

Graffolution - template for describing individual projects based on 5Is framework

Blank template	2
Project/service overview	2
1. Intelligence	3
What is the social/geographical context of the graffiti, and the action taken to address it, in this case study?	3
Location of the action	3
How was the action initiated – and who did the demand for action come from?	4
What is the nature of any criminal offences associated with the graffiti?	4
How is the graffiti crime defined ?	4
What are the basic statistics?	4
Is the graffiti associated with a wider pattern of crime or other social problem/s ?	4
What is the nature of the graffiti to be reduced, or facilitated?	5
Who are the graffitists targeted by the action?	5
What kinds of surface/object is the graffiti targeted on?	5
Are there specific situational attractions or vulnerabilities that draw the graffitists to the target location and/or to the target surface/object ?	5
What motivates or prompts the graffitists?	6
What resources do the graffitists use and how do they obtain them?	6
What additional harmful consequences does the graffiti have?	6
What further criminal consequences does the graffiti have?	6
What beneficial consequences might the graffiti have?	7
What sources of evidence of the nature/extent of the graffiti, its producers, its consequences and its causes were collected?	7
Were there any special Involvement activities for obtaining Intelligence?	7
2. Intervention	7
What kinds of action were in place prior to the start of this project/service, or were initiated at about the same time?	8
What kinds of ‘societal action’ does the project/service cover? [note this overlaps with Intervention and Involvement particularly]	8
What scope of problem/issue does the project/service address?	8
What are the aims or objectives of the action? In other words which of the harmful consequences of graffiti vandalism does the project or service especially seek to reduce, and which beneficial consequences of graffiti art, both described under Intelligence, does it seek to deliver?	9
What are the individual interventions that make up this project/service?	9
What is the overall intervention strategy?	9
Were any design processes employed in devising the intervention strategy and tactics?	9
3. Implementation	10
What was the mode of delivery/business model of the action?	10
What was the working structure of the project/service?	10
What was the nature of the organisation/institution founding and/or running the project?	10
What infrastructure did the problem require?	10
How was the action targeted?	10
What was the lifecycle/s of action?	11

What was the basic execution process, [both planned and] achieved?	11
4. Involvement	11
Who does what – what criminal and civil roles do people and organisations play in and around the graffiti location?	11
What partnership arrangements were in operation in the project/service?	13
What mobilisation arrangements were in operation in the project/service?	14
What consultation arrangements were in place?	15
What accountability arrangements were in place?	15
What efforts were devoted to building collaborative capacity?	15
What was the wider climate of opinion on graffiti in which the action was implemented, and how did it need to be influenced?	15
What were the risks and blockages to and from Involvement?	15
What were the outputs of Involvement?	16
5. Impact	16
What was the context of the evaluation?	16
Process evaluation	16
Implementation and Involvement overview	16
Full process evaluation headings	16
Impact evaluation	17
What were the aims/objectives of the project/service, and how do these feature in the evaluation?	17
What was the methodology of evaluation?	17
What were the results of impact evaluation?	17
Wider appreciation of case study	19
Wider performance/selection measures	19
Benefits	19
Limitations	19
Opportunities	19
OTHER COMMENTS	19

Graffolution case study template – 5Is version

Blank template

Project / Activity overview

- Identification details
- Summary of action taken

1 para or 1 page pen picture. If the action is complex, with multiple interventions and/or multiple perspectives (e.g. law enforcement and creative practice) and/or operating at different ecological levels (e.g. individual graffitiists, artistic community, neighbourhood), describe how they all fit together here in order to orient the reader. It may be easier to rough this para out at start of writing up the following description, and revisit it as your grasp of the action in detail and as a whole develops.

May also benefit from a more structured summary of the action as for example at <http://5isframework.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/5is-eastleigh-full-case-study.doc>

Detail of any confidentiality/anonymity issues [description]

1. Intelligence (Why?)

The task of gathering and analysing information and knowledge on crime, its nature, causes and harmful consequences. Its purpose is to inform the specification of crime prevention and community safety aims and priorities to be implemented; the planning and design of the preventive intervention/s and the other tasks that follow. Each of the other three Is has its own subsidiary intelligence requirements. Intelligence can also apply to the action of fostering graffiti as acceptable art.

What is the social/geographical context of the graffiti problem, and the action taken to address it, in this case study?

Location of the action

- Name the site (unless protected e.g. for ethical reasons) and locate it in a district, city, country etc.
 - Wider locality
 - Specific site
- Size of site
- Whether site is
 - Public
 - Semi-public (open access)
 - Semi-private (controlled access)
 - Private (restricted access)
- Multiple sites: Public, semi-public and semi-private

Background information on town/city/neighbourhood where action is located, including for example:

- *Land use* type (note these are broad land usage categories, details of specific items targeted are covered later):
 1. INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE
 - Industry
 - Shopping and services (A1)
 - Work offices (A2)
 - Pubs, cafes, restaurants (A3)
 - Offices
 - Business – Light industry (B1)
 - Retailing
 - Storage and warehousing (B2)
 2. RESIDENTIAL
 - Residential Institutions (C2)
 - Hotels, Hostels (C1)
 - Residential Dwellings (C3)
 3. COMMUNITY SERVICE

- Non-residential Institutions
 - Public and Community Centres, Libraries, Health Centres, etc (D1)
 - Education – Universities; Schools; Play Centres, etc (D1)
- Leisure & Recreational (D2)
 - Cultural - Leisure halls, museums, theatres, etc (D2)
 - Recreational – Parks; other outside spaces

4. TRANSPORT & UTILITIES

- Highways & road transport
 - Railway
 - Tram
 - Bus e.g. bus station
 - Highways/roads in general
 - Car Parks
 - Other [...]
- Utilities
 - Electricity, gas or water plants
 - Other [...]

5. VACANT

- Vacant Buildings (specify)
- Vacant Land/Derelict Land

6. OTHER (specify)

- *Built environment* including design and layout considerations (e.g. cul-de-sac, or permeable road network), and physical state (e.g. dilapidated or smart).
- *Demographics* including significant recent trends in youth population, employment and education.
- *Seasonality*

How was the action **initiated** – and who did the demand for action come from?

Please use free text. This could be e.g. from crime or environmental audits by dutyholders, campaigns/stories by local media, complaints by stakeholders (please specify), initiatives by graffitiists or cultural entrepreneurs.

What is the nature of any **criminal offences** associated with the graffiti?

How is the graffiti crime defined?

The crimes associated with graffiti will differ across EU Member States but will include:

- Criminal damage directly from graffiti
- Theft and damage in support of obtaining materials, gaining access
- Criminal or civil trespass
- Endangering life e.g. on railway, obscuring road signs, distracting drivers
- Offensive content e.g. variously obscenity, racist messages, supporting illegal gang membership

We need to know 1) for background, how individual Member States (or regions, local government areas within them) differ in their definition of graffiti in criminal terms; and 2) within this framework, the nature of the particular offence/s addressed in the current action of interest.

Mostly illegal tagging as Criminal Damage and Anti Social Behaviour (UK system). Also referred to as 'Illegal defacement of public property'.

What are the basic statistics available? What statistics are missing??

E.g.

- Reported/recorded incident rates, Arrest rates, Conviction rates, Types of judicial disposal and formal diversion e.g. cautioning

*Is the graffiti associated with a **wider pattern of crime or other social problem/s** within the local context?*

E.g. general vandalism or disorder, street drinking, gang crime; unemployment, poor education, poor housing

*What is the nature of the **graffiti** vandalism related problem to be reduced, or facilitated?*

Tick all that apply:

- Tags
- Etch (acid)
- Scratch (point or blade)
- Throw Up / Dub / Bomb / Scrub
- Piece / Wildstyle / Burner / Top-to-Bottom
- Stencil
- Stickers / Posters / Post-ups (paper + wheat paste)
- Street Art (unsanctioned, wall mural)
- Street Art (unsanctioned, other: eg: miniature paintings; moss-up; reverse graffiti; yarn-bombing)

Above are prob the most generic top-level categories. There are others but may not be needed here. Eg...

<http://www.at149st.com/glossary.html> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glossary_of_graffiti

*Who specifically is targeted by the actions? **(a) to benefit?** And where relevant **(b) to be controlled?***

- Graffitiists
- Other groups of persistent vandals
- Young people
- Particular geographic or interest groups
- Particular passengers
- Other [...]

E.g. where relevant and available:

- Age group/s
- Gender
- Ethnicity and/or gang/ artistic community membership
- Whether they live locally or travel to do the graffiti
- Work alone or in groups
- Other [...]

*What kinds of **surface/object** is the graffiti targeted on?*

Tick all that apply:

- General environment
 - Free-standing walls/fences
 - Pavements
 - Pedestrian subways
 - Footbridges
 - Buildings [specify any type]
 - Advertising hoardings
- Trains
 - Inside
 - Outside
- Railway infrastructures
 - Bridges
 - Stations
 - Tracks/sidings

- Walls/fences
- Control kiosks
- Other [...]
- Buses
- Bus infrastructures
 - Bus stops/shelters
 - Bus stations
 - Other [...]
- Road infrastructures e.g. traffic signs, control kiosks
- Other [...]

*Are there specific situational **attractions or vulnerabilities** that draw the graffitiists to the **target location** and/or to the **target surface/object**?*

- Yes – to location:
 - Specific absence of preventers motivated and capable to undertake surveillance and response
 - General poor social cohesion/collective efficacy in area
 - Good supply of art materials
 - Good community of graffitiists
 - Good exposure to audience (e.g. major train line, bridge over busy motorway)
 - Absence of CCTV
 - Good vantage point for keeping lookout for police/security patrols
 - Other [...]
- Yes – to surface/object:
 - Easy to reach
 - Challenging/rewarding to reach
 - Surface takes spray paint well
 - Good background colour
 - Prominent position within location
- No – locations/surfaces chosen for graffiti are not selected because of any particular attraction but are simply part of the **routine activity space** of graffitiists e.g. on way home from school.

*What **motivates or prompts** the graffitiists?*

This refers to here-and-now influences rather than, say, early childhood history and ‘criminal predisposition’.

- Need for entertainment/ lack of leisure facilities
- Sight of other graffiti on site – prompting them and/or giving them ‘permission’ to add to it
- General peer esteem/peer pressure
- Commitment to gang/ display of gang membership/territory
- Provocation by presence of graffiti of rival gang
- Provocation e.g. by ‘officials’ notices banning ball games
- Belonging to graffitiist community – competition, expression of allegiance
- Artistic expression for its own sake
- Desire for audience
- Other [...]

*What **resources** do the graffitiists use and how do they **obtain** them?*

Include physical and informational resources, insider knowledge, contacts etc

- In their art, e.g. spraycans
- In gaining access to their art sites, e.g. pass key, disguise e.g. maintenance worker’s tabard TBC – specifics not known
- In maximising reward from art – e.g. social media portfolio
- In avoiding recognition/arrest – e.g. wearing hoodie, giving excuse to police officer, of going equipped to spray at legitimate site

*What **harmful** consequences does the graffiti have?*

Additional to those consequences implicit in the offences listed above. Please identify the consequences, if you have the information readily available, under the following headings – feel free to split into subcategories or to add additional ones.

- Costs of judicial/enforcement action
- Costs of civil prevention
- Costs of clean-up
- Deterioration in quality of life/community safety including fear
- 'Degeneration' of a 'good' area
- Hindrance to economic and social regeneration of a 'poor' area
- Reduction in property prices
- Damage to area reputation
- Drop in resident satisfaction
- [Other...]

*What further **criminal** consequences does the graffiti have?*

- 'Broken windows' effect – arguably contributes to 'spiral of decline'
- Prompting/provoking local conflict, e.g. between gangs
- Facilitating criminal gang membership/recruitment
- Possibly initiating individuals' criminal career and leading to negative effects on their legitimate life chances e.g. in education, employment
- Other [...]

*What **beneficial** consequences might the graffiti have?*

As art

- Economic/social regeneration including via art tourism, business location decisions, activity support in CPTED terms [add more]
- Increase in property values
- Improvement of aesthetics of environment and hence of general public life
- Specifically, improvement in quality and appropriateness of location of graffiti
- Reframing of a consistently negative experience as (where appropriate) a positive one (not seeing every piece of graffiti as an indicator of malintent)
- Improvement in feelings of security
- Cohesive effects of collaboration on artwork, talking (as audience) about the artwork, developing distinctive and positive neighbourhood identity
- Positive expression and resolution of local conflicts (reduction in frequency, seriousness, duration)
- Improving life chances/ careers of graffitiists
- Skills and 'craft' development
- Social / recreational opportunities for graffitiists
- [more?]

[Beyond art?]

What were the sources of evidence supporting the challenge addressed, the nature/extent of the graffiti vandalism related problem, its producers, consequences and causes?

Note – some of these may be repeated when used in Impact evaluation to measure before-after changes.

Note – please record any innovative and/or particularly successful/unsuccessful sources and methods used.

- Police crime records/statistics
- Police incident logs
- Transport authority/company logs/statistics
- Survey
 - Of whom (e.g. residents, businesses, anti-graffiti or crime prevention specialists, graffitiists)
 - And/or of where (e.g. types of place (using land use headings/codes above) or named localities)
 - Initiated by whom (e.g. transport authority, other public institution/organisation)
 - Methods used for sampling
- Direct systematic observation of graffiti

- Media reports
- Other [...]

Were there any special Involvement activities for obtaining Intelligence?

E.g. data sharing protocols

2. Intervention (What?)

The task of Intervention responds to the requirements for action revealed by Intelligence, by designing and planning practical *methods* to realise particular intervention *principles*. On the **crime** side these all aim to block, divert or weaken the causes, and attend to risk and protective factors, of *future* criminal events and careers or of wider community safety problems – so the probability of their occurrence, and the harm they cause, is reduced. Beyond this primary preventive focus, Intervention can also include stopping *ongoing* harmful events and processes and mitigating harm *already done*. Here, it combines *local* evidence from Intelligence, and *generic* evidence from what-works knowledge and theory. The Intervention task is the defining focus for describing crime preventive, security and community safety action. On the **artistic** side, intervention is about action to initiate, manage, influence and develop the central artistic activity – not so much the practical arrangements (covered under Implementation and Involvement) but the nature of the art and its production and appreciation in relation to the wider objectives of the action e.g. regeneration)

What kinds of action were in place prior to the start of this project / activity, or were initiated at about the same time?

It may be that the prior action, or simultaneous action addressing more than just graffiti, was a necessary background ingredient for the current graffiti intervention to work. Alternatively, the beneficial outcomes could have come from that other action rather than the current graffiti intervention. This is necessary to know both for the purpose of evaluation of impact,

- *Prior action* covering crime prevention and wider social/economic services, projects and programmes, that provides a context for the current action of interest. For example, if the project was introduced after the failure of successive attempts at law enforcement and/or rapid clean-ups.
- *Ongoing action* simultaneous to the current graffiti intervention, and possibly complementary to or supportive of it

What kinds of ‘societal action’ does the project/service cover?

Tick all that apply:

- Care/welfare/education of offenders
- Control/repression/enforcement
 - Conventional justice
 - Restorative justice
- Civil crime prevention and community safety
 - CPTED (1st generation)
 - Situational Crime Prevention
 - Including generic mobilisation through awareness-raising
 - Offender-oriented action
- Conflict resolution/avoidance – including redefinition of crime as art
- Cohesion and collective efficacy
- Codesign in identifying and solving problems
- Collaborative action/coproduction in applying problem solution
- Clean-up of environment (specific mitigation of harm)
- Codesign of artistic graffiti facility
- Coproduction of art
- Creative practice
- Cultural engagement
- [Other...]

What scope of problem/issue does the project/service address?

- Graffiti alone – as art

- Public art in general
- Art at its most general
- Graffiti alone – as crime problem
- Vandalism and antisocial behaviour in general
- Crime in general
- Wider objectives
 - Economic/social regeneration – alleviating problems
 - Economic/social regeneration – enhancing cultural tourism
 - Environmental improvement
 - Education and improving life chances of residents

What are the **aims or objectives** of the action? E.g. which harmful consequences of graffiti vandalism does the project/activity seek to reduce, and which beneficial consequences of graffiti art, both described under Intelligence, does it seek to deliver?

These objectives will be revisited in the **Impact evaluation** section.

What is the overall intervention strategy?

- This is where to list how the individual interventions contribute to the whole package, and whether they were designed merely to complement/support one another or to positively synergise in a more holistic approach. Include in this account any contribution of prior action, or action on a wider front than just graffiti or even than just crime or facilitation of street art.
- Also cover any *interference* between the interventions.

What are the individual interventions that make up this project/activity – theoretical principles and practical methods?

Often, a project/service will implement several distinct interventions in a package of greater or lesser complexity. For each separately-identifiable intervention describe:

- The particular **aim/s** it is intended to serve, if these are a distinguishable subset of the whole.
 - The underlying **theoretical principles or causal mechanisms** that define the intervention.
 - On the crime prevention side, this can draw on
 - The **Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity** which covers the full range of **situational** and **offender-oriented interventions** (and their underlying theories); and relates these to the **causes** of the criminal events which need to be interrupted, diverted or weakened (such as lack of active crime preventers undertaking surveillance, easily accessible walls well-placed for spraying and for display, easy availability of resources e.g. spray cans and young people bored by lack of entertainment facilities) CCO has been used to classify and describe the widest range of preventive interventions using a common framework and terminology.
 - Offender – oriented
 - Situational
 - **CPTED** (e.g. target-hardening, surveillance, access control, territoriality, defensible space, activity support, image and maintenance)
 - Other [e.g. disruption of gangs, networks etc to be discussed]
 - On the art side, this can draw on
 - Theoretical principles to characterise positive street art [?]
 - The **method/s** used to realise these principles in practice
- Initially these might need to be listed as free text then coded after a few cases have been compiled. Or we could develop a starter pack. The simplest list of methods in situational crime prevention is the 25 Techniques of SCP. Classifying offender-oriented methods would be more demanding but would need a little research.

Were any design processes employed in devising the intervention strategy and tactics?

The design processes could be explicit or implicit; social innovation, product, information, graphic or service design and curation; could involve codesign between stakeholders and dutyholders; and may or may not involve professional designers

Risks and tradeoffs identified during the design of the intervention are useful to record. Designers of other projects may benefit from being alerted to these, even if they end up making different choices from the designers of the original project, due to differences in context, resources or priorities.

3. Implementation(How?)

This is the wider set of practical and managerial tasks required to *realise the plans and designs* for methods of Intervention, and of the other main tasks of the preventive process. Implementation operates at levels ranging from the specific intervention *methods* themselves, to *projects and services* applying sets of methods, to *processes* like recruitment, training or management of the 'final delivery unit' such as a youth centre or a dedicated project team.

What was the mode of delivery/business model of the action?

Was the action:

- Problem-oriented project e.g. addressing a specific local graffiti hotspot by whatever methods/principles best apply
- Case-based offender-oriented service e.g. probation or youth justice service dealing with a succession of individual graffitiists through a set of procedures or treatments
- Case-based reactive response service e.g. rapid clean-up team
- Exhibition/festival
- Guerilla / situationist intervention [does this mean intervention by the graffitiists or the preventers?]
- Other [...]

What was the working structure of the project/service?

- Freestanding
- Embedded within a wider organisation [specify]

What was the nature of the organisation/institution founding and/or running the project?

- Public body
- Social enterprise
- Commercial enterprise
- Artistic enterprise

What infrastructure did the project/action require?

- Pre-existing
- Specifically implemented for this project

How was the action targeted? What might it have missed/not addressed in the given context?

- Ecological level of action – the units targeted
 - Individuals
 - Families
 - Peer groups
 - Gangs
 - Artistic communities
 - Neighbourhoods
 - Cities
 - Regional/national
- ☐ The principle of target selection:
 - ☐ Universal

- Selective (e.g. people at risk of offending; people/places likely to benefit from doing or hosting art)
- Indicated (e.g. convicted offenders, repeat victims; emergent cultural hotspot, emerging talented individuals)
- The basis of target selection including
 - Risk & protective factors
 - Known causes
 - Emergent risk patterns (sets of people at risk of offending, manifest hot-spots of graffiti etc)
 - Needs – e.g. based on social/economic deprivation or exclusion statistics

What was/were the lifecycle/s of action?

If relevant, this may cover:

- The history of the *project or service* from demand through initiation, main activity, closure and exit strategy
 - Year(s) or period of project/service
 - Duration of start-up period (Timescales as relevant)
 - Duration of Intervention (e.g. from when the legal site first opens for graffitiists)
 - Is project/service designed to have limited lifespan or to continue indefinitely? Is there a rationale for the chosen option?
 - Why (if relevant) did the project/service close – if relevant, what factors made it unsustainable?
- Where relevant, describe the lifecycle of the typical individual *case* addressed by the service (e.g. how long did the legal graffiti stay on the wall?)

What was the basic execution process, including resourcing and costs?

- Inputs – nature
 - Capital/setup costs €
 - Running costs €
 - Human resources (paid/volunteered/participant)
 - In-kind contributions [specify]
- Inputs – sources
 - Sources, constraints imposed and support offered as part of context [Use of 'localism' budgets for hotspots; constrained on money]
 - Cost/value transfers
- Process
 - Practical implementation issues (this covers tasks – involvement section covers people)
 - Risks to implementation, and implementation failures
 - Noteworthy solutions
 - Outputs of implementation (quantitative and qualitative)

Could base these on the ecological levels of action and the particular units in question e.g.:

 - Numbers of offenders/artists handled/participating
 - Nature/duration/quality rating of their experience
 - Numbers of areas or route-miles protected/benefitting from the project/service
 - More [...]

4. Involvement (Who?)

This covers tasks specifically focusing on getting *other people and/or organisations* to understand, accept, and undertake, share or support the tasks, roles and responsibilities of implementing preventive interventions; or to otherwise support them by alleviating constraints, boosting enablers and establishing a receptive climate. Involvement may be *operational* (doing specific crime-prevention or art-related tasks, e.g. setting up and running projects or supplying services) or *capacity-building* (e.g. training activities to get practitioners ready for running projects).

Involvement and Implementation should be viewed as two intertwined task streams – the one *people*-focused, the other *task*-focused.

Who does what – what criminal and civil roles did people and organisations play in and around the graffiti location? Who were the Dutyholders with specific (paid or formally trained) responsibility and who were the Stakeholders, with other interests?

General introduction to role analysis approach

It's important for purposes of describing and guiding graffiti action, and specifically Intervention, Implementation and Involvement tasks, to be clear about the different *roles* people and institutions/ organisations play in graffiti. This is all the more so than with straightforward crime, where everyone (except perhaps the criminal) agrees it's wrong. The roles that can be identified are in the following table.

Note that one person or institution can play more than one role, and that they can be described in terms of both *crime-related* and *civil* roles (e.g. *resident* could be *crime preventer* or *offender*)

Civil role (everyday world)	Crime role (specifically about law and lawbreaking)	Art role (graffiti as legal art in appropriate place)
Graffitiist	<p>Offender – individual covering graffiti and its content – which may be offensive and/or support illegal gangs or movements</p> <p>Offending group, network or community (geographical or virtual)</p>	<p>Artist – individual</p> <p>Artist – community – practical and motivational support, instruction, appreciative criticism (shading into social control – a crime preventer role)</p>
<p>Dutyholder (at practice, programme and policy levels in given institution, e.g. local or central government, police, youth justice team)</p>	<p>Crime preventer (judicial/enforcement, e.g. judges, police acting to deter or incapacitate offender; local and/or national government in creating the laws against graffiti). Note that arrest, trial and sentencing have a <i>justice</i> function besides their preventive function.</p> <p>Crime preventer (civil, e.g. council employee, parajudicial eg police or probation service supporting civil interventions, resolving conflicts without recourse to law; specifically, changing offenders into artists and/or changing victim stakeholders into legitimate audience and/or active supporter of street art, perhaps changing their perception of the graffiti from crime to art)</p> <p>Crime promoter (inadvertently facilitating graffiti e.g. by failing to provide legitimate entertainment facilities for bored local youths, failing to keep public surfaces generally clean and tidy)</p> <p>Mitigator of criminal harm (clean-up, wider reassurance of victims and wider community)</p>	<p>Facilitator/organiser of street art activity</p> <p>Advocate to stakeholders of concept of acceptable street art</p> <p>Protector of street art idea, by management to keep it within acceptable content and places – climate setting</p>

Stakeholder (those affected by, or with an interest in, graffiti but without specific graffiti-related duties e.g. resident, local public or private employee, property-owner, tourist or visitor)	Direct victim (personal, e.g. on my wall) Direct victim (impersonal, e.g. view incivility when passing graffiti on public property or someone else's wall; reduction in value of home due to incivilities in neighbourhood) Indirect victim (eg via extra local tax or increased train fares paid to fund protective and judicial/ enforcement services, in cleaning up, in constraints on regeneration) Crime preventer (e.g. reports crime/offender for further judicial/enforcement or civil action, creates <i>demand</i> for action, undertakes surveillance, removes spraycans, controls own children, contributes as volunteer to civil preventive action, participates in codesign of that action) Crime promoter (e.g. sells spraycans to graffitiists, fails to supervise own children, provides appreciative audience for illegal graffiti) Mitigator of criminal harm (e.g. cleans up own wall, participates in joint clean-up of neighbourhood)	Audience – appreciative criticism generating emotion and motivation among graffitiists (shading into social control – a crime preventer role) Host – organisation or individual owning/managing site where graffiti is installed Community beneficiary – gets benefit from regeneration, tourist income etc produced by art [any additional audience roles?]

For each of the roles in the table that are relevant for describing your project or service, please try to supply details of

- **Who** the role players are (e.g. *stakeholders* – residents) and any distinguishing information you feel is relevant for describing your project (e.g. stakeholders – residents – *elderly people*; stakeholders – private companies – *small local shops*).

Key information includes private individuals, private organisations e.g. businesses, public organisations e.g. local government departments, private umbrella organisations (e.g. local Chamber of Commerce/ Syndicat d'Initiative), public-private consortia or alliances.

then

- **What crime roles** and **what art roles** the stakeholders in question undertake – use the language of roles, responsibilities and tasks as appropriate.
 - This could include initiating action through demand, participating in codesign, collaborating on interventions, acting as appreciative audience etc.
 - Whether the roles are mainly describable as:
 - A Partnership (who are the partners and what do they each contribute to the whole?)
 - Mobilisation (a less symmetric, usually more top-down relationship) who are mobilised, by whom?)

Structuring your description could be through a table like the above, or through free text, in any order that makes sense of what may be complex arrangements and relationships, but please try to stick to the terminology used here.

What partnership arrangements were in operation in the project/activity?

- Structural issues
 - Purpose of partnership in outcome terms (e.g. reducing crime, increasing community safety, regeneration, art)
 - Whether partnership is operational (delivering interventions), strategic (providing environment in which interventions are planned, designed and delivered) or providing infrastructure (e.g. protocols for exchanging information or resources)
 - Composition (which agencies/ individuals/ groups engaged) and structure including leadership, balance of power between member agencies, and whether operating on multiple levels (e.g. an operational team and a strategic advisory board)
 - Geographical scope
 - Pooling of resources: which agencies contribute what, how they complement or synergise
 - Governance issues: responsibility, authority and accountability; inherent structural strains e.g. over welfare versus security or justice
 - The environment of the partnership, which may include other agencies or partnerships; even higher-level strategic partnerships
- Process issues:
 - Practical creation of partnership: including intelligence for planning the partnership
 - Creation and maintenance of partnership climate: including building mutual understanding and trust; handling differences of perspective, values and priorities of partner organisations (e.g. security v welfare)
 - Handling boundaries, both geographical and of responsibility
 - Which of the operational 5Is tasks the partnership undertakes; and task-specific issues such as codes of practice on information exchange, service-level agreements on handling offenders etc
 - Partnership operations: how it works on a day-to-day basis, including inter-partner communications, decision-making and tactical coordination; partnership management (including performance management) and leadership
 - The working relationship between tactical and strategic levels
 - Sustainability of partnership
 - Dismantling or disengagement of partnership

What mobilisation arrangements were in operation in the project/activity?

- For each **stakeholder or dutyholder** mobilised to support the objectives of the project or service, supply the following information based on the CLAIMED framework:
 - Who they are and what sort of entity (individual, group, organisation or community): including offenders mobilised through outreach to participate in their own treatment, and artists mobilised to participate in the artistic activity
 - What roles they play, tasks they carry out, responsibilities they bear or decisions they take in implementing or supporting
 - Crime prevention, community safety or security (clarify whether they normally act as crime preventers (to be mobilised) or promoters (to be demobilised))
 - Legitimate artistic activity
 - Why they were especially chosen for the role (e.g. their competence, numbers, legitimacy) and how they were identified
 - Mobilisation methods, principles and theories:
 - How they were Alerted to the part they could play in crime prevention (e.g. publicity, personal approach)
 - How they were Informed about the problem or case, its nature, consequences and causes.
 - How they were Motivated (e.g. regulations, legal duty, self-interest, naming and shaming, incentives)
 - How they were Empowered (e.g. capacity-building including training, equipment, information, guidance, money; legal powers; alleviation of constraints)
 - How (if relevant) they were Directed (e.g. codes of conduct for confidentiality, performance standards, crime reduction targets)
- Beyond initiation:

- Sustainability of mobilisation: issues and practices in maintaining participation, and specifically alertness, informedness, motivation etc
- How and why any mobilisation was brought to an end
- Multiple mobilisations
 - Implementation chains: how the various stakeholders/dutyholders (and their tasks/roles) connect, ultimately to the 'business end' of the chain in influencing preventers and promoters in the Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity
 - Systems of involvement: how diverse agents work together to execute and/or support intervention; or how an interlocking system of agents resistant to crime prevention was disrupted
 - 'Gateway' mobilisations e.g. referral of client victim or offender to other agency: structure and process
- Conflicts, constraints and issues (including ethical issues) in any of the above: their nature and how resolved
- Outreach – who is 'reached out to', by whom, using what techniques, and for what preventive or artistic purpose

What consultation, participatory or engagement arrangements were in place?

- Consultation with whom, over what issues (e.g. crime prevention/priorities), by what methods and media; at what stage/s in the planning and execution of interventions

What accountability arrangements were in place?

- Accountability to whom (internally or externally), over what issues (e.g. crime prevention priorities, performance), by what methods and media; at what stage/s in the planning, execution and review of interventions and the project or service as a whole

What efforts were devoted to building collaborative capacity?

- These are actions prior to setting up specific partnerships or undertaking specific mobilisation exercises, intended to create, for example, a residents' or a traders' association or wider social cohesion, as a context within which specific interventions can be implemented, and specific agencies, groups, communities or individuals can be involved

What was the wider climate of opinion on graffiti in which the action was implemented, and how did it need to be influenced?

- Describe whether the local climate was initially hostile/suspicious or supportive/accepting of the preventive or artistic action; and how, if relevant, a positive climate was encouraged and a negative one dispelled
- Assess whether the methods of Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation and Involvement employed in the present action only work in a supportive climate
- More generally, describe other issues of awareness, expectation and interest in the action, and issues of public attitudes and beliefs about the crime problem, to offenders and to community safety; and how these affected the design and performance of the action

What were the risks and blockages to and from Involvement?

- Describe possibilities and instances of failure or of undesirable outcomes: including aroused and disappointed expectations, stigmatisation, breakdown of trust, and exacerbated conflict. How these are identified and managed are important practice knowledge.
- Describe any noteworthy solutions

What were the outputs specific to Involvement?

These could be quantitative and qualitative

Could base these on the ecological levels of action and the particular units in question e.g.:

- Numbers of volunteers participating
- Range of organisations participating
- Nature/duration/quality rating of their contribution
- More [...]

5. Impact (Worthwhile / What next?)

This is about gathering and presenting evidence of effectiveness and related evaluative information on the intermediate and ultimate outcomes of the preventive action. This information is variously for use as feedback in improving performance of the current preventive action; guiding decisions on continuance, expansion and replication of that action; accountability; or 'export' to the collective evidence base. *Process* evaluation isn't a separate task stream but can be undertaken throughout the other 'I' tasks: wherever there is a process, it can be evaluated, learned from and improved. However, a culminating overview of Implementation and Involvement achievements is required as part of reporting on Impact evaluation.

What was the context of the evaluation?

- Evaluation is internal or external to the implementing organisation
- Evaluation is independent or not independent (e.g. external but paid for by the implementing organisation)
- Type of evaluators – academic, commercial consultant, practitioner
- Formative or summative evaluation (i.e. continual feedback of provisional findings to help improve implementation, or results strictly held back till after the project has ended)
- Routine evaluation or a one-off exercise
- Orientation – whether evaluation covered impact, process or both

Process evaluation

The headings of process evaluation aren't intended to appear in one single location in a 5Is description but to reappear at points throughout the various task streams wherever it is appropriate and convenient to present evaluative findings. There are two alternative approaches for Graffolution case studies – a simple overview, versus a more thorough process evaluation. The choice will depend on time available, source material and whether cases are particularly informative.

Implementation and Involvement overview

This is where to report on successes and failures in Implementation and Involvement, essentially a summary of process evaluation.

- What were the *outputs* achieved by the project/service? Were planned output objectives met in terms of quality and quantity?
- What were the ingredients of *successful* Implementation and Involvement?
- What were the causes of any *failure* – were they failures of Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation or Involvement and if so, of which subsidiary tasks?
- What are *future* opportunities, risks, constraints and enablers?

Successes and Failures (Full process evaluation headings)

- Success and failure of implementing each task, including whether any numerical targets or quality standards were met or not met
- Whether the task, if successfully implemented to adequate quality, delivered the desired result. This could be an internal result passed to the next task, or an output to the external world
- Whether the task engendered positive or negative side-effects in crime or other spheres
- The enablers and constraints, conflicts, tradeoffs and synergies, collaboration and competition behind the successes and failures of implementation and its result; how these issues related to the context of the action described.
- How the process problems encountered were resolved or avoided, how benefits were capitalised on and failures coped with.

- Generic qualities of implementation such as adaptability and improvement, responsiveness and deliverability
- Existing benchmarks applied and/or new ones indicated
- Task-specific techniques for evaluating and quality-assuring particular processes (e.g. mentoring)

Impact evaluation

How do the aims/objectives of the project/activity match the impact and how do they feature in the evaluation?

- Restate the *aims* of the project/service, relating back to the nature of the crime problem/artistic opportunity, and harmful/beneficial consequences (referred to under Intelligence), and the aims (stated under Intervention).

Ideally the *ultimate outcomes*, directly reflecting these aims, should themselves be directly measurable, e.g. reduced costs of clean-ups, or direct *proxy indicators* of these, such as reduced use of cleaning fluids. But often we have to remain content with *intermediate outcomes* which are indicators, causally upstream of the ultimate ones, or *consequent outcomes*, which are downstream. So for example an ultimate aim of reduced graffiti on private property might, for various practical reasons including cost of data collection, be measurable only by the intermediate outcome of graffitiists' intentions to focus more on legitimate public property, measured by interviews with the graffitiists. Or for an ultimate outcome of people feeling safer on the streets, a consequent outcome indicator might be that more of them go out at night.

- Identify how any *ultimate outcomes* relate to proxy, *intermediate and consequent outcomes* and in turn how these follow causally from the *outputs* of the intervention, i.e. the actions described under implementation and involvement.

Ideally these can all be put together in some sort of *logic model* and maybe a comparison made between the *intended* logic model planned for the project or service, and the *actual* logic model which is what really happened and of course may be different. Diagrams would be helpful here.

What was the methodology of evaluation?

The evaluation may have used a single methodology or a mixed-methods approach. It may be elementary or (much less often) technically sophisticated. What follows are fairly technical points which we may or may not be able to report on, but interest in *evidence-based policy and practice* is now pervasive in government, public organisations and third sector. We should therefore report on, and encourage, better evaluations wherever we can; but obviously we are constrained by our own time and resources.

- Approaches— e.g. Realistic, Theories of Change, Experimental, qualitative
- Design, e.g. before-after x action-control (and perhaps how this relates to methodological quality scales e.g. Maryland scale)
- Basic parameters:
 - o Data - output measures, intermediate and ultimate outcome measures – these should relate to those already described under Intelligence, Implementation and Involvement
 - o Sampling frame, sample size and units (e.g. individuals, families, neighbourhoods)
 - o Time periods for before and after measurement
- Statistical testing – methods and their justification, power considerations etc
- Problems, issues and tradeoffs in the above, and any practical resolutions worth sharing (building up knowledge of how to evaluate graffiti projects/services is itself a useful output of Graffolution)

What were the results of impact evaluation (positive and negative)?

The results of evaluations can be presented in headline form, alone or accompanied by an account in greater depth, showing the logic of inference between observation and conclusion. Both alternatives are presented for discussion. What follows is predominantly crime-focused; we need to develop counterparts for art-centred action.

For comparative purposes we need to compile a *master-list of impact evaluation outcomes*, which relate to the increased beneficial and reduced harmful consequences of graffiti and of any positive/negative side effects of the projects/services, as stated under Intelligence.

[Master-list to be added]

Headline impact evaluation results

- Attributable effects on the outcome measures (and if these are intermediate, proxy or consequent, how these relate to the ultimate outcomes)
- Any positive or negative side-effects on other crimes, on other policy values
- Cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit
- [more?]

In-depth impact evaluation results

- Was there a statistically significant *change* in (intermediate or ultimate) outcome measures relating to crime, safety and other benefits? If so:
- To what extent can this change be *attributed* to the outputs of the preventive intervention as opposed to background trends, coincidental events and 'masking or mimicking' effects such as increased reporting of crimes, regression to the mean and maturation? Depending on the sophistication of the evaluation this can involve simply relying on a 'control' design, presenting a few elementary cross-checks or a thorough exploration of alternative explanations.
- With multiple sites and/or individuals studied, were the effects confined to *subsets* e.g. only to highly-cohesive areas, or only to offenders with supportive families?
- Were there any *adaptive reactions* to the intervention e.g. by offenders showing diffusion of benefit, displacement, longer-term evolution of countermoves and offender replacement (i.e. arrest Mr Big the drug dealer and Mr Notsobig takes his place)? Did other parties adapt such as potential victims showing 'conservation of risk' (for example relaxing their guard on where to park, in the belief that their immobiliser would protect their car from theft)?
- How did the intervention *work* – by what *mechanisms* and dependent on what *contextual contributions*? Were the latter *essential* or did they merely *boost* impact?
- With multiple interventions, which ingredients were *essential* to any impact? Which *boosted* impact?
- Were there *harmful side effects* – on crime and safety (e.g. the intervention made another crime type easier, widened the net for involvement of young people in criminal justice system or increased fear or inconvenience); and beyond (e.g. conflicting with other policy aims such as sustainability or inclusion)?
- Were there any *beneficial side effects*? Did these come from the Intervention method itself or from Implementation and Involvement actions? Assembling a cumulative list of possible harms and benefits can facilitate designs of future interventions and future evaluations. In *improvement* terms, did the trial suggest how harmful side-effects could be reduced or avoided and benefits increased?
- How big and how cost-effective was the *gross attributable change*? And the attributable change *net* of offender adaptations and other side-effects on crime?
- How did these changes translate into *benefits* – at the very least the public and private cost-savings on crimes prevented, and perhaps knock-on benefits of education or area regeneration? Approaches to identifying and quantifying costs and benefits were systematically elaborated in the UK's Crime Reduction Programme 1998-2003 (State-of-the-art quantification and costing is at 'Mainstreaming Methodology for Estimating Costs of Crime', www.costsofcrime.org.)
- How *durable* or *sustainable* was the impact? Did investigation of mechanisms indicate likely durability of Intervention (e.g. CCTV that works by arrest and conviction may have a longer lasting effect than if it worked by merely deterrence), and sustainability of Implementation (e.g. how long could payment of extra police overtime be maintained?) or Involvement (e.g. would neighbourhood watch members lose interest if crimes were rare?)?
- If there was *no* significant change in the intended direction in the outcome measures, was this attributable to failure of Impact evaluation, Implementation and Involvement, Intervention or Intelligence (and to specific, subsidiary tasks within each of these, interpretable through process evaluation or at least process monitoring)? Are any of these susceptible to *improvement*?
- How far did the intervention meet its *aims* and any *targets*?
- What were the *limitations* on performance and how might these be alleviated through *improvements*?

Wider appreciation of case study

Wider performance/selection measures

- How *responsive* and *scalable* to crime/safety problems was the action?

- o *Prioritisation* of community safety action in terms of severity of *consequences* of crime/safety problems (and perhaps in line with wider policy targets)
- o Accurate *targeting* on *needs* of victim and wider society – intervening universally or selectively as appropriate; and on *causes* of crime/safety problem – intervening at appropriate levels from local to international
- o *Coverage* on the ground, in terms of what *proportion* of a given crime problem the policy aims to tackle
- o *Scope*, in terms of the range of different crime problems tackled.
- Over what *timescale* did the Implementation occur, did the Intervention take effect, did the Impact reliably become apparent?
- How *sustainable* was the project/service in terms of continuing implementation/maintenance of action, and impact?
- How *legitimate or acceptable* were the preventive actions, within the wider population, within minority subgroups, or even among offenders?
- How *robust* was the project or service
 - o In terms of being straightforward to implement versus a ‘delicate greenhouse plant’ that needed much careful nurturing, expert input and the following of very specific guidelines?
 - o In terms of reliance on unusually inspiring, charismatic or expert leadership/direction?
 - o In terms of how *context-dependent* i.e. a long or a short list of contextual conditions need to be met or established before the action can succeed?

Benefits

Describe Short term – Long term

- Are benefits in the conception or implementation phases?
- Do the benefits focus on specific groups?
- Other [...]

Limitations

Describe Short term – Long term

- Are limitations in the conception or implementation phases?
- Do the limitations focus on specific groups?
- Other [...]

Opportunities

- What to improve in future and how?

Describe Short term – Long term