



European Crime Prevention Network

Criteria for the evaluation of crime prevention practices

QUALIPREV short manual
October 2016

RESEARCHER

Anneleen Rummens

PROMOTORS

Prof. dr. Wim Hardyns
Prof. dr. Freya Vander Laenen
Prof. dr. Lieven Pauwels



With financial support from the Prevention of and Fight against Crime
Programme of the European Union
European Commission – Directorate-General Home Affairs

Legal notice

The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of any EU Member State or any agency or institution of the European Union or European Communities.

QUALIPREV: a crime prevention evaluation model: short manual

The European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN) offers a unique forum to exchange existing best practices in crime prevention between EU members and distribute those practices to local, national and European policy makers. Although a large volume of crime prevention practices is shared daily, a means to evaluate those practices and identify best practices is currently still lacking.

The QUALIPREV-tool is meant to evaluate the quality of crime prevention projects quickly and easily, based on the presence of key criteria. It is aimed at evaluators wanting to evaluate the (potential) of their own projects or external evaluators wanting to select promising practices.

The model consists of the following parts:

Step I: scoring of the project

1) problem statement and theoretical background:

an analysis of the crime problem the prevention project wishes to target and the theoretical justification for the methods and approach used

2) evaluability assessment:

ensuring that the project can be evaluated properly and reliably by setting up data registration and collecting information on the project

3) process evaluation:

an evaluation of the implementation and development of the project

4) outcome evaluation:

an evaluation of the short-term and long-term effects of the programme

5) dissemination and publication of results:

distribution of the results of the project to a wide audience (prevention workers, policy makers, academics, general public)

Step II: identification of good practices (only for projects with evaluation)

Effectiveness assessment:

a quality label is assigned to accompany the score from step 1 based on the main findings from the evaluation.

The final score and label for a project can be calculated automatically by filling out the Excel score form. This score form can also be printed and filled out manually.

A two-step evaluation model

Step I: scoring of the project

To aid in the comparison of different projects, each project can be scored according to relevant criteria within each part. These criteria have been determined based on current theoretical guidelines for evaluation crime prevention projects. See appendix I in this manual for more information about the different criteria and their definitions. More background information on how these criteria were determined and relevant references can also be found in the research report.

The scoring is done according to the following main principles:

- Points are awarded according to the presence of certain criteria

For example, if the project contains a context analysis (assessment of the crime problem the project tries to address)

- If a criterion is only partially fulfilled, half the corresponding points are awarded

For example, if only a summary of the project results is published online instead of a full report, the criterion of online publication is partially fulfilled.

- Key criteria are scored higher

For example, a link with theory is considered a key criteria and thus its fulfilment receives more points than e.g. the criterion of innovativeness.

- Projects are only scored based on the parts which are present

For example, a project that has not (yet) been evaluated is only scored on the first two parts (problem statement & theoretical background and evaluability assessment).

To determine the final score, the scores of the different parts are added and weighted according to the scheme in table 1.

Projects without evaluation	<i>Item score</i>	<i>Weights</i>	<i>Weighted score</i>
Problem statement & theoretical background	10 points	x 4	40 points
Evaluability assessment (part 1)	5 points	x 2	10 points
Process/outcome evaluation	N/A	N/A	
Dissemination & publication of results	N/A	N/A	
Total score	/50 points		
Projects with evaluation (either process or outcome)			
Problem statement & theoretical background	10 points	x 2	20 points
Evaluability assessment	10 points	x 0,5	5 points
Process or outcome evaluation	5 points	x 4	20 points
Dissemination & publication of results	5 points	x 1	5 points
Total score	/50 points		
Projects with evaluation (both process and outcome)			
Problem statement & theoretical background	10 points	x 2	20 points
Evaluability assessment	10 points	x 0,5	5 points
Process and outcome evaluation	10 points	x 2	20 points
Dissemination & publication of results	5 points	x 1	5 points
Total score	/50 points		

Table 1: Scoring weights

The final score reflects the methodological quality of the crime prevention project and its evaluation (if conducted). It is also represented as a percentage:

- 90%+: excellent
- 75-89%: very good
- 60-74%: good
- 50-59%: average
- 30-49%: below average
- 0-29%: poor

Step II: identification of good practices

This step is only conducted if a process, outcome or both types of evaluation have been conducted, otherwise this step should be skipped. In step I a score was determined based on the methodological merit of the evaluation process. It is however necessary to take into account the effectiveness of the prevention measure when ranking the different projects under evaluation. In that case, the score

form also provides a colour-coded label to accompany the score (see table 2). This label depends on the main conclusions of the evaluation(s):

- positive (+): positive process/outcome effects have been found
- negative (-): no or unwanted process/outcome effects have been found
- inconclusive (?): the results are mixed or unclear either way

The results of cost-benefit analysis should be considered part of the outcome evaluation.

Note that no effect (e.g. no increase but also no decrease of crime rate) is considered a negative effect, as it is an undesired outcome. If the score form is filled out electronically, this label is determined automatically based on the answers under 'Effectiveness assessment'. If the score form is filled out manually, consult table 2 for determining the correct label.

	Only process or outcome	Both process and outcome
Effective		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process (+) Outcome (+)
Promising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process/Outcome (+) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process (+) Outcome (?) • Process (?) Outcome (+)
Likely not effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process/Outcome (-) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process (-) Outcome (?) • Process (?) Outcome (-) • Process (-) Outcome (+) • Process (+) Outcome (-)
Not effective		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process (-) Outcome (-)
Inconclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process/Outcome (?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process (?) Outcome (?)

Table 2: Effectiveness labels

Short manual annex I: QUALIPREV criteria

Problem statement & theoretical background	
<i>Context analysis</i>	<p>Is there a discussion of the crime problem the project wishes to address?</p> <p>-yes: a context analysis is present -no: a context analysis is not present</p>
<i>Statement of specific objectives</i>	<p>Are the objectives stated concretely enough such that they can be evaluated unequivocally?</p> <p>-yes: the objectives are specific -no: the objectives are not specific</p>
<i>Link with theory and empirical research</i>	<p>Does the project provide a theoretical justification for the chosen prevention approach? Is there a link with previous empirical research?</p> <p>-yes: theoretical and empirical justification is given -partially: either theoretical or empirical justification is given -no: neither theoretical nor empirical justification is given</p>
<i>Crime prevention mechanisms identified</i>	<p>A crime prevention mechanism explains how a certain measure works to reduce or prevent crime.</p> <p>-two or more: two or more crime prevention mechanisms are identified -one: only one crime prevention mechanism is identified -none: no crime prevention mechanisms are identified</p>
Evaluability assessment	
<i>Systematic data registration</i>	<p>Is data collected in a methodical way?</p> <p>-yes: all data are collected methodically -partially: data are only partially collected methodically -no: the data are not collected methodically at all</p>
<i>Replicability</i>	<p>Is enough information available to replicate the project in another context (e.g. another country)?</p> <p>-yes: the project can be fully replicated -partially: part of the project can be replicated -no: the project cannot be replicated</p>
<i>Independent evaluation</i>	<p>Is the evaluation conducted by an independent third party?</p> <p>-yes: the evaluation is conducted by an independent third party -no: the evaluation is not conducted by an independent third party</p>

<i>Continuous evaluation</i>	<p>Is the evaluation also conducted in some form during (instead of only afterwards) the prevention project?</p> <p>-yes: the project is also evaluated during its course</p> <p>-no: the project is only evaluated afterwards</p>
Process evaluation	
<i>Relevant process indicators discussed</i>	<p>Are relevant process indicators discussed? The process evaluation indicators table (see appendix II) can be consulted to aid in determining relevant process indicators.</p> <p>-three or more: two or more relevant process indicators are discussed</p> <p>-one or two: only one or two relevant process indicators are discussed</p> <p>-none: no relevant process indicators are discussed</p>
<i>Involvement of external stakeholders</i>	<p>Are external stakeholders involved in the process evaluation?</p> <p>-yes: external stakeholders are involved in the evaluation</p> <p>-no: no external stakeholders are involved in the evaluation</p>
<i>Involvement of target group or local community</i>	<p>Is the target group of the prevention or the local community involved?</p> <p>-yes: the target group or local community is involved in the evaluation</p> <p>-no: neither the target group nor the local community is involved in the evaluation</p>
Outcome evaluation	
<i>Relevant outcome indicators discussed</i>	<p>Are relevant outcome indicators discussed? The outcome evaluation indicators table (see appendix II) can be consulted to aid in determining relevant outcome indicators.</p> <p>-three or more: three or more relevant outcome indicators are discussed</p> <p>-one: only one or two relevant outcome indicators are discussed</p> <p>-none: no relevant outcome indicators are discussed</p>
<i>Control group</i>	<p>Is a control group used to compare the results of the treatment group against?</p> <p>-yes: a control group is used</p> <p>-no: no control group is used</p>
<i>Randomisation or matched pairs</i>	<p>Is randomisation used to determine which units undergo the preventative measure and which units are the controls? Or, alternatively, is each unit in the preventative measure group is matched to a similar unit in the control group?</p> <p>-yes: randomisation or a matched pairs approach is used</p>

	-no: neither randomisation nor a matched pairs approach is used
<i>Cost-benefit analysis</i>	Has a cost-benefit analysis been conducted? -yes: a cost-benefit analysis has been conducted -no: a cost-benefit analysis has not been conducted
Dissemination and publication of results	
<i>Online available report</i>	Is a report of the results freely available (e.g. project website or EUCPN database)? -yes: a full report of the results is available online -partially: only a summary of the results is available online -no: neither report nor summary is available online
<i>Academic publication</i>	Are the results published academically? -yes: the results are published academically -no: the results are not published academically
<i>Report in English</i>	Is the report of the results available in English? -yes: the full report is available in English -partially: only a summary is available in English -no: neither report nor summary is available in English

Short manual annex II: Indicator tables

Process evaluation indicators
• Costs associated with implementation of preventative measures
• Correct implementation of preventative measures
• Accessibility
• Feasibility
• Participation rate
○ General participation rate
○ Participation of specific groups
• Retention rate
• External confounding factors

Outcome evaluation indicators

Situational prevention indicators	Social prevention indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-reported offending
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimisation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear/perception of crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in attitudes towards offending behaviour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased social skills

Universal prevention indicators	Selective prevention indicators	Indicated prevention indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded crime within risk group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported re-offending
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported offending 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-reported offending within risk group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconviction rate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimisation within risk group 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community fear/perception of crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear/perception of crime 	

Alcohol & drug related crime prevention indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substance use • Attitudes towards substance use
Youth crime prevention indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher/parent assessment • Mental health & well-being • School attendance
Property crime prevention indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts • Clear-up rate • Financial loss
Violent crime prevention indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts • Increased reporting
Fraud & cybercrime prevention indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of preventative measures • Increased detection