

# European Crime Prevention

## Good practice template

The European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN) serves as a conduit for good practices in crime prevention. These good practices rely on current evidence and other quality criteria that assist the target groups in selecting effective preventive action to address their own crime problem in their own context. It simultaneously facilitates efforts at knowledge synthesis across projects.

This template serves as a formal framework for extracting information on the nature of potential good practices. All questions are to be completed in English.

**With this completed template, the applicant aims to**

Share good practice for inclusion on the EUCPN's channels (Knowledge centre, newsletter, publications, etc.)

Participate at the European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA)<sup>1</sup>

**The applicant gives permission to publish this information and her/his contact details on the EUCPN's website.**

## **General information**

1. What is the name of the intervention?

2. Country of application

3. Who is responsible for completing this template?

*Organisation responsible for this application:*

*Contact person:*

*Address:*

*Contact details:*

*E-mail (if possible, add institutional e-mail):*

*If different, please provide contact details to ask for additional information:*

4. Timing

*Start date of the intervention:* Click or tap to enter a date.

*Is the intervention still running:*  Yes  No

*If not, please provide the end date of the intervention:* Click or tap to enter a date.

5. Where can we find more information about the intervention? Please provide links to the intervention's website or online reports or publications (preferably in English).

6. Please give a **short summary** of the intervention (**Max. 600 words**).

**Description of the crime problem(s) the activity wishes to address**

7. What problem does the intervention wish to address? Please elaborate on its nature, scale, context, involved actors (offenders, victims, other involved parties), causes, risk and protective factors, etc. (**Max. 200 words**)

8. Was the problem and its context analysed before the intervention was initiated and in what way (How, and by whom? Which data were used?)? If so, in what way did this analysis inform the set-up and implementation of the intervention? (**Max. 150 words**)

9. What is/are the objective(s) of the intervention? Please, if applicable, distinguish between main and sub-objectives.<sup>1</sup> (**Max. 150 words**)

**Description of the way in which the intervention addresses the identified problem(s) and why it is expected to be effective**

10. What is the target of the intervention? Please motivate your answer (**Max. 150 words**)

- Universal prevention: the intervention targets potential offenders and victims in the general population, or general places or systems.
- Selective prevention: the intervention targets groups whose members have a higher risk of committing deviant behaviour or being victimised, or specific places or systems that are at an increased risk of becoming the scene of a crime.
- Indicated prevention: the intervention targets individuals who are already exhibiting problem behaviour, with the aim of preventing re-offending, or those systems or places that are the scene of crime.

*Motivation:*

---

<sup>1</sup> **Main objectives** define what changes you desire with respect to the previously defined problem and/or within the target group. In other words, if you achieve these strategic goals, then the project achieves its purpose of preventing and/or reducing crime or fear of crime.

**Sub-objectives** are more short-term and establish the objectives of specific actions. Achieving these goals is necessary to achieve the main objectives.

11. How is the intervention expected to achieve its goals on a practical level? In other words, what are the activities of the intervention, its outputs and its outcomes? If possible, you can describe the **Logic Model**<sup>2</sup> of the intervention here. (**Max. 200 words**)

12. How is the intervention expected to have an effect on the identified problem? In other words, is the intervention based on any particular **crime prevention/reduction mechanism(s)**<sup>3</sup> or **principle(s)**? Please, also explain if and how the activation of this/these crime prevention mechanisms is dependent on the particular context of the intervention (**Max. 200 words**)

### **Description of outcome evaluation results or indications of theoretical plausibility**

13. Has there been an outcome<sup>4</sup> or impact<sup>5</sup> evaluation? and what were the main results? Please, also describe which indicators were used to measure the effects of your intervention. (**Max. 300 words**)

---

<sup>2</sup> A **Logic Model** represents the relationship between the project's key activities and the intended outcomes in a way that shows the underlying logic behind the project. It usually presents this relationship in a diagram that plots the resources that the intervention employs (i.e. inputs), the action designed to achieve the outcomes (i.e., activities), the expected and unexpected changes produced by the activities (i.e., outcomes), and the units of service or products (e.g., the number of workshops with young people to prevent juvenile delinquency, the number of talks with elderly people to prevent victimisation through fraud and theft, etc.) that the activities generate (i.e., outputs).

<sup>3</sup> **Mechanisms** are how the intervention has its effects on a particular problem, within a specific context. For a list of potential mechanisms, see final page of this document.

<sup>4</sup> **Outcome evaluation:** Measures the **direct effect** (i.e., extent of the changes) **of the intervention on the target group, population, or geographic area**. The information produced by the outcome evaluation determines at what level the **objectives were achieved**.

<sup>5</sup> **Impact evaluation:** Measures **long-term effects** of the intervention on the target group, as well as **indirect effects** on the broader community. The information produced by the impact evaluation determines at what level the **ultimate goals** of the intervention were achieved.

14. If applicable, please provide more information on the quality of the evaluation(s). For example: who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?), what evaluation approach (pre-post-test design, randomised controlled trial, theory-based evaluation,...) was selected, what data and data collection method(s) were used, etc. **(Max. 150 words)**

15. If no outcome or impact evaluation has been conducted, are there any theoretical indications that the intervention might be successful? If applicable, please motivate these indications. **(Max. 150 words)**

16. Has a cost-benefit analysis<sup>6</sup> been carried out? If so, describe the results of this analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out. **(Max. 150 words)**

**Description of the nature of the intervention, its original context, and its implementation**

17. What are the costs of the intervention in terms of finances, material and human resources? If needed, please provide an adequate timeframe to contextualise the costs (e.g. cost per participant, cost per month of keeping the project running, cost including/excluding personnel costs) **(Max. 150 words)**

---

<sup>6</sup> **Cost-benefit analysis:** A type of economic evaluation that compares the direct and indirect cost of the resources employed in the intervention, with the equivalent economic value of the benefits. If no outcome evaluation has been conducted, a cost-benefit analysis is simply not possible.

18. Were external reviewers, evaluators or researchers involved in the evaluation, and if so, what was their role in the evaluation? (**Max. 150 words**)

19. Which partners or stakeholders are involved in the intervention and why? What is the level of their involvement? What was their role in the evaluation? How well does this partnership function in practice? (**Max. 200 words**)

20. Describe the implementation of the intervention's activities and its outputs<sup>7</sup>. (**Max.200 words**)

21. Has there been a process evaluation<sup>8</sup> and what were the main results? Please, also describe what indicators were used to measure the implementation of your intervention? (**Max. 300 words**)

22. If applicable, please provide more information on the quality of the evaluation(s). E.g., what data and data collection method(s) were used, what research methodology, etc. (**Max. 150 words**)

23. What, if any, contextual factors/circumstances may have caused this project succeed in your own country/region/locality that won't necessarily exist when practitioners in other places try to replicate it? If applicable, mention

---

<sup>7</sup> **Outputs** refer to the units of service or products (e.g., the number of workshops with young people to prevent juvenile delinquency, the number of talks with elderly people to prevent victimisation through fraud and theft, etc.)

<sup>8</sup> **Process evaluation:** A process evaluation documents **how the activities were implemented** in order to determine any deviations from the original planning. It facilitates finding explanations for when the results of the intervention are not as expected.

organisational, institutional, and socioeconomic contextual factors. (**Max. 150 words**)

### **Additional ECPA questions**

24. How is the intervention innovative in its methods and/or approaches? (**Max. 150 words**)

25. How is the intervention relevant for other Member States? (**Max. 150 words**).

## List of potential crime prevention mechanisms<sup>9</sup>

- **Establishing and maintaining normative barriers to committing criminal acts**
  - e.g. 'Offenders, we are watching you' campaigns
- **Reducing recruitment** to criminal social environments and activities by eliminating or reducing the social and individual causes and processes that lead to criminality
  - e.g. social and financial support for disadvantaged families
- **Deterring** potential perpetrators from committing crimes through the threat of punishment
  - e.g. decreasing the time between arrest and punishment
- **Disrupting** criminal acts by stopping them before they are carried out
  - e.g. increasing police patrols in vulnerable areas
- **Protecting vulnerable targets** by reducing opportunities and make it more demanding to carry out criminal acts
  - e.g. placing locks and cameras
- **Reducing the harmful consequences** of criminal acts
  - e.g. initiatives to recover stolen goods
- **Reducing the rewards** from criminal acts
  - e.g. restorative justice programmes
- **Incapacitating** (or neutralising) perpetrators by denying them the ability (capacity) to carry out new criminal acts
  - e.g. imprisonment of key gang members
- **Encouraging** desistance from crime and rehabilitating former offenders so they are able to settle back into a normal life
  - e.g. prison rehabilitation programs



Funded by  
the European Union

---

<sup>9</sup> T. Bjørgero, *Preventing Crime: A Holistic Approach*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.