European Crime Prevention

Evaluation form

General criteria:

In the 'Rules and procedures for awarding and presenting the ECPA', the general criteria are described as follows **(Par.2 §3)**:

I. The intervention shall focus on prevention and / or reduction of everyday crime and fear of crime within the theme selected by the organising Member State and agreed by the National Representatives of the EUCPN.

II. The intervention shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives.

III. The intervention shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.

IV. The intervention shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.

V. The intervention shall be capable of replication in other Member States. Therefore information should be provided on the financial costs of the intervention. the source of funding, the implementation process and relevant source material.

Specific criteria:

Each general criterion will be measured by means of questions. Each question will be rated by a score between 1 and 5. As there are 10 questions to be answered, scores will range between 15 and 75 points. These quantitative scores provide a more objective point of comparison between interventions.

Score	
0	Not applicable
1	Weak
2	Average
3	Good
4	Very good
5	Excellent

General information

Country:	
Title of the intervention:	

I. **The intervention shall focus on prevention and / or reduction of crime and fear of crime within the theme selected by the organizing Member State and agreed by the National Representatives of the EUCPN.**

1. How would you judge the degree of compliance of the intervention to the current theme selected by the organising Member State? When the intervention is awarded with 0 or 1, the intervention will no longer be eligible to participate in the ECPA competition.

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1 = weak / 5 = Excellent): 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. Given the identified problem and context of the intervention, how would you judge the relevance and applicability of the underlying mechanism(s)[1] of the intervention? (programme theory)

Comments:

[1] **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.

Score (0 = NA/1 = weak / 5 = Excellent):	0	1	2	3	4	5

3. Is the link between the intervention's objectives, input, activities, output and outcomes realistic and feasible? In other words, does the logic model make sense? (logic model[2])

Comments:

Score (0 = NA/1 = weak / 5 = Excellent):	0	1	2	3	4	5

II. The intervention shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives.

4. Given the available evaluation(s), how would you judge the degree to which the intervention's activities were implemented as originally intended or appropriately modified in the light of the experience of difficulties encountered during implementation (process evaluation)?

[2] 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 victimization through fraud and theft, etc.) that the activities generate (i.e., outputs).

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): (0 1 2 3 4 5)x 2

5. Given the available evaluation(s), how would you judge the effectiveness of the intervention (outcome or impact evaluation)? Did the intervention have a substantial impact on the crime problem it wished to address?

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): (0 1 2 3 4 5)x 2

6. Overall, how would you judge the scientific quality (research questions, correct indicators, appropriate data collection methods, etc.) of the evaluation(s) of the intervention? Is the quality of the evaluation(s) sufficiently rigorous and informative to justify this intervention to be classified with confidence as 'good practice'?

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1 = weak / 5 = Excellent): 0 1 2 3 4 5

7. The intervention shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.
    a. How would you judge the innovativeness of the intervention in its methods and/or approaches? High scores could come from either overall innovativeness, or innovativeness of significant elements of the action.

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): (0 1 2 3 4 5)x 3

8. The intervention shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.
    a. How would you judge the appropriateness of the involvement of relevant partners or stakeholders in the intervention? This refers to both the level of cooperation, its relevance, and proper implementation?

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): **0 1 2 3 4 5**

9. The intervention shall be replicable in other Member States.
    a. How would you judge the replicability of the intervention (particularly within other Member States)? Is there enough information provided on the funding, the costs, the implementation process and the context of the intervention so that practitioners and policy makers can select, replicate and, if needed, modify it to their own local context?

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): (0 1 2 3 4 5)x 2

10. How would you judge the intervention's relevance for other Member States? Relevance could refer to the applicability to similar problems elsewhere crime problem or the methodology of the intervention.

Comments:
Score (0 = NA/1= weak / 5 = Excellent): 0 1 2 3 4 5

Overall evaluation of the intervention:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Proposal(s) for improvement:

***

EUCPN Secretariat

Funded by
the European Union