Crime Prevention – Implementation and Evaluation

1. "Implementation weaknesses have dogged crime prevention work. It has proven remarkably difficult to deliver crime prevention initiatives effectively. Implementation has received rather less attention in academic research than the formulation of methods of reducing crime" (Tilley, N. (2009) **Crime Prevention**, Willan Publishing, Devon, page 146).

2. Crime prevention initiatives often fail because of the following:
   a. The naive optimism of policy/project or scheme architects
   b. The number of interventions
   c. The number of independent agencies/parts of agencies involved
   d. The number of separate lines of accountability
   e. The space for unfettered practitioner discretion
   f. The number of changes to the personnel, especially leaders
   g. The indifference of leaders at all levels
   h. The changeability of the context for the initiative (Tilley, N (2009) **Crime Prevention**, Willan Publishing, Devon, page 158)

3. Ekblom's 5Is is a useful crime-problem solving framework. It includes the following Is:
   1. Intelligence
   2. Intervention
   3. Implementation
   4. Involvement
   5. Impact

(see Ekblom, P. (2011) **Crime Prevention, Security and Community Safety Using the 5Is Framework**, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire for a detailed overview of the 5Is)

   a. **INTELLIGENCE** – gathering and analysing information on
   - crime and disorder problems and their consequences
   - offenders and modus operandi
   - causes of crime and (with longer-term, developmental prevention) the 'risk and protective factors' in young children's life circumstances associated with later criminality

   b. **INTERVENTION** – blocking, disrupting or weakening those causes. The interventions cover the entire field:
   - acting through both civil prevention and traditional justice/ law-enforcement
   - addressing both situational and offender-oriented causes and
   - tackling causation at different levels – immediate 'molecular' causes of criminal events, higher-level causes in communities, networks, markets and criminal careers, and remote 'upstream' causes influenced by manipulation of risk and protective factors in children's early lives

c. **IMPLEMENTATION** – converting the intervention principles into practical methods that are:
   - customised for the local problem and context
   - targeted on offenders, victims, buildings, places and products, on an individual or collective basis
   - planned, managed, organised and steered
   - monitored and quality-assured, with documentation of inputs of human and financial resources, outputs and intermediate outcomes
   - assessed for ethical issues

d. **INVOLVEMENT** – mobilising other agencies, companies and individuals to play their part in implementing the intervention, or acting in partnership, because crime prevention professionals must often work through or with others, rather than directly intervening in causes of crime. In both cases specifying:
   - who was involved
   - what broad roles or specific tasks they undertook
   - how they were alerted, motivated, empowered or directed (e.g. by publicity campaigns, financial incentives)
   - how a broadly supportive climate was created in the community and how hostility was reduced

e. **IMPACT** - nature of evaluation (how the project was assessed, by whom; whether this was a reliable, systematic and independent evaluation; and what kind of evaluation design was used)
   - impact results (what worked, how)
   - cost-effectiveness, coverage of crime problem, timescale for implementation and impact
   - process evaluation (what problems/ tradeoffs faced in implementation, how they were resolved at each stage)
   - replicability (which contextual conditions and infrastructure are helpful, or necessary, to successfully replicate this project – or particular elements of it – at each of the 5Is stages)
   - learning points – both positive and negative (what to do, what not to do)

4. There has been a move toward to delivery of crime prevention through partnerships. The rationale for partnership approaches include:
   a. Wicked' policy issues like crime require inter-agency responses. The causes of crime cannot be tackled by any single agency. Consider domestic and family violence as an example – police, courts, corrections, legal aid, child welfare, health, housing, education, etc. all have a role to play in prevention
   b. 'Greater than the sum of the parts' potential for inter-agency collaboration / cooperation
   c. Fits with neo-liberal governance ethos
   d. Can be cost-effective, especially where budgets are pooled

5. Key ingredients of successful partnerships:
    a. **Mission and purpose** – clear sense of mission and purpose built around a recognition of interdependence
    b. **Leadership** – commit resources, unlock internal blockages, accountability, drive enthusiasm, 'think outside the box', sell vision
    c. **Appropriate structure** – strategic management divided off from operational and implementation issues
    d. **Appropriate resources** – time, information (data sharing protocols), financial
    e. **Durability** – continuity in representation, decisions documented to survive organisation churn (Gilling, D. (2005) 'Partnerships and Crime Prevention', in Tilley, N. (ed) **Crime Prevention and Community Safety Handbook**, Willan, Devon, pages 735-736)

6. In many jurisdictions, localised responses to crime have been advocated. International support for local governance of crime prevention is demonstrated by the following:
    a. "A multi-agency approach and a coordinated response at the local level in accordance with an integrated crime prevention action plan … this should involve:
        • A local diagnostic survey of crime
        • The identification of all relevant actors
        • The establishment, wherever appropriate, of consultation mechanisms
        • The elaboration of possible solutions to these problems in the local context"
    (UN Office on Drugs and Crime (2004) **Promoting the Prevention of Crime – Guidelines and Selected Projects**)
    b. "Cities, municipalities, and their leaders are in a unique position to mobilize local agencies in the development of safe, secure and lively communities. They are *strategically* placed to bring together all the actors. They have traditionally been responsible for urban or rural planning, they have intimate ties with all the local services, hospitals, schools, transport, youth and social services, police and judiciary, and the business community, to say nothing of their constituents"
    (Shaw, M. (2001) **The Role of Local Government in Community Safety**, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, Montreal)

7. While this movement to 'local solutions' has seen local government assume greater responsibilities for crime prevention, not all commentators are convinced that local government has the necessary resources, reach or expertise to effectively prevent crime:
    "… most of the risk and protection factors associated with involvement in crime are under the control of the State and federal governments rather than local government … **Local government is in a somewhat better position to influence the supply of opportunities and incentives for involvement in crime, through their development control plans and the services and recreational facilities they provide**. Municipal and shire councils can exercise some direct control in this domain through the policies they adopt in relation to such things as **building design, public space development and local business practice**. They can also exert some degree of indirect control through the relationships they establish with local police" (Weatherburn, D. (2004) **Law and Order in Australia: Rhetoric and Reality**, Federation Press, Annandale, page 209).