

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)¹

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?

Non-Profit Employment Agency RUBIKON

2. Country of application

Czech Republic

3. Who is responsible for completing this template?

Organisation responsible for this application: RUBIKON Centrum

Contact person: Lucie Streichsbierová

Address: Novákových 439/6, 180 00 Prague 8-Libeň, Czech Republic

Contact details: +420 778 424 979

E-mail (if possible, add institutional e-mail): streichsbierova@rubikoncentrum.cz

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

ester.kunstatova@mvcr.cz, michal.barborik@mvcr.cz

4. Timing

Start date of the intervention: 1/01/2012

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).

<https://www.rubikoncentrum.cz/pracovni-agentura-rubikon/>

<https://www.iksp.cz/storage/169/441-Zamestnani-jako-faktor-desistence.pdf>

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

We have developed and are implementing a unique service of a non-profit employment agency that focuses on increasing the employability of people with criminal histories, providing job placement, and working with employers to create an inclusive labour market. We aim to work comprehensively with the social disadvantages that people with criminal histories face and improve their position in the job market.

Within our employment agency RUBIKON, we connect the work of the non-profit sector, the state, and the commercial sector and coordinate the cooperation. The key actors in the field and our valued partners are the prison service, social probation officers, probation and mediation services, NGOs, employers, state employees, and many other experts. We consider long-term and intensive cooperation, especially with the Prison Service of the Czech Republic and with representatives of municipalities and regions to be crucial. We have built strong partnerships with a majority of prisons in the country which allow us to work intensively with the target group during their prison sentence.

The project's key activities work towards holistically preparing our clients for their release from prison and providing subsequent support after the release. Each year we work in about 20-25 cooperating prisons (in 2023 we worked in 23 prisons). Our main activities consist of:

- A. Counselling
- B. Preparation for negotiations with the employer and self-presentation training including mock interviews
- C. Arranging a job placement and support in the subsequent adaptation

Our work with the target group starts during their time in prison and continues after their release. The cooperation usually begins six months before the release with an initial meeting and continues in the form of regular individual consultations. During the consultations, we focus on job counselling, creating a CV, and preparing for job interviews, but also on identifying the strengths, skills, and competencies of the clients which could be relevant on the labour market and for their overall reintegration. Given their commonly low formal education and work experience, we often build on so-called transferable skills, i.e. skills they have acquired during their life and prison stay (e.g. orderliness, ability to accept authority). We are discovering their hidden potential and teaching them to use it.

We consider working with the target group during their prison sentence as a crucial prerequisite for ensuring continued employment after release. We have adapted the program to be able to carry out a large part of the activities (at least 75%) in the prisons and thus use the time that the prisoners have for their growth and development. Thanks to the established relationship of trust and intensive preparation for entering the labour market, almost 50% of our clients continue to work with us after release.

In addition to that, we actively seek out and reach out to employers and help them fight stereotypes in their recruitment practices. We provide employers with continuous support and HR services (referral of candidates, mediation of contact between employer and client, support in adaptation of the new employees) when recruiting people with convictions. We also lead by example and draw on our personal experience - 30% of our employees have a criminal history. We spread the principles of fair recruitment among employers and teach them to apply these principles in practice.

In 2013 and 2015 we won 1st place in the National Career Counselling Award for the RUBIKON Employment Agency concept, and in 2015 we were awarded a prize at the Regiostars Awards 2015 in Brussels. We continue to offer our know-how and experience, and we strive for our solutions to be adopted by other entities in state administration and the non-profit sector.

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)**

People with criminal records (about 425,000 or 6% of the productive population in CZ) are one of the most vulnerable groups on the labour market. They face an accumulation of social disadvantages (lack of housing, indebtedness, broken social ties) which are compounded by a criminal record. Often, they can only get short-term jobs or are hired for low-skilled positions that are not in high demand. Many remain in long-term illegal employment (47.7 % of convicts lacked any legal income in the 3 years before their current sentence, making finance one of the most risky factors for committing crime) or in the welfare system (45% of prisoners have experienced long-term unemployment), and their social exclusion deepens (80% are in a debt trap).

Employment is crucial for reducing recidivism by providing legal income, economic stability, structured time, and new social connections. Each year, around 50,000 individuals are sentenced in the Czech Republic, with more than 21,000 under probation supervision and nearly 20,000 serving their time. Additionally, 10,000 individuals are released from prison annually. The Czech Republic has the 3rd highest incarceration rate in the EU, with a correspondingly high probation rate. Neglecting the labour integration of people leaving prison exacerbates social inequalities, increases recidivism risks, and harms families as well as society, weakening both the economy and security.

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)**

Based on our data from serving about 1,000 clients annually, we have found that while participants successfully complete our job readiness programs, they struggle to connect with employers and often cannot maintain employment. Our analysis of services in the public, NGO, and commercial sectors showed a significant gap in effective support for people with criminal records in the Czech Republic.

To address this, we examined successful practices abroad and identified the British organization [Working Chance](#) as exemplary. With their support, we adapted their non-profit employment agency model for women with criminal records to fit the Czech context and both genders. We also collaborated with LMC/AlmaCareer to assess employers' attitudes toward hiring individuals with criminal records. Our survey of 241 Czech employers revealed that 68% require a criminal record transcript during recruitment, 46%

demand it for all positions, and 55% do not ever hire individuals with criminal histories, while only one-third do not ask for transcripts at all.

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

The main goal of our program is to increase the employability and social integration of 300 people leaving prison each year and to help 100 of them find employment in the labour market.

A secondary objective is to promote labour market inclusiveness and increase the motivation and readiness of employers to employ people leaving prison.

The expected impact is to promote the desistance of the clients, enhancing their social integration, strengthening their economic stability, and reducing their recidivism.

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: Persons released from prisons are threatened by many factors and social disadvantages such as low employability, low orientation on the labour market, low self-esteem, reduced ability to self-present, low education and work experience (49% of incarcerated persons have only primary education, 26% have no experience of legal

¹ **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.

employment, 45% have experienced long-term unemployment), a criminal record, indebtedness, low financial literacy and an accumulation of other social and personal problems (addictions, complex trauma, broken relationship networks, unresolved health problems, etc). People leaving prisons are often excluded from job tenders or have limited access to the labour market. They are mainly only allowed to work in low-skilled positions or remain in the informal economy (illegal employment) for long periods of time. All of this leads to frequent reoffending.

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**² of the intervention here. (**Max. 200 words**)

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 victimisation through fraud and theft, etc.) that the activities generate (i.e., outputs).

Logic Model of the Project



The project is run from the RUBIKON offices in 4 Czech regions with total costs of EUR 250,000 and 9 staff members. We also have a stable network of cooperating employers and partners. One of the main activities of the project is counselling intending to motivate clients to find and keep legal and long-term employment, creating a plan for social and work integration of the clients, and helping improve clients' competencies, qualifications, and skills for engaging with employers. Out of the 300 motivated clients entering our program, 250 complete the complex of support services during their sentence and are prepared for legal employment. 150 of those clients choose to continue to work with us after their release and receive offers of mediated employment and support in adaptation on the job and further

integration. We also cooperate with the employers, providing them with HR support. 100 of our clients gain legal and sustainable work and 60 remain in the position after the trial period. Our program leads to a reduction in factors of social exclusion, a strengthening of factors for desistance, reduced recidivism of the target group, increased inclusiveness of the labour market, savings on public spending, and improved safety of communities and society.

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)³ 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**)

The RUBIKON employment agency aims to increase employment for its target group by supporting clients in overcoming barriers to social inclusion and labour market entry. The project educates employers, works to remove systemic workforce barriers, and facilitates the integration of clients, which reduces social exclusion and recidivism. This has positive societal impacts, such as enhanced public safety and savings on social benefits, criminal proceedings, and healthcare.

The project promotes interdisciplinary cooperation, collaborating with government bodies, research institutions, and NGOs to develop systemic solutions for penitentiary and post-penitentiary care. This approach benefits both the clients and the broader system, driving meaningful changes in policy and practice.

The project is built on the following crime prevention mechanisms:

- a) Encouraging desistance from crime and rehabilitating former offenders - motivation and support in desistance is an essential part of all contact with clients during and after their prison sentence
- b) Eliminating or reducing the social and individual causes and processes that lead to criminality - identification of these causes and processes is part of individual planning with the client
- c) Reducing the harmful consequences of criminal acts - the approach to the client includes an emphasis on attitudes towards the criminal past as well as the consequences of the criminal past, with an attempt to be restorative

³ **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.

Description of outcome evaluation results or indications of theoretical plausibility

13. Has there been an outcome⁴ or impact⁵ evaluation? and what were the main results? Please, also describe which indicators were used to measure the effects of your intervention. (**Max. 300 words**)

We had a professional external evaluation performed by a research team from the Institute for Criminology and Social Prevention (IKSP), focusing on ex-offenders who participated in the RUBIKON Centre's non-profit employment agency project. The evaluation examined the role of employment in preventing further criminal behaviour, testing the hypothesis that finding and maintaining stable employment through RUBIKON acts as a key factor in desistance from crime.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. The research explored various indicators, including reoffending rates, motivations for leaving crime, desistance factors, turning points, the role of employment, and labour market barriers. The results were striking: only 11.4% of RUBIKON clients were found to have new convictions, compared to 97.6% in the control group. This confirmed that stable legal employment achieved through RUBIKON plays a critical role in promoting desistance. The outside factors with the strongest influence on desistance were abstinence, help from the non-profit sector, employment, and help from close people. The biggest barriers to employment in the target group were criminal records, indebtedness, and poor work habits.

It is important to consider several contextual factors that may have affected the results. The RUBIKON project works primarily with clients already motivated for change and free from addiction, both of which are strong predictors of desistance. Additionally, the control group was younger on average, which increases the likelihood of reoffending. There was also a higher number of first-time offenders in the RUBIKON sample, which may have contributed to the lower reoffending rate.

In addition to this external evaluation, we regularly and continuously assess program outcomes as part of project management. We focus on tracking positive changes in clients' lives that contribute to desistance, covering areas such as social relationships, mental health, self-confidence, work, and motivation for life change. This assessment involves a set of questions rated on a 1-to-5 scale. We do not quantify assessment results in these areas, but they are the subject of a continuous guided conversation between the counsellor

⁴ **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**.

⁵ **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.

and client as part of a review of the individual plan.

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)**

The external evaluation by the Institute for Criminology and Social Prevention employed an analysis of copies of the Criminal Register and RUBIKON Center employment files, in-depth interviews with the target and control groups, and a questionnaire survey of prison social workers, social probation officers, probation and mediation service staff, and RUBIKON Center staff. A sample of 44 RUBIKON clients was compared to a control group of 83 offenders with similar backgrounds. The survey was distributed among all RUBIKON agency partners and colleagues.

The continuous verification of outcomes is conducted through feedback from employers and target group members. For clients, the Outcome Stars method evaluates individual progress, using a five-step scale to measure shifts, with a significant shift defined as two steps. The objectives in each participant's individual plan (IP) are also assessed. Cooperating organizations are surveyed to determine if clients have secured employment and maintained it beyond the trial period.

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)**

In addition to our evaluations, we have had theoretical projections of the success of the project since the methodology was based on the successful work of the Working Chance employment charity which has been helping women with criminal histories find employment since 2009. This organisation has a proven positive impact on those women and their families, on the economy, and on society through reducing reoffending. It cooperates with over 100 employers across all sectors and has a near 0% reoffending rate among its clients with 89% of the women reporting increased hopefulness about their future after engaging with the organisation.

16. Has a cost-benefit analysis⁶ been carried out? If so, describe the results of this analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out. (**Max. 150 words**)

Around 300 people a year benefit from the program, with around a third, or 100 people, gaining employment. The cost of working with one client for one year (usually the intervention does not last longer) is EUR 833.

The average annual cost per an unemployed person for one year in 2020 was almost EUR 11 640 (VUPSV, 2021). The cost of one year in prison for one person is more than EUR 29 000 (Statistická ročenka VS ČR, 2022) and the social costs of one recidivist are more than EUR 2 million (České Priority, 2023). Additionally, the failure to address the problem has negative impacts on society as a whole - e.g. reduced security, costs to public budgets, costs to the social and justice systems.

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**)

During the implementation of the project activities, we use financial resources of about 250,000 EUR per year. Personnel costs represent about 60%, about 15% of the costs are direct support to our clients (requalification courses, salary during training placements). The remaining 25% of the costs include overheads, administrative costs, and team training. The team usually consists of 9 people (6.5 full-time positions in total). We provide direct services in 4 regions. The team consists of 4 counsellors, an employer manager, a team leader, an advocacy expert, and a PR manager.

⁶ **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**)

Yes, there was a research team from the Institute for Criminology and Social Prevention who planned, conducted and wrote a report on the evaluation.

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**)

We have well-established and effective partnerships with all of the relevant stakeholders. The main partners in the project are the Prison Service of the Czech Republic (we cooperate with 25 prisons), social probation officers, Probation and Mediation Service staff (in case of ordered supervision), and other experts such as addictions specialists, staff of other NGOs, and staff of the Labour Office of the Czech Republic. These partners are involved in the direct work with our clients (selection/recommendation of clients, provision of partial support within case management). The involvement of all actors works on the principle of case management, experts are connected based on the tasks that the client is dealing with. These actors are also involved in the evaluation of the project (e.g. in-depth interviews and questionnaire surveys as part of a research study on employment as a factor of desistance).

Among other key partners are the collaborating employers, with whom we maintain regular contact, including events that focus specifically on this collaboration, e.g. mock interviews, employer breakfasts, and recruitment day. It is the link between the non-profit, public, and commercial sectors that is key to comprehensively grasping the problem.

20. Describe the implementation of the intervention's activities and its outputs⁷. (**Max.200 words**)

The project activities include:

- **Counselling for clients in prison and post-release** to support social stabilization and increase employability (career counselling, identification of potential for sustainable employment). Crucially, this key activity starts during their stay in prison,

⁷ **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.)

about 6 months before the end of the sentence, and continues after release. Outputs include 250 clients completing a preparatory program in prison, 150 receiving post-release support, individualized plans for resocialization for each client (with specific contacts, appointments, and financial aid for initial accommodation).

- **Self-presentation training:** Clients undergo mock interviews to prepare for real job interviews. Outputs include two mock interviews before and after release, certificates of completion, CVs, and potential job contacts for each client.
- **Job placement and employer cooperation:** We search for suitable employers and create a portfolio of job offers for our clients. We mediate contact and match the client's potential and the employer's needs. We provide employers with support in recruiting and guarantee to solve any problems during the work adaptation process. Outputs include partnerships with 140 employers, 100 clients gaining employment annually, and 60 of these clients maintaining their jobs after the trial period. We also provide financial support, such as covering travel costs, until the first payday.

21. Has there been a process evaluation⁸ and what were the main results?

Please, also describe what indicators were used to measure the implementation of your intervention? **(Max. 300 words)**

RUBIKON Centrum has been implementing process evaluation for a long time as an integral part of the management of all areas of its activities, including the RUBIKON Employment Agency. We have the ambition to approach the status of the so-called learning organization and continuously examine the effectiveness of our management processes. One of the specific comprehensive and professionally managed process evaluations was carried out intensively within the framework of the project *We are interested in how you see it* (in the period 1.1.2020 - 31.12.2021) under the leadership of an external evaluator Ing. Vladimír Kváča, Ph.D.

The following indicators were used to evaluate our project:

- Obstacles in establishing contact between the client and the RUBIKON Centre staff, taking into account the aspect of cooperation with partners and adherence to the case management method
- The client's passage through the service - what stages of cooperation, for how long, with what result
- Moving towards the desired life change of the client

⁸ **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.

One of the aims of the process evaluation was to reduce the number of clients who leave the service prematurely and without agreement, particularly at the time of transition from prison to freedom. As a result of the process changes adopted, the continuity of client engagement in the program after release was increased from 14% to 47%. The change occurred over a 4-year period.

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)**

Evaluation findings are based on a combination of continuous participant observation and engagement with the RUBIKON clients, diary entries by the change guide and team members, and quantitative data collected during monitoring periods. Quoting the evaluation report: 'The essence of the intervention was to create initially a small team of consultants, i.e. the RUBIKON staff in direct work with clients, who, with the help of a change guide (an expert in Design Thinking and Systems Thinking), will systematically create and test new ways of working with clients and gradually influence other processes within the organisation. This was more than successful, two internal change guides emerged quite quickly, and by the second half of the project, they were already leading several separate change processes with only the supervisory support. At the same time, it was possible to move from partial aspects of service delivery to dealing with quite profound changes in the organisation's work"

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

Causes specific to the Czech Republic

1. Employers' side

- Stigmatization and prejudice (belief that those punished are to blame, don't deserve a second chance, or are dangerous).
- Recruitment practices requiring a clean criminal record.
- Acceptance by public authorities of the overuse of criminal records in hiring.

2. Systemic:

- Absence of a comprehensive support system for the target group
- Gaps in employment services, with intensive support provided by the Labour Office only after six months of unemployment. The early post-dismissal period, which is most critical,

lacks support for work adaptation.

3. Target group side

- Accumulation of social disadvantages (indebtedness, fluctuating motivation for legal work, low self-esteem, poor labour market orientation, and low education — 49% of prisoners have only primary education).

4. Overall mindset

- The public fears and dismisses people with a criminal record.

Additional ECPA questions

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

We address the integration of people with criminal backgrounds comprehensively:

- We provide services to the target group and share our expertise with other actors. For example, our probation program PUNKT was adopted by the Probation and Mediation Service, and Croatia's Ministry of Justice decided to replicate our Roma mentoring program.
- We remove systemic barriers, such as pushing for the abolition of the criminal record requirement for social service jobs.
- We work to change mindsets by revealing the hidden potential of individuals with criminal backgrounds and teaching employers and other actors to see this potential.
- We support evidence-based approaches, contributing to studies like the IKSP Employment and Desistance Study and Czech Priorities' Penological Recidivism or Gender and Other Criminological Data studies.
- We lead by example, with 30% of our employees having a criminal record.
- Our service development relies on the lived experiences of people with criminal backgrounds, we address the problem of this group together with their representatives.

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

We believe that the project is highly relevant for other EU member states if the specifics of the disadvantage of people coming out of prison, the post/penitentiary care systems and

the situation on the labour market are taken into account.

We benefit significantly from our collaboration with Working Chance, an organization based in Great Britain, which applies these methods when working with women. This partnership provided us with the necessary know-how and training to help shape and improve our approach. We try to offer and pass on our know-how to relevant actors, both at the level of the state in the Czech Republic and at the level of NGOs and other organizations across the EU. An example is the Portuguese organization RESHAPE, which is interested in taking over our model. Together with this organization and Working Chance, we organized a successful thematic panel at the prestigious international conference Prison Insights - international event (reshape.org).

List of potential crime prevention mechanisms⁹

- **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



This tool was funded by the European Union's Internal Security Fund — Police.

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