preventive Process (although there is no neat 1:1 mapping). They represent the kinds of information that we need to capture, assess and organise in order to transfer good practice between projects, between regions and between countries, and more generally to build up a shared body of practical expertise.

It is quite a challenging task to describe diverse crime reduction projects in a uniform and systematic way, which nevertheless helps them to 'come alive' from the written text. The framework adopted is based on the '5 I's' of the Preventive Process. Two versions of the suggested framework are presented. The first, below, sets out the headline contents that can be captured, where relevant, for each project. The second, in the Appendix, repeats this but under each heading are suggested categories, illustrations and terms which may be helpful in clarifying what is meant. It is a kind of 'manual' for describing projects. It is not the intention to dictate the fine detail of what is written for its own sake; but there are great advantages in promoting consistency and accurate comprehension of what is covered under each heading. This is particularly important in the international context in which we are striving to collaborate and communicate with one another, on the basis of different languages, different practical, legal and administrative frameworks, and a crime prevention lexicon which has been imprecise and inconsistent even within individual countries; but experience shows that equivalent problems beset national and local collaboration and sharing.

### **Some Q&As**

#### **Who should capture the information for the example projects?**

We suggest that **researchers/ criminologists** should be involved alongside **practitioners or administrators** in capturing the information for good practice example projects. Throughout the exercise, they should keep in mind the 5 different kinds of knowledge set out above. They should ask what information of each kind is needed to describe the key ingredients of the crime problem that the project aims to prevent, and the principles and practical realisation of the preventive intervention?

#### **How to be selective in capturing information?**

Practical action is often rich and complex. Even the simplest crime prevention project can generate an enormous amount of information – but only a limited amount of it will be useful or interesting. It is therefore very important to be selective in assembling information for the descriptions of the example projects. Here, we offer a few guiding principles, but this is very much a matter of judgement.

- The general idea is not to go into great detail beyond that which is necessary for conveying the main concepts and key signposts, qualifiers and cautions for the project as a whole, and describing the special points of good practice in enough detail to be intelligible and replicable.
- Information on what is judged to be **good practice** should be especially highlighted, of course – particularly where particular **practical problems and policy issues** have arisen, and the practitioners have developed some **useful solutions** that are worth sharing.
- '**Troublesome Tradeoffs**' centre on the need to design preventive methods so that they serve their purpose without excessive cost, or unacceptably interfering with other goals such as convenience, aesthetics, environmental concerns, reliability, safety or privacy.

How such tradeoffs were resolved could be useful for practitioners replicating the preventive method, even in very different contexts. For example, a solution that was too expensive to use in a context where offenders were amateurs, could yet be useful elsewhere against professionals. The experience is thus not wasted.

- It is not appropriate for project descriptions to contain the full details of any academic evaluation that has been done, although if such an evaluation exists, a summary of results (and appropriate references) would be a vital part of the description.
- Other details are only necessary if they contribute to **setting the scene, completing the picture or establishing contextual ingredients** which may be important for the project to succeed. It is necessary to use judgement on what to cover in detail, what to include as background and what to leave out entirely.

#### **How long should a project description be?**

This depends on how complicated are the project's history, crime problem tackled and methods deployed.

Projects for which only limited information is available (for example, where there is not yet any information on ultimate impact on crime, or which focus on just one or two good practice elements in intelligence, implementation or insertion) will of necessity generate shorter descriptions. It may be that any future version of the material that was incorporated on a website could contain extra detail. To put a figure on it, we currently envisage about a 5-page description for a fully-covered project.

#### **What if a project employs more than one preventive method?**

Sometimes, a project can employ several distinct preventive methods, working together. In such cases it may be necessary to complete a separate description for each method, and then to describe how the different methods work together, any problems this caused and how they were overcome. However, it is often difficult in such circumstances to identify which components contributed most to the success of the project, and whether any were in fact unnecessary.

## Good practice description – main headings

### 1. Intelligence

Intelligence involves gathering and analysing information on crime problems and their consequences, and diagnosing their causes and (with longer-term, developmental prevention) the 'risk and protective factors' in young children's life circumstances associated with later criminality.

- 1.1. **General social/geographical context to the problem**
- 1.2. **The crime problem** (or set of crime problems) that the project aimed to prevent. **Wider crime & disorder context.**
- 1.3. **Significant consequences of the crime problem/s** to individuals, families, communities or society which the project aimed to alleviate – for example:
- 1.4. **Evidence of crime problem – sources of information and analysis**
- 1.5. **Know-how in collection and analysis**
- 1.6. **Immediate causes and risk factors**

### 2. Interventions

Interventions are **how the action works**: the causal **principles or mechanisms** – both civil prevention and traditional law-enforcement – that could be applied to block, disrupt or weaken the causes of criminal events or the risk factors, and strengthen the protective factors.

- 2.1. **Intervention principles**
- 2.2. **Offenders' countermeasures – displacement and offender replacement**

### 3. Implementation

Implementation is **what is actually done** – how the practical methods that realise the principles in locally-appropriate ways, are targeted, converted into action on the ground that is directed at an appropriate 'social level', and monitored.

- 3.1. **Targeting of the action on the crime problem, offender, place and victim**
- 3.2. **Aiming the action at the right social levels**
- 3.3. **Inputs of funds, effort, human resources and capacity-building**
- 3.4. **Converting the method into action on the ground – management, planning and supervision**
- 3.5. **Outputs achieved – for each method**
- 3.6. **Monitoring, quality-assuring and adjusting the action in the light of feedback**
- 3.7. **The supporting environment for projects – infrastructure and partnership**

## Good practice description – main headings

### 4. Involvement in the community

Professionals, like the police, often have to work through others rather than directly intervening themselves. Insertion is when those formally in charge of a crime prevention project (who could themselves be a partnership) act through an existing partnership or mobilise other agencies, companies and individuals to collaborate in playing specific, limited parts in implementing the intervention.

**4.1. Partnership, and mobilisation/collaboration - The individuals, agencies, companies, government departments or NGOs involved**

**4.2. The wider climate of opinion in which the project was implemented**

### 5. Impact/cost effectiveness and process evaluation

Obviously, describing some element of action as 'good practice' gains credibility if this was identified or confirmed by an evaluation. As the 'Call for good practice examples' annex indicated, we give preference to project descriptions which contain the results of evaluations which are **reliable and valid**. **Independence** from the implementers or funders is also desirable. However, we acknowledge that this is not always possible (and even the most sophisticated evaluation cannot rigorously test every aspect of a project).

We are interested in results from the two main aspects of evaluation. **Impact** evaluation yields information on **what worked** in reducing crime and meeting the other objectives of the project. Ideally it also identifies **how it worked** (the principles/mechanisms), **what aspects of it worked** and **what contextual factors** contributed to success. **Process** evaluation essentially assesses the quality of the entire Preventive Process from intelligence to insertion, identifying all the significant problems and issues encountered and how they were dealt with, and checking whether any agreed standards (eg over data protection) were adhered to.

Impact evaluation can be extended into cost effectiveness assessment.

**5.1. The evaluation of the project – scope, method, results, replicability**

## Appendix: Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

### Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

#### 1. Intelligence

Intelligence involves gathering and analysing information on crime problems and their consequences, and diagnosing their causes and (with longer-term, developmental prevention) the 'risk and protective factors' in young children's life circumstances associated with later criminality. Throughout this section describe the **evidence and research methods** on which the description and analysis was based (refer to 1.5).

##### 1.1. General social/geographical context to the problem

##### 1.2. The crime problem (or set of crime problems) that the project aimed to prevent.

1.2.1. Describe the following aspects of the crime problem and its context *if they are of particular interest, and relevant to replication of the project* (and describe any other aspects you also think are important). [take in PBM heads?]

- The types of **offenders** involved
- The **Modus Operandi**, tools, weapons, skills and other **resources** used by the offenders
- The **target goods** that were typically stolen or damaged
- The **target homes** that were burgled
- The **owners or managers** of the homes or goods
- The **target persons** who were assaulted
- The **immediate physical and social context** of the criminal events (type of street, shop, station etc; type of activity in that place)
- The **wider physical and social context** of the criminal events (town centre, residential area etc; demographic features such as area of social deprivation)
- The **timing** of the criminal events during the day, the week or the year
- Whether the crime problem was **recent or of long-standing**
- Whether **repeat victimisation** was significantly involved
- The **wider crime and disorder context** included nuisance-related incidents and young men loitering who caused some residents to be worried. Within the community, there was also some fear of reprisals if crimes were reported to the police. Police officers suggested that youths growing up in the area were at high risk of drifting into crime.

##### 1.3. Significant consequences of the crime problem/s to individuals, families, communities or society which the project aimed to alleviate – for example:

- **Fear**
- **Injury**
- **Financial cost**
- **Restriction of leisure, work or domestic activity**

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

1.3.1. Describe whether these consequences:

- Fell on particular **communities or sets of people**
- And whether these people were specially **vulnerable** in some ways, or needed **help** to cope

### 1.4. Immediate causes and risk factors

Describe any identifiable causes of the criminal events; or any risk factors (associated with offending in later life) present and protective factors absent. It is *not* necessary to describe every cause – only those which significantly relate to the intervention or determine the context for it to work. The causes set out below (and the interventions in section 2) are based on the *Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity* conceptual framework described at [www.crimereduction.gov.uk/cco.htm](http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/cco.htm).

1.4.1. **Immediate** causes on the **offender** (or potential offender) side can be grouped under the following headings:

- a. **Criminality** – longer-term, personality-based influences predisposing offenders to crime
- b. **Lack of resources to avoid crime** – eg for avoiding conflict or gaining a legitimate living
- c. **Readiness to offend** – shorter-term influences – motives and emotional states, as determined by current life circumstances, conflicts and influence of drugs
- d. **Resources for committing crime** – skills, courage, knowledge of targets, Modus Operandi, tools, weapons, access to networks of collaborators
- e. **Immediate decision to offend** – anticipation/ perception of low risk and effort, and of high reward, and absence of attacks of conscience
- f. **Presence** of the offender in the crime situation

1.4.2. **Immediate causes** on the **situational** side can include:

- g. **Target** person, property, service, system or information that is vulnerable, provocative or attractive to assault, theft or damage by criminals
- h. **Target enclosure** – building, room, vehicle or container that is vulnerable to penetration and contains suitable targets
- i. **Wider environment**, both physical and social, that is logistically/tactically favourable for offenders and unfavourable for preventers, and which may attract the offence and motivate or otherwise generate it
- j. Absence of **crime preventers** – people or organisations, formal or informal, who make the crime less likely, whether deliberately or incidentally
- k. Presence of **crime promoters** – people or organisations who make the crime more likely, whether unwittingly, carelessly or deliberately – for example by supplying tools, information or other criminal services before or after the crime

1.4.3. **Remoter, or higher-level causes** can include for example:

- Criminal **careers** of offenders
- Criminal **networks and organisations**
- Criminal **subcultures**
- Criminal **markets** eg drug markets



## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

- Anything that **brings the immediate causes together** such as victims' or offenders' lifestyles and routine activities

1.4.4. **Risk factors** are conditions in offenders' earlier life, which are known correlates of later offending. They may differ from country to country but can include [taken from UK Communities that Care]

At the **family** level:

- Poor parental supervision and discipline
- Family conflict
- Family history of problem behaviours
- Parental involvement or attitudes condoning problem behaviour
- Low income and poor housing

At the **school** level:

- Low achievement, beginning at primary school
- Aggressive behaviour at school, including bullying
- Lack of commitment to school, including truancy
- School disorganisation

At the **community** level:

- Community disorganisation and neglect
- Availability of drugs
- Disadvantaged neighbourhood
- High turnover of residents and lack of neighbourhood attachment

At the **individual** and **friends/peers** levels:

- Alienation and lack of social commitment
- Attitudes that condone problem behaviour
- Early involvement in problem behaviour
- Friends involved in problem behaviour

And lack of the following **protective** factors:

- Social bonding
- Healthy living
- Opportunities for involvement
- Social and learning skills
- Recognition and praise for positive behaviour

1.5. **Evidence of crime problem, causes and consequences – sources of information and methods of analysis**

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

- 1.5.1. Describe the types of **information** that were collected to identify the crime problem and its consequences, and the type of **analysis** – for example:
- **Crime pattern analysis** (including measurement of repeat victimisation) based on **victim surveys** or **recorded crime statistics**
  - Analysis of **risk and protective factors** a) in potential offenders' life circumstances and/or b) in geographical areas
  - **Interviews with actual or potential offenders**
- 1.5.2. Describe *very briefly* any relevant **technical issues** of reliability, validity, bias etc which may have significantly affected the crime picture obtained.
- 1.5.3. **Know-how in collection and analysis** – Describe any special **difficulties and tradeoffs** encountered in collection or analysis, and any **innovative** approaches adopted.

## 2. Interventions

Interventions are **how the action works**: the causal **principles or mechanisms** – both civil prevention and traditional law-enforcement – that could be applied to block, disrupt or weaken the causes of criminal events or the risk factors, and strengthen the protective factors. It is central to the notion of good practice, that we can closely describe the principles. To replicate '*what works*', we must have a very clear idea of '*how it works*'. This obviously connects with **theory** – and any part played by particular theories in the design of the intervention should be highlighted.

Whether the interventions are close to the criminal events in time and space (such as deflection of violent encounters between groups of young people by establishing a youth club) or remote from the criminal events in time and space (such as a 'developmental' intervention addressing an early childhood risk factor like school failure), they all act through the same generic intervention principles which correspond to the causes a-k described under 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 above.

### Intervention principles

- 2.1.1. Interventions on the **offender** side can be grouped under the following headings:
- a. **Reducing criminality** – intervening in early lives to reduce known risk factors, enhancing known protective factors through family, school and peer groups; and supplying remedial treatment for those already convicted
  - b. **Supplying resources to avoid crime** – training offenders in social and work skills
  - c. **Reducing readiness to offend** – changing offenders' current life circumstances – alleviating drug addiction problems, poverty, unemployment, stressors like poor housing, and conflicts
  - d. **Restricting resources for offending** – control of weapons, skills, tools and information on crime targets, and transfer of criminal know-how
  - e. **Deterrence** – raising perceived risks and costs of detection; discouragement – making the effort to offend seem too great and the reward too small; awakening conscience
  - f. **Excluding offenders** from crime situations – eg keeping young offenders out of football stadia, attracting them into youth clubs, holding them under curfew (or in prison)

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

2.1.2. Interventions on the **situational** side can be grouped under the following headings:

- g. **Target hardening, target removal, value reduction** for the goods stolen or damaged in property crime
- h. **Perimeter access and security** of buildings and other enclosures (as in burglary prevention)
- i. **Environmental design, planning and management** including aiding surveillance (by landscaping or by technology such as lighting or CCTV), resolving conflicts and setting rules
- j. **Boosting preventers** – their presence, alertness, competence, motivation and responsibility –through formal control (like patrolling), informal social control, supplying positive role models for offenders, or self-protection and avoidance for victims
- k. **Discouraging and deterring crime promoters** and awakening their conscience – through naming and shaming, civil liability, prohibiting recharging of stolen mobile phones, tackling criminal subcultures, procedural controls or market reduction including cracking down on fences

Often, a practical intervention **method** may act through more than one of these **principles** (for example, improving the perimeter security of a house both physically blocks offenders' entry, psychologically deters and discourages them and facilitates the preventer role played by home owners). Describing how the method works may involve a narrative picture rather than a simple list. Ideally, the description of the practical method and its underlying principles/theories should relate back to the crime problem and context and the causes intervened in. Often it is unsure which is the active ingredient, but it is desirable to know this if possible, for purposes of replication.

### **2.2. Offenders' countermoves – displacement and offender replacement**

Offenders' countermoves are important in determining the success or the durability of the intervention, and it is important to anticipate them.

- 2.2.1. Describe any significant problems of **displacement** (offenders using different tactics, attacking in different places and at different times, or even changing to a different target of crime), and any means of limiting it that were used in the project
- 2.2.2. Describe any problems of **offender replacement** (for example, if the police remove the local drug dealer, another one fills the niche) and any means of limiting it that were used in the project

## **3. Implementation**

Implementation is **what is actually done** – how the practical methods that realise the principles in locally-appropriate ways, are targeted, converted into action on the ground that is directed at an appropriate 'social level', and monitored.

### **3.1. Targeting of the action on the crime problem, offender, place and victim**

- 3.1.1. Describe any principles used to target the action to where it was needed or would have best effect. The most widely-used way of describing targeting strategies in crime prevention is the 'public health' classification:

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

- **Primary** – focusing on the general population as potential offenders, treating all environments as potential scenes of crime or all people and material goods as targets of crime
- **Secondary** – focusing on people at particular risk of offending, on targets at risk of victimisation or on places likely to set the scene for victimisation. (Obviously, the risk and protective factors mentioned at 1.5.4 are appropriate indicators for targeting.)
- **Tertiary** – focusing on people already convicted or victimised, or targets and scenes of existing crime (linking to the concepts of **repeat victimisation**, **repeat or persistent offending**, and **hot-spots**)

### 3.2. Aiming the action at the right social levels

Crime prevention methods act on, or through, a diverse set of ‘entities’ in the real world. These range from the individual offender or target of crime, to family, community, or institutions such as schools. Here they are called ‘social levels’.

3.2.1. Describe the social level at which the intervention method primarily operates:

- **Individual places/people**
- **Family and intimates**
- **Peer groups** – networks, gangs, organised criminals
- **Institutions** – schools, companies, hospitals etc
- **Media**
- **Areas (purely geographical)**
- **Markets** – eg drug or stolen goods markets
- **Communities** (where there is a common interest and a common identity, whether this is territorial or dispersed, as with some ethnic groups)

**Community** is a complex concept, and a term that is used in confusing ways. In the project description it would help to distinguish explicitly between:

- **Community-based** projects (those which are implemented through communities and their members, and are implemented in a community setting,)
- Those which involve **community-mechanisms** such as social control or conflict resolution
- Those where the community and its members are the **target** of crime – as in racial harassment)
- Those where the **cause** of crime is at community level – such as a criminal subculture

### 3.3. Inputs of funds, effort, human resources and capacity-building

3.3.1. Describe the principal inputs into the project of funds, effort, human resources and capacity-building such as equipment and training. If relevant to replication, also describe the **sources** of the inputs (eg funds from a charitable organisation or academic expertise from a university).

### 3.4. Converting the method into action on the ground – management, planning and supervision

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

3.4.1. Describe any special principles of planning, management and supervision that were adopted and seemed to work well (indirect control through mobilising others is covered in section 4 below, on insertion) – and which may be necessary or useful in replication.

### 3.5. Outputs achieved – for each method

### 3.6. Monitoring, quality-assuring and adjusting the action in the light of feedback

3.6.1. Describe any arrangements for **monitoring and quality assurance** of the arrangements – especially where they are relevant to the replication of the project.

- Was the action delivered efficiently, and effectively?
- Were arrangements in place to ensure that proper standards on human rights, data protection etc were followed?
- Did these raise any special problems which required special solutions?

### 3.7. The supporting environment for projects – infrastructure and partnership

In the background of any project is a local, regional or national **infrastructure** of resources and support such as training and other capacity-building activity, guidance, funding and operational information systems. The infrastructure may be strong or weak – but it is important to know what level of outside support a project was able to rely on. There is no point, for example, in a country with limited infrastructure trying to replicate a project which only works in well-prepared and fertilised ground.

**Partnerships** often constitute the environment in which individual projects are designed, funded, implemented and supported. Partnership is an institutional arrangement that shades into a philosophy. It is a way of enhancing performance in the delivery of a common goal, by the taking of joint responsibility and the pooling of resources by different agents, whether these are public or private, collective or individual. The focus of the present exercise is of course on good practice in individual projects – and the Council of Europe's Committee of Experts on partnership in crime prevention (PC-PA) is nearing completion of its report on good practice at that level. So, for the present purpose, our interest in the partnership dimension is confined to the **project's perspective**: how that partnership environment helped, and/or directed, the creation and performance of the individual project.

3.7.1. Describe any infrastructure arrangements of resources and support, where they are relevant to the replication of the project. Likewise, describe any partnership arrangements where these are necessary to understanding how the project came into existence, and how it was shaped, directed, supervised and supported. We are not specifically looking for good practice at partnership level.

3.7.2. Likewise, describe any **partnership** arrangements where these are necessary to understanding how the project came into existence, and how it was shaped, directed, supervised and supported. We are not specifically looking for good practice at partnership level.

## 4. Involvement in the community

Professionals, like the police, often have to work through others rather than directly intervening themselves. Insertion is when those formally in charge of a crime prevention project (who could

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

themselves be a partnership) act through an existing partnership or mobilise other agencies, companies and individuals to collaborate in playing specific, limited parts in implementing the intervention.

### 4.1. The individuals, agencies, companies, government departments or NGOs involved

4.1.1. For each body **acting in partnership, or otherwise mobilised** to support the objectives of the project, describe (where it is not obvious):

- Who they are
- What roles they play (or what tasks they carry out) in implementing or supporting crime prevention or community safety
- Why they were especially chosen for the role (eg their competence, numbers, legitimacy)
- How they were alerted to the role they could play in crime prevention (eg publicity, personal approach)
- How they were motivated (eg regulations, legal duty, self-interest, naming and shaming, incentives)
- How they were empowered (eg with training, equipment, information, guidance, money)
- How (if relevant) they were directed (eg codes of conduct for confidentiality, performance standards, crime reduction targets)

### 4.2. The wider climate of opinion in which the project was implemented

4.2.1. At the beginning, was the local climate **hostile/suspicious** or **supportive/accepting** of the project?

4.2.2. How, if relevant, was a positive climate encouraged and a negative one dispelled?

4.2.3. Can the methods employed by the project only work in a **supportive** climate?

## 5. Impact/cost-effectiveness and process evaluation

Obviously, describing some element of action as ‘good practice’ gains credibility if this was identified or confirmed by an evaluation. As the ‘Call for good practice examples’ annex indicated, we give preference to project descriptions which contain the results of evaluations which are **reliable and valid**. [Some discussion of ‘what makes a good evaluation’ is set out in the EUCPN ‘logic model’ paper]. **Independence** from the implementers or funders is also desirable. However, we acknowledge that this is not always possible (and even the most sophisticated evaluation cannot rigorously test every aspect of a project).

We are interested in results from the two main aspects of evaluation. **Impact** evaluation yields information on **what worked** in reducing crime and meeting the other objectives of the project. Ideally it also identifies **how it worked** (the principles/mechanisms), **what aspects of it worked** and **what contextual factors** contributed to success. **Process** evaluation essentially assesses the quality of the entire Preventive Process from intelligence to insertion, identifying all the significant problems and issues encountered and how they were dealt with, and checking whether any agreed standards (eg over data protection) were adhered to.

## Good practice description – guidance and suggested details

Impact evaluation can be extended into **cost effectiveness** assessment. Cost effectiveness studies are still rare in crime prevention, but if any are submitted it would help to define terms here.

- **Input** (section 3.3 above) comprises all the **funds, effort, human resources and capacity-building** such as equipment and training. It includes 'subsidies' from infrastructure.
- **Output** comprises all the actions done by the various people which include, or directly contribute to, inserting and implementing the intervention in the causes of the crime problem or manipulating the equivalent risk and protective factors. For example, this could include the numbers of crime prevention surveys done to homes at risk of burglary, the numbers of youth clubs set up to divert young people from violent encounters in the town centre, or the time spent on a knife amnesty.
- **Intermediate outcome** comprises the immediate influence of the intervention on the causes or risk factors of the crime problem. For example, this could include the number of homes made secure to a particular quality standard, the number of young people successfully completing a course on aggression management at the youth club, or the number of knives collected during the knife amnesty.
- **Impact, or ultimate outcome** is the extent to which the project reduced crime and met its other objectives.
- **Cost effectiveness** is the ratio of impact to input – for example, an estimate of how many crimes were prevented per 1000 Euro of input.

### 5.1. The evaluation of the project – scope, method, results, replicability

5.1.1. In what ways was the project evaluated?

- Independently?
- Impact?
- Process?

5.1.1. Briefly describe the core elements of the **evaluation method**:

- **Design** – eg comparison group, before and after measurement
- The type of **outcome measures** taken (eg recorded crime statistics, crime survey) etc

5.1.2. Briefly describe the **main results** of the evaluation covering impact, cost-effectiveness and process as appropriate

5.1.3. Reflect on the **generalisability and replicability** of the results in other contexts.