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Foreword

Evaluation is a key component of any project or initiative. It is not an ‘add on’ or an afterthought but woven throughout any activity. The purpose of evaluation therefore is to understand what works or doesn’t work and why, in order to improve practice and performance in the future.

The process of evaluation is a crucial component within any problem-oriented approach (POA). The approach outlined in this guide sets evaluation in a problem-solving context, utilising the SARA approach which has become the most recognised problem solving model to identify and address crime reduction and community safety problems. As most projects and initiatives are now built upon a problem-solving model, it is logical to consider evaluation in this context.

By sharing evaluation findings you can learn from previous projects and possibly attract resources for future projects. Published reports can be a useful source of information about effective practice but there is a limited supply of evaluated projects and associated evaluated effective practice.

One of the purposes of this guide is to encourage more people to evaluate projects and to share their findings with others. In so doing, the library of evaluated effective practice can grow and the lessons disseminated more widely, with the ultimate aim of improving the impact and effectiveness of community safety activity.
About this Guide

Welcome to the Passport to Evaluation v.2.0. This section looks at what you will learn and how to apply it

**Aims and objectives**

This Passport to Evaluation v.2.0 looks at the basic techniques used to monitor and evaluate community safety projects and initiatives. By the time you complete this guide, you will be able to:

- define evaluation;
- understand the relationship between evaluation and the problem-oriented approach;
- explain why community safety work needs to be evaluated;
- describe different types of evaluation;
- understand the process for evaluating a project;
- evaluate a community safety project;
- take account of some of the issues that you need to consider when planning an evaluation;
- identify skills and knowledge that you can use in your own work.

**Who is the guide for?**

This guide is particularly relevant to everyone who works in community safety, particularly those who are likely to be involved in evaluating projects or initiatives.

The skills and knowledge in this guide will be valuable for those new to evaluation and a useful reminder to anyone, whatever level of experience they may have in evaluation.
How to use this Guide

This guide is built on the view that the most effective way to learn is through an interactive approach, which enables participants to not only learn about concepts and principles but also to ‘try them out’. It is a flexible document that is designed to help you learn how to evaluate projects and initiatives.

If you are new to evaluation you will probably want to work through from start to finish.

If you already have some experience of evaluation, you may decide to skip some sections. You should still read the objectives at the beginning of each part and the summaries at the end of each part to make sure that you are not missing out on anything new to you.

Each part of Passport to Evaluation has a similar structure.

- Objectives at the beginning to tell you what you will learn.
- Text broken down into individual sections, each covering a single topic.
- Questions designed to make you think more about some of the issues in the guide and how they apply to you.
- A summary of the key points raised.

Part Three also includes a case study for you to work on, which gives you the opportunity to practice some of the skills you will have learned. The case study is set in the fictional community of Dofton, but it is based on real community safety problems.
Symbols used in this book
To help you work your way round this book there are several symbols.

This symbol highlights the section objective.

This symbol highlights the overview.

This symbol at the beginning of a paragraph means that there is a question for you to answer. Space is provided in the book for your answers.

This symbol shows where there is a suggested answer to a question or activity.

This symbol indicates where there is a summary of the points you have learned.

This symbol appears on case study pages.

This symbol indicates that there is part of the case study for you to complete.

Notes
This book has been designed with wide margins so that you have plenty of space to make notes.
Part One – the Context of Evaluation

Introduction
The aim of this part is to set the scene for learning about evaluation. Evaluation is really about measuring what a project has achieved and which activities have had an impact on the problem being addressed.

At the heart of this is the problem-oriented approach and this Part outlines the basic principles of problem solving using the SARA model. If you feel you have a sound understanding of problem solving and the SARA model, you may want to skip to Part Two. However, if you are unsure, all of this Part might provide a useful refresher.

Objectives
By the end of this Part you will be able to:

- understand why evaluation is linked so closely with a problem-oriented approach;
- describe a number of problem solving models;
- explain the principles behind the SARA and PAT models;
- understand how the project management and problem-solving approaches to evaluation are linked;
- understand some of the seven key steps which underpin any evaluation.

Overview
Section One – evaluation and problem-solving.
Looks at the link between evaluation and the problem-oriented approach and introduces some simple problem-solving models.

Section Two – SARA and PAT.
Looks in more detail at the SARA model and its accompanying data analysis model, PAT.

Section Three – evaluation as a project in a problem-solving context.
Looks at how the original project management and problem-oriented approaches are linked.

A summary of key points in this part is found on page 23.
Section One – evaluation and problem-solving

The process of evaluation is a crucial component within any problem-oriented approach. You need to understand whether or not an initiative is having any impact on the problem at which it is targeted. This can help you to modify your activity if necessary to ensure that it continues to target the problem. You can also use the results from previous evaluations to help shape your initiative. As such, evaluation should be built into any problem-oriented project from the very beginning. It is, therefore, worth spending a few minutes making sure that we understand some simple principles of problem-solving.

The problem-oriented approach has become the standard way of identifying and addressing crime reduction and community safety problems. It has evolved from the Problem Oriented Policing (POP) approach and focuses on the identification of underlying causes which drive particular problems and the development of solutions, targeted on those causes. The Home Office suggests a problem-oriented approach as a useful framework to find sustainable solutions to recurring crime and community safety projects and initiatives increasingly utilise this approach. It is logical, therefore, to consider evaluation in the problem-orientated approach context.

There are several simple problem-solving models, which underpin the problem-oriented approach. The most common is the SARA model, which stands for Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment.

This simple model suggests that any problem-oriented approach should comprise four broad stages.

**Scanning** An early review of clusters of similar, related or recurring incidents. From these, one or a small number of specific crime and/or community safety problems are selected for further examination.

**Analysis** A detailed review of data to identify the underlying causes of the particular problem. This also makes use of another simple tool, namely the Problem Analysis Triangle, which helps you to analyse the problem from the three main perspectives of offender, victim and location.

**Response** The activities designed to address the causes of the problem, as identified in the analysis.

**Assessment** The measurement of the impact of the response on the problem.

We will consider the SARA model in a little more detail shortly, but for those who are interested, you can find out more about it on the crime reduction website, at [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/sara.htm).
Though SARA is the most common model, there are others.

The 5 I’s model was developed by Paul Ekblom in the Home Office Research Unit and rather than just focusing on problem solving it states that the model relates to the preventive process. The 5 I’s in the model stand for

- **Intelligence**
- **Intervention**
- **Implementation**
- **Involvement**
- **Impact.**

If you are interested, in learning more about the 5I’s model you can find out more at [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/5isintro.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/5isintro.htm)

The **PROCTOR** model is a refinement of the SARA model and appears in the Home Office publication *Not Rocket Science*? This stands for

- **PROblem**
- **Cause**
- **Tactic (or treatment)**
- **Output**
- **Result**

You can find out more about it at on the crime reduction website, at [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/proctor.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/proctor.htm) and also at [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skills05.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/skills/skills05.htm).

**CAPRA** is the community safety problem solving model developed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and comprises five broad stages:

- **Clients**
- **Analyse information**
- **Partnerships**
- **Response**
- **Assessment of action plan**

If you are interested in learning more about the CAPRA model you can find out more about it at on the RCMP website, at [http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ccaps-spcca/capra-eng.htm](http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ccaps-spcca/capra-eng.htm).

Though all use slightly different terminology (e.g. assessment, results), all of the models focus on a clear understanding of problems, responses focused on those problems and monitoring and evaluation to assess the impact of responses on the problem.
Section Two – SARA and PAT

The most commonly adopted model, and the one which underpins the approach of most UK partnerships who have adopted a problem-oriented approach is the SARA model. It provides a common language to communicate with community safety practitioners across different partner organisations and it is also recognised as the *de facto* standard by the Home Office, so it is worth having a more detailed look at it.

While the SARA model is made up of four simple stages it is also important to recognise that the model is cyclical and not linear. In other words, each stage feeds back into previous stages to fine-tune activity and ultimately deliver desired results. We will now have a more detailed look at these stages.

**Scanning**

A problem can be defined in any number of ways, but might include the following:

- A cluster of similar, related or recurring incidents;
- A substantive community concern;
- A type of behaviour;
- A place;
- A person or persons;
- A special event or time;
- A specific desirable object or hot product. (For more on hot products and understanding, anticipating and reducing demand for stolen goods see [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fprs112.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fprs112.pdf)

A problem may also be a combination of any of the above. It is not proposed to be too prescriptive with regard to what a problem is, as all circumstances are different and what is a problem in one area may not be so in another.

You may become aware of problems in a number of ways, including:

- analysis of calls for service;
- crime and incident data analysis (including mapping), looking specifically for repeat events or substantial unseasonal changes in the number of offences;
- consulting with colleagues in the police service;
- consulting with colleagues in other agencies;
- consulting with members of the community, business owners, local politicians, community groups and so on;
- reviewing public complaints and letters;
Part One – the Context of Evaluation

- community forums and consultative meetings;
- information from neighbourhood associations;
- reviewing media coverage.

Other valuable sources of information, which may assist in the identification of a problem, include:

- personal observation and experience;
- victims;
- offenders;
- individual members of the public.

Once problems have been identified, they need to be prioritised such that effort is focused on the most serious problems.

In selecting a problem on which to focus, possibly from a number of problems which have been identified, you may wish to consider several factors which will help you to prioritise. These may include the following:

- The impact of the problem on the community – size and cost (in terms of financial or quality of life costs);
- The significance of the problem and the need to address it from a police perspective. In other words, how the problem fits in the ‘big picture’ (in terms of local policy, national policy and community need);
- The likely impact of not dealing with the problem;
- The presence of any life-threatening conditions;
- Community interest and likely support for actions designed to address the problem;
- Potential threat to civil rights of the problem and the solution;
- The likelihood that a solution will have some impact on the problem;

Once the problems have been scanned and prioritised, the next stage is to carry out a more rigorous analysis of the problem which has been selected.
Analysis

A thorough analysis of the selected problem is critical as the development of a response targeted on the problem cannot be effective unless there is a clear understanding of the problem in the first place. Yet, too often, analysis is either carried out at a very superficial level, or sometimes not at all. Reasons for this might include the following:

- A view that the problem (and its cause) is so clearly defined that there is no need for further analysis. Despite this, very often problem causes are found to be totally unexpected, following proper analysis;
- Pressure to solve the perceived problem quickly;
- Insufficient time and/or resources to enable proper analysis to take place;
- Lack of credibility of analysis. (It’s not real police work!)

It is important to resist the urge to skip or ‘skate over’ the analysis phase. Failure to analyse properly might cause you to address a problem that does not exist or implement an ineffective or inappropriate solution. There is, therefore, a strong need to evidence the specific crime problem in the area, specifically looking at what data is available.

Another benefit of thorough analysis of the problem will provide benchmarks for evaluating the success of any project designed to address the problem, after implementation.
Example

A scan of crime and incident data in one police force indicated a problem with criminal damage to vehicles in a number of adjacent streets, which included wing mirrors being smashed and scratches to paintwork along the side of vehicles. What might a traditional response be, without further detailed analysis?
A response, without any further analysis, might have been high profile policing and the introduction of costly CCTV cameras (either mobile or permanent). Analysis actually revealed that the majority of these ‘crimes’ related to incidents where lorries (including Council refuse collection lorries) were catching the wing mirrors of cars as they made their way down the narrow streets between two lines of parked cars. Scratches to paintwork were mainly caused by people walking down the narrow pavements late at night (often drunk), leaning against the cars accidently and scratching them with zips, buttons and other fasteners from their coats. As a result, the high-profile policing/prevention campaign would have had little impact on the problem and been an ineffective use of resources.

The actual solution lay outside the service and revolved around the adoption of herringbone parking along the streets. This gave more room in the streets for lorries to pass safely through and more room on the pavements for pedestrians. It also presented less surface area of the cars to the pavements which reduced the opportunity for accidental scratching to take place. As a result of this action, the number of reported instances of criminal damage in these streets fell dramatically.

There are a number of simple questions to ask at the analysis stage. These include the following.

- Can we group any information into themes?
- How can we explain the emerging themes?
- Do we understand how or why the problem has occurred and what is driving it?
- Do we know of any past attempts to solve it?
- Did such attempts succeed and if so, why, and if not, why not?

It is important to consider the problem from different perspectives, during analysis and another simple model to assist in this is the Problem Analysis Triangle. The PAT suggests that problems should be looked at from three broad perspectives, namely:

- offender;
- victim;
- location.
In recent years, this model has been supplemented by some of the concepts from Routine Activity Theory (RAT), notably the idea of capable guardians. A capable guardian has a ‘human element’, that is usually a person that by their mere presence would deter potential offenders from perpetrating an act. A capable guardian could also be CCTV, providing that someone is monitoring it at the other end of the camera.

The PAT model has been developed in recent years and a further outlying triangle is included which incorporates the RAT model and shows those factors which control individual elements.

The inner triangle relates to the analysis of problems (PAT), while the outer triangle relates to the development of interventions to address the problems (RAT). Taking one or more of the factors away from the internal triangle will help to prevent or reduce crime, while adding one or more factors to the outer triangle will also do so.

It is not uncommon to find that each element contributes in some way to the problem and each requires different responses. In fact, rather than a triangle, it might be better to consider a ‘swirl’ with factors interacting as an initiative progresses.

For those of you who want to find out more about the RAT and the PAT/RAT model, you can go to http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/rat.htm.
Example
Analysis of a burglary problem in a high-class residential area, using PAT revealed the following.

- **Location.** Burgled houses were in clusters, within a 400-yard radius of three railway stations on a local commuter line.

- **Victim.** High-class property, empty during daylight hours; little natural surveillance due to large hedges.

- **Offender.** Individuals from deprived areas using the trains without paying, as the local rail company had stopped carrying out train ticket inspections.

- **Capable guardians – lack of natural surveillance due to environment (high hedges obscure lines of sight from buildings, low occupancy in a commuter area – so natural surveillance is limited)**

What do you think were the main causes of this problem?
The causes of this problem were ease of access and secluded and empty properties. The PAT analysis had also revealed a problem of offenders travelling on trains free of charge into the area. The symptom was a high number of burglaries.

A traditional response might have been high-profile policing and crime prevention advice. Whilst this still took place, the railway company and the British Transport Police implemented a rigorous ticket inspection and enforcement programme which had a dramatic and almost instant impact on the level of burglary in the affected area and, interestingly, in other areas of the city, near to railway stations. This more innovative response, arising from a thorough analysis of the problem, was the major contributor to the reduction in burglary.

There are a number of other frameworks that can be used to underpin the analysis of crime problems. These include the Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity model. Others include the VIVA and CRAVED models which relate to factors which influence the commission of property crime. VIVA suggests that the attractiveness of property from a theft perspective depends on its Value, Inertia, Visibility and Access. Affecting one or all of these factors will affect the ease by which the property can be stolen.

In a similar vein, CRAVED suggests that the extent to which property is Concealable, Removable, Available, Valuable, Enjoyable and Disposable will influence the likelihood that it might be stolen.

You can find out more about each of these frameworks at http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/cco.htm and at http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/hotproducts.htm.

In addition to frameworks which help you to approach the analysis of problems, there are also many methods or techniques that can be used to analyse data in order to gain a clear understanding of the problem and its causes, including the following:

- Crime Pattern Analysis – specifically useful to consider control group comparison, seasonality effect and displacement theory (http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/displacement_theory.htm);
- Market profiles – particularly in relation to drugs and vehicle-related offences;
- Demographic/social trend analysis;
- Network analysis;
- Target profile analysis;
- Environmental audits.

We will have a look at these in more detail in Part Three.
Response

Once the problem has been properly analysed and the underlying causes identified, then and only then should a response be developed. The temptation and pressure to ‘do something’ before the analysis is complete is often very strong, but it is important that any response put in place focuses upon the causes of the problem.

It is equally important to recognise that the response phase includes pre-implementation planning and development as well as its operation. Much of the preparation for the evaluation is carried out in this response planning stage.

Initial responses to problems might include:

- high profile policing;
- stricter enforcement;
- targeting prolific offenders;
- physical changes to the environment (sometimes referred to as target hardening);
- organising and mobilising the community;
- educating the public – raising awareness;
- diversionary activities for youths.

While all these may be perfectly appropriate if relevant to the identified problem, some of the most effective responses to problems arise from working in partnership with other agencies. Often these responses require people to be innovative in their thinking.

The Home Office publication *Not Rocket Science?* outlines three core features common to all effective responses.

- The response is focused on the *pinch point* or the point at which intervention might be expected to have the longest term, greatest or widest impact.
- The response almost inevitably involves some degree of partnership working. The report recognises, however, that some agencies might be reluctant to involve themselves and this is revisited later.
- The response is usually sustainable, though not necessarily permanent.

To read more about this report go to http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/crrs06.pdf.
One of the early tasks in preparing any response is to identify those who will benefit if the problem is addressed. These stakeholders will bring a different perspective to the problem and how it can be addressed. The more stakeholders identified the more potential resources you will have to deal with the problem. Stakeholders could include:

- local and national agencies (e.g. police, probation, housing services, drug services, schools and local authorities);
- victims (e.g. victim can become involved through programmes such as restorative justice);
- the community (neighbourhood watch, crime focused community forums, Partner’s and Communities Together meetings (PACTs), wider members of the community, hard-to-reach groups);
- businesses (e.g. business watch/corporations).

In practice, usually only one or two will work on a particular problem, with others having more to contribute at specific points. Some stakeholders might be reluctant to become involved, particularly where there is no obligation on them to deal with the problem.

To try to encourage groups to become actively involved, the use of ‘levers’ may be considered. Work by the Home Office in naming the make and models of cars most vulnerable to auto theft in car theft index publications is a lever used in an attempt to encourage the car industry to build more preventative measures into their vehicles as standard. You can find out more about this piece of work on the following website: http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/vehiclecrime/vehiclecrime47.htm.

**Assessment**

Assessment of responses is necessary for a number of reasons:

- check the progress of responses to dealing with problems;
- find out what works (and what does not) and why;
- manage responses more effectively;
- promote good practice and discourage bad practice;
- to provide evidence of impact to obtain further or sustainable funding.

You could argue that in crude terms evaluation is just the Assessment part of the SARA model but this harks back to the old ‘add-on’ view of evaluation, as something which you do at the end of any project. This may be so, but we must not forget that, as we have already seen, evaluation is central to any project, as progress should be continually reviewed throughout the lifetime of any project. This requires you to think about evaluation before you implement any project or initiative. It should be a key part of the planning process.
It is important to recognise that, sometimes, responses will not deliver the desired outcomes. It may be necessary to return to the analysis phase any number of times to ensure that the response is properly targeted at the problem in order to deliver the desired impact.

In addition, we all operate in a dynamic world and it may be that the nature of the problem changes over time. This again reinforces the view that problem solving is a cyclical process, requiring constant review and adjustment and not a linear process.

In conclusion, carrying out problem solving in a systematic way (whichever model you follow) will bring clear benefits to you and the success of your project. More references to problem solving are found in the reference section at the end for those of you interested in finding out more.
Section Three – how evaluation and problem solving are linked

One approach to evaluation sees it as a project management process. Indeed, this approach was at the heart of the original version of Passport to Evaluation. Under a more project-focused approach to evaluation, you are likely to come across a number of other terms, such as objectives, targets, inputs, outputs and outcomes. These are described in greater detail in the Key Terminology part at the end of this Guide.

This version of the Guide takes a more problem-oriented approach, but it is important to note that the two approaches are still complementary. Even though problem solving is at the heart of the approach to evaluation explained in the rest of this guide, there is still a need to carefully plan and manage the process.

When you carry out an evaluation of a project you should approach it as a project in its own right. You must make sure that it is planned and organised properly. There are eight simple stages to carrying out the evaluation. These are shown below.

1. Identifying why you are carrying out the evaluation – for example, establish what the research question should be (e.g. How much impact does the introduction of a diversionary activity for youths have on first-time offending and re-offending by youths in your catchment area?)

2. Deciding how you will measure how the project or initiative is doing and what its impact is (or has been) it is important to have some idea of what success would look like.

3. Identifying what data you will need for the evaluation and setting up the processes for collecting that data – this will also help to establish what the gaps are.

4. Deciding how you will analyse the data and doing the analysis when the data starts to flow.

5. Looking at the logistics – who will do the evaluation? Consider here issues of control of the outputs of the project, the importance of leadership and partnership working, and the resources of partners in terms of time and financial input.

6. Carrying out the evaluation – actually collecting and analysing the data and arriving at your conclusions.

7. Publishing your findings – consider robustness of evidence and sharing new ideas.

8. Understanding how the findings will be acted on – consider the level of detail and the required audience (it is usually beneficial to produce reports at several different levels).
In a problem-solving context, stages 1 and 2 will be carried out during the Scanning and Analysis phase; stages 3, 4 and 5 will be carried out when planning the Response; stages 6 and 7 will be carried out during the Assessment phase and 8 will inform the continual feedback process that drives problem solving.

For each step there are many things that you will need to consider and the rest of this guide helps you through these stages, putting them into the problem-solving model.
Summary – Part One

- The process of evaluation is a crucial component within a problem-oriented approach and as such should be built into any project from the very beginning.

- There are several problem-solving models in use currently, the SARA & PAT models being the most commonly used by both practitioners and the Home Office.

- The SARA model comprises four broad stages
  - Scanning. Looking across a range of problems to identify the main ones.
  - Analysis. A detailed review of data to identify the underlying causes of the particular problem. This also makes use of another simple tool, namely the PAT, which helps you to analyse the problem from the three main perspectives of offender, victim and location.
  - Response. The activities designed to address the causes of the problem, as identified in the analysis.
  - Assessment. The measurement of the impact of the response on the problem.

- Problem-solving is an ongoing cyclical process and not simply a linear process. Responses are continually reviewed and refined in the light of progress in relation to the identified problem and changes in the nature of the problem. Evaluation is central to this process.

- The project management and problem-solving approaches to evaluation are linked together.

- Any evaluation should be tightly managed as part of the broader problem-solving response.

- The evaluation process comprises eight simple stages.
Part two – What is Evaluation?

Introduction
The aim of this Part is to define evaluation, explore why we should evaluate and consider different types of evaluation. It also introduces the idea of realistic evaluation, which we will consider in much more detail later in this part of the guide.

Objectives
By the end of this part you will be able to:

- define evaluation;
- define monitoring;
- understand when it is appropriate to do a full scale evaluation or a small-scale evaluation;
- explain the importance of evaluation to all crime reduction projects;
- describe different types and levels of evaluation;
- understand the factors that influence the timing of any evaluation;
- understand the concept of realistic evaluation and how it links.

Overview
Section 1. What are evaluation and monitoring?
Defines evaluation and monitoring and explains the difference between them.

Section 2. Why evaluate?
Looks at some of the reasons why you should evaluate your crime reduction projects. There are many reasons why you should evaluate and it is useful to be aware of them.

Section 3. Types of evaluation.
Looks at the different ways of evaluating a project and when you should use the different types. It also introduces the concept of realistic evaluation.

A summary of the key points in this Part are found on page 38.
Section One – what are evaluation and monitoring?

Evaluation and monitoring are terms that are often used interchangeably, but they mean subtly different things.

**Evaluation** is the process of assessing whether or not a project is achieving or has met its own objectives based on collected data. It may also include a discussion of what processes, mechanisms and interactions were in put place to achieve these objectives.

Evaluation can also be used to measure whether the processes being used to help you achieve your objectives and carry out the project are working properly. In other words, did how you operated and managed the project help the project or not. If so, how, and if not, why not? This is called process evaluation.

One of the key points is that evaluation is about measuring progress and the impact of a particular set of activities on a particular problem. You must bear in mind that evaluation is not an exact science and even the best ones are only likely to give you an approximation of whether or not a project has been a success and brought about change. This is largely due to not being able to capture all the potential influences that may have directly or indirectly affected the outcome or the effectiveness of the intervention.

A simple example is deterrence. We cannot directly measure if an offender chose, at a specific time/place, to commit an offence or not (as we do not have direct access to offenders’ thoughts on specific offence opportunities). We can, however, measure general levels of offending in an area following intervention implementation and infer from this that deterrence has occurred.

There are a number of different approaches to evaluation which will be discussed in Section Three.

**Monitoring** is a process that can be used to collect evaluation data during an intervention or can be used for project management purposes not necessarily linked to an evaluation. Monitoring, like evaluation, can involve collecting information on progress against the objective along with how processes, mechanisms and interactions are influencing the implementation of the project.

Monitoring and evaluation both involve measuring what you have actually achieved. The difference is that monitoring involves continuous measurement of progress, while evaluation involves measurement at a given point in time. Both are a key part of the cyclical problem-solving process, whereby the results emerging from the monitoring and evaluation are fed back and if necessary, changes are made to the project itself on a real-time basis.

Similarly, the results from both can also inform the development of other projects in the future.
Section Two – why is evaluation valuable?

Evaluation can be a time consuming process, so why do it?

*In the space below, write down why you think it is important to evaluate projects. Think of as many different answers as you can and compare your answers with ours on the next page.*
Evaluation is important for several reasons.

- It provides evidence of a project’s level of achievement.

- An evaluation will identify what worked well and what did not. It will help future projects by highlighting the most effective aspects, by identifying potential pitfalls and appropriate contexts to introduce similar projects in other areas.

- Evaluation will also try to show why certain results were achieved, that is what were the critical activities or mechanisms that brought about change and affected the problem being focused on?

- It allows improvements to be made to future work and to learn lessons from projects. Examples of good (and bad) practice highlighted through an evaluation can be taken into account in other projects. This may also help reduce duplication of evaluation on tried and tested methods, whilst also highlighting potential problems to avoid replicating in similar projects. The Home Office Effective Practice Database provides examples of projects which have been successful at a local level. This can be found at [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/effectivepracticedatabase](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/effectivepracticedatabase).

- It provides information for others who may want to run a similar project. A good evaluation is a useful piece of research and helps to spread ideas.

- Projects can have a variety of impacts on a problem. Some of these may be unexpected and evaluation is often the only way of finding out what they are and why they have happened.

- It can show how effectively resources have been used. This is especially important if projects have been funded externally. It is usually a condition of funding that you should be able to demonstrate how you will evaluate the project, i.e. what you have achieved and how you have used the funds to achieve it. As such, it is an important stage in the accountability process.

- Evidence of successful work attracts resources for future projects. If you can show that a particular project has been successful it is sometimes easier to get resources for further work.

- It is an important stage in the accountability process.

Finally, we should not forget that evaluation is now a key part of the guide, Delivering Community Safety: A Guide to Effective Partnership Working and is now backed up by statutory requirements. It runs through many of the six hallmarks of effective practice, including intelligence-led business processes, visible and constructive accountability and effective and responsive delivery structures. In other words, there is now a real and strong imperative for individuals and organisations to fully embrace evaluation.

To download a PDF copy of the guide go to [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships/partnerships001.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships/partnerships001.htm).
Think now about why monitoring is important and put your answers in the box below.
Again, our answers are over the page.
Monitoring is important for several reasons:

- **It can be used to make improvements to a project as it progresses in terms of both the nature of the problem, activities and the use of resources, i.e. returning to the Analysis stage of SARA to reshape the Response.**

- **It is a key element of the project management process.**

The purpose of an evaluation may affect how it is carried out. In the next Section we will look at different types of evaluation.
Section Three – types of evaluation

You will hear the word evaluation used about many different aspects of work. Almost anything can be evaluated and there are different types of evaluation for different purposes. Different types of evaluation approaches are able to answer different research questions. A number of different types of evaluation are briefly described below. Often a mix of approaches is combined to evaluate a particular project.

**Evaluation types and purposes**

**Review of current evaluation literature**
It may be appropriate to conduct an examination of what current evidence is available in relation to the subject of the evaluation. It may be that the crime prevention method you are planning on implementing has been tried out in another area and there may be existing key learning points. This is an area of evaluation that is frequently overlooked and should usually be carried out at an early stage.


A very structured and thorough approach to the review of existing literature is the Systematic Review, which focuses on a particular issue and takes a comprehensive and systematic approach to the review of all available information. You can find out more about systematic reviews at [http://www.campbellcollaboration.org](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org).

These can be resource-intensive and take a considerable amount of time and in recent years, a more streamlined version has emerged, called the Rapid Evidence Assessment. There is more information on these at [http://www.gsr.gov.uk/professional_guidance/rea_toolkit/index.asp](http://www.gsr.gov.uk/professional_guidance/rea_toolkit/index.asp).

**Feasibility study (also known as pre-project evaluation, appraisal, piloting or pathfinder evaluation)**
It may be the case that initially there is not enough financial support or evidence to suggest rolling out a new or untried method of crime prevention to a wide area. In this scenario it is often useful to attempt a small-scale version of the project in a specific area experiencing a crime problem. The evaluation and project length tend to be carried out within a short-time scale – usually limited by the available funding.

Evaluation in the early stages of a project, before any work is done, is called pre-project evaluation or appraisal. Its purpose is to explore whether or not particular project activities or options are feasible.

**Impact evaluation**
This approach has a focus on understanding what the impact has been following the implementation of an intervention. In simple terms, did the project meet (or is it meeting) its objectives?
**Process evaluation**

This approach has a focus on understanding what the systems, processes and interactions are of the intervention and whether or not they have supported or hindered the delivery of the project objectives.

The table at the end of this section shows the pros and cons of impact and process evaluations.

**Realistic Evaluation**

The idea of Realistic Evaluation, particularly in a community safety and crime and disorder context was published in 1997 by Nick Tilley and Ray Pawson. The reference to their text is found in the references section at the end of the guide.

In simple terms, it argues that the effect of any particular intervention will vary according to the context in which that intervention takes place. The context will include such factors as:

- Geography;
- location of the problem and response;
- socio-economic – average earnings, employment, housing values and so on;
- demographic – age, gender, ethnicity and so on.

There is much evidence that the same intervention is experienced differently in different circumstances. For example, the evaluation of an initiative in the USA designed to reduce repeat incidents of domestic violence (Sherman, 1992) found that while the initiative was relatively successful in Minneapolis, when it was adopted in other cities it was less successful. Indeed, Sherman looked at six other cities and he found that in three of the cities, incidents of repeat domestic violence actually went up after the initiative was launched.

Realistic evaluation says that what works to produce an effect in one circumstance/context may not produce it in another. You, therefore, need to be aware of the context and circumstances in which the initiative is being operated.

At the heart of realistic evaluation therefore is the question “**What works for whom and in what circumstances?”** Traditional evaluations have tended just to ask the question “**What works?”**

The key problem is to find out how and under what conditions a given activity or intervention will produce impacts. Sometimes the effects may be unwanted, sometimes they will be wanted and sometimes they will be a mixture.

The theory states that

“realistic evaluation is …concerned with understanding causal mechanisms and the conditions under which they are activated to produce specific outcomes”.


This might sound a little complex but in reality not. In problem solving terms all it means is that you should have a detailed understanding of problems (the circumstances or contexts) and their root causes (causal mechanisms), and measuring the impact of any interventions targeted at those problem causes. Hence the model proposed by realist evaluation is often demonstrated with the key elements – context, mechanism and outcome.

Putting this into a SARA context, it can be seen that both problem solving and realistic evaluation are very closely linked.

- Scanning = understanding the context and circumstances and emerging problems (CONTEXT).
- Analysis = understanding the detailed problem and the factors that are causing the problem to occur (MECHANISMS).
- Response = putting in place activities that will target the factors which cause the problem (MECHANISMS)
- Assessment = evaluating the impact of the activities to see if they affected the factors which have caused the problem and in so doing, helped to reduce the problem (OUTCOME).

To summarise, if you have a clear understanding of the problem (including the contexts) this will help boost your understanding of which mechanisms are likely to have the greatest impact. This then leads to the easy and clear identification of how to evaluate the intervention. Good problem solving leads to good evaluation.

Too often in the past, people have identified a problem and then proposed an intervention from a standard set, e.g. high-profile policing, leafleting etc, often with little consideration of how they are expected to work in practice. It is critical to identify the problem accurately, target the response at the problem and then measure whether or not it is having an impact.

**Theory-based evaluation**

Theory-based evaluation is a useful technique to consider when conducting crime prevention evaluations because it lays a strong emphasis on trying to understand the relationships between inputs and specific actions carried out in interventions and both the long-and short-term outcomes.

This method also has an additional benefit in that it may help manage the expectations of the stakeholders regarding what is the likely result of the actions carried out. It clarifies what measurements are needed and highlights potential problems resulting from the crime prevention activity or in the implementation of the activity itself.

Monitoring throughout a project acts as a check to see whether satisfactory progress is being made. The purpose is to provide information so that changes can be made to the project if required.

In some circles this may be referred to as formative evaluation, which is a method of judging the worth of a project/intervention while activities are forming or happening.

Post-project evaluation is designed to see whether the project achieved what it set out to achieve. This can take place either directly at the end of a project to check the immediate effect or after some time has elapsed to see whether the effects of a project have been sustained.

In some circles, this may be referred to as summative evaluation, which is a method of judging the worth of a project or intervention at the end of all activities.

Timing of your evaluation

Data to examine the impact should ideally be considered and collected from the onset of the project. This is dependent on availability of data – for example, recorded police crime data are generally available over a long time period, allowing retrospective analysis. Conversely, survey data on public opinions of crime are usually collected at specific time points during a project, so a baseline would need to be taken at the onset of the project.

The consequences of not considering data collection at the onset will lead to gaps and loss of clarity in memory for qualitative data and limited time series for quantitative data.

We talk more about identifying data needs and gathering data in Part Three.

One question that is often asked is around the timing of evaluations and when the right time is to carry out an evaluation. In particular, how long after the launch of an initiative is the right time to carry out an evaluation?

There is no right or wrong answer and depends on a number of factors.

- The reason why you are carrying out the evaluation.
  - Learn lessons for future reference.
  - Feedback into an ongoing project in ‘real time’.
  - Justify spending.
  - Project manage the initiative.

- What you will do with the results.
  - Modify how an existing project is being delivered.
  - Inform the development of future projects.
  - Update project sponsors/funders.
  - Forward it for inclusion on the Effective Practice Database, referred to earlier.
  - Share the findings with other practitioners and academics.
The complexity of the project/initiative that you are evaluating.

• The ease by which you can collect and analyse the necessary data.

• The resources that you have available to you.

• The timescale of the project or initiative being evaluated.

• The level of evaluation (see later in this Section)
  – Project level.
  – Programme level.
  – Strategy level.

• Depth of the evaluation required.
  – Quick overview/snapshot – shorter term.
  – Thorough and robust evaluation of all factors – longer term.

The table at the end of this Section offers some pointers regarding the depth of evaluation required.

If you want to identify lessons from activities that you are carrying out and feed them back in ‘real time’ so that you can change what you are doing, then clearly you will need to think about carrying out your evaluation ‘sooner rather than later’, depending on how long the project is due to run for. Once again, this links to the cyclical process at the heart of SARA, where you continually return to the Analysis phase in order to modify the Response if necessary.

If you carry out and draw your conclusions from an evaluation too soon, then the potential effect of what you are doing may not have time to emerge. Indeed, just after the launch of particular initiatives the opposite effect to that which you are trying to generate, is often experienced. For example, the introduction of CCTV schemes designed to reduce anti-social behaviour and offending in certain areas, is often followed by an increase in reports of such offences (more are being spotted). If you evaluate too late, the effect may have waned somewhat. Also, by the time you have carried out the evaluation it may be too late for you to feed messages back into the project.

A crude ‘rule of thumb’ might be not to consider evaluating any project until it is at least one-quarter completed. That is, for a project that runs over a year you should not think about starting to evaluate it until at least three months have elapsed. However, this assumes that you have already carried out some pre-implementation evaluation work in order to provide a baseline position. We will discuss this further in Part Three when we start to consider the mechanics of the evaluation.

As we have already said, however, there is no right or wrong answer. Each case needs to be considered on its merits and you will need to consider all of the above factors when thinking about the timing of an evaluation.
Think about a project that you have recently been involved in or are currently involved in. Based on the factors listed above, when do you think would be the right time to carry out an evaluation (post-implementation), assuming that you have already established a baseline position prior to the project starting? If it is a project that was evaluated, when did the evaluation actually take place and, on reflection, do you think the timing was appropriate?

If the purpose of the evaluation is to reflect on what has happened (once the project is completed) and to inform other projects in the future, then the timing is probably less critical. In these cases, you often do not have to worry about the evaluation until after the initiative is complete, though of course you will still have to think about the evaluation before you start the initiative as you may need to gather source data.

Whatever the case, as we have already seen, evaluation is a dynamic process and not something that we should only think about at the end of a project. It is a key component in the cyclical SARA process.

We will need to establish a baseline position, possibly appraise options even before a project starts. Many evaluations (particularly impact evaluations) will need data to be gathered throughout the project, so you will need to think about evaluation even before you launch any initiative.

**Level of evaluation**
Evaluation can take place at different levels and the main ones are as follows.

**Strategy level evaluation**
This tends to take place at a fairly high level and will involve the evaluation of many projects and programmes. For example, an evaluation of community safety strategies would fall into this category. Once again, the purpose of this level of evaluation is often to understand the impact of the strategy as a whole and to identify which programmes and projects were more successful than others (often through an approach known as meta-analysis).

**Programme level evaluation**
A programme is a group or set of projects or initiatives which have a common theme. An example is the burglary reduction initiative which involved several projects in several towns and cities designed to tackle the burglary problem from different perspectives. The purpose of this level of evaluation is often to understand the impact of the programme as a whole and to identify which components were more successful than others. The focus of this level is often on multiple locations.

**Project level**
This is the basic level of evaluation. A project or initiative is a set of related tasks that have a specific objective. It normally has a clearly defined scope and looks at a single problem. For example, work to reduce concerns regarding public safety in a park by providing better lighting, cutting back hedges, the presence of a warden and so on. The purpose of this level of evaluation is to measure whether the project has had an impact on the problem. The focus of this level is often on one location.
The remainder of this guide looks at how you evaluate individual projects. It is also the level of evaluation that you are most likely to become involved in, in a problem-solving context, i.e. evaluating the impact of responses which have been developed to counter specific problems.

The following tables provide some pointers in relation to short term and long term evaluations and the pros and cons of different types of evaluation. They are not ‘hard and fast’ rules but suggest some of the often seen features of each type of evaluation. For example, you can have short-term qualitative evaluations but they are most commonly long-term evaluation. As such the tables provide a rough guide only.

**Depth of the evaluation required**

**Differentiating short-term from long-term evaluation – general features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>low input (time or staff)</td>
<td>high input (time and staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>primarily funding groups and stakeholders</td>
<td>primarily research and crime prevention community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation type</strong></td>
<td>Impact – snapshot of success</td>
<td>Process – (process monitoring and review) and Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>predominantly quantitative (numerical)</td>
<td>mixture of quantitative (numerical) and qualitative (attitudes and opinions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research question</strong></td>
<td>Is it working/did it work?</td>
<td>Is it working/did it work? Why/how did it work/is it working?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention complexity</strong></td>
<td>Often simple, single intervention – operational level</td>
<td>Often complex, multiple interventions – programme level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General points for both types of evaluation.

- Both require the establishment of key indicator measures at the beginning of the project. There are great problems with gaining access to data retrospectively.
- Cost benefit analysis is generally important – this allows one to justify the input in terms of resources.
# The pros and cons of impact and process evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Process only</th>
<th>Impact only</th>
<th>Impact and process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td>Cheapest option – does not require any resources</td>
<td>Provides evidence for improving project through ongoing monitoring; useful for identifying project operational problems and exploring potential solutions</td>
<td>Provides evidence on whether or not the project was success (i.e. it met its objectives)</td>
<td>Well rounded evidence on whether or not the project was success (i.e. it met its objectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not require any research knowledge</td>
<td>May require some basic understanding of open and closed questioning, but minimal knowledge required</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides evidence for improving the operation of the project through ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td>Does not provide any useful evidence – cannot answer if or why a project is successful (or not) – this is a key problem</td>
<td>Does not provide any insight into whether or not the project was successful (i.e. it met its objectives); this is a key problem</td>
<td>Requires ongoing staff throughout the process to collect data but not as time-intensive as process evaluation</td>
<td>Requires funding and staffing to be able to establish measures initially, collect data throughout the project and analyse the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be easily recorded by staff in house, as part of a monitoring process, but has time resource implications</td>
<td>Does not provide insight into how effective the project structures and processes are</td>
<td>Does not provide insight into how effective the project structures and processes are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires a sound basis in statistical methodology and understanding of data limitations and methodology appropriate to data</td>
<td>May require a sound basis in statistical methodology and understanding of data limitations and methodology appropriate to data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires some basic understanding of open and closed questioning, and a sound basis in statistical methodology and understanding of data limitations and methodology appropriate to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other considerations</strong></td>
<td>Does not require any planning</td>
<td>Requires access to stakeholders, those in receipt of the project and staff involved in the roll out of the project</td>
<td>Access: Requires access to data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not require access to staff or data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access: Requires access to data sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary – Part Two

• Evaluation is the process of assessing, at a particular point in time, whether or not a project is achieving or has achieved its targets, objectives or aims.

• Evaluation:
  – Provides evidence of a project’s level of achievement;
  – Identifies what worked well and what did not;
  – Will try to show why certain results were achieved. i.e. what were the critical activities or mechanisms that brought about change and affected the problem being focused on?
  – Allows improvements to be made to future work and to learn lessons from projects;
  – Provides information for others who may want to run a similar project;
  – Is often the only way of finding out what unintended consequences of a project are and why they have happened;
  – Can show how effectively resources have been used;
  – Can help to attract resources for further work;
  – Is in important stage in the accountability process.

• Monitoring:
  – Can be used to make improvements to a project as it progresses in terms of both activities and the use of resources;
  – Is a key element of the project management process.

• Both evaluation and monitoring:
  – Need to be clear in relation to their purpose, e.g. measuring impact?
  – Require an understanding of the problem;
  – Are a key part of the cyclical SARA process, which requires continual return to the Analysis phase to ensure that the Response is still appropriate to the problem.

• The timing of your evaluation rests on a number of factors:
  – The reason why you are carrying the evaluation out;
  – What you will do with the results;
  – The complexity of the project/initiative that you are evaluating;
  – The ease by which you can collect and analyse the necessary data;
  – The resources that you have available to you;
  – The timescale of the project or initiative being evaluated;
  – The level of the evaluation;
  – The depth of evaluation required.
Part Three – The process of evaluation

• Evaluation can be carried out at:
  – project level;
  – programme level;
  – strategy level.

• Evaluation can take place:
  – pre-project (option appraisal);
  – mid-project;
  – post-project.
Part Three – The process of evaluation

Introduction
The aim of this Part is to look at the process of evaluation. It outlines what you should be doing in relation to evaluation when a project is in certain stages. This part of the guide is structured alongside the problem-solving process. In that way it makes it easier to see what you should be doing in terms of evaluation when the project is at different stages of the problem-solving process.

Objectives
By the end of this part you will be able to

- describe the process for evaluating a project

Overview
Section One. Scanning and analysis
Looks at what you should be doing with the evaluation when the project is in the scanning and analysis phase. This includes generating a baseline position, understanding why you are doing the evaluation, who it is for and what your timescales are.

Section Two. Response
Looks at what you should be doing with the evaluation when the project is in the response stage, especially when you are planning your responses i.e. pre-implementation. This includes:

- understanding how the proposed project will work including the mechanisms of change;
- target setting;
- deciding how you will measure impact;
- setting up the processes for gathering the necessary data;
- logistics – who actually does the evaluation.

Section Three. Assessment
Looks at what you should be doing with the evaluation when the project is in the assessment stage, i.e. once the response is being actioned or post-implementation. This includes looking at how you can analyse the data.

Section Four. Presentation
Looks at how you might present and make use of your findings.

A summary of the key points in this Part are found on page 99.
Section One – scanning and analysis

We have chosen to combine the Scanning and Analysis phases here because, from an evaluation point of view, you are engaged in the same processes at both stages, namely trying to generate a baseline position and understand the nature of the evaluation required. There is little value in stating what you should do at the Scanning stage only to repeat it for the Analysis stage.

Generating a clear baseline position

When any problem-solving project is in the Scanning and Analysis stage you need to develop a clear understanding of the problem and the context within which the problem is occurring.

As we have seen from the realistic evaluation approach, an understanding of the broad context within which the problem is occurring and a detailed understanding of the problem and the factors that cause it is critical to the development of effective responses.

We explored some of the methods for clearly identifying your problem in Part One of this guide. It is not the place of this guide to explain how detailed problem analyses can be carried out. Indeed, it will probably not be your job to analyse crime problems. This is likely to be within the remit of crime and partnership analysts. There are however some tips that might prove useful to you in Section Three.

If you are interested in this subject, however, there are numerous guides and aids to crime analysis, some of which are referred to in the references section at the end of this guide.

Another way of looking at this Scanning and Analysis phase of any problem-solving project is that by developing a clear understanding of the problem and contexts we are developing our baseline position. The baseline is the situation at the start of a project, before any preventative work has been done or any responses implemented. You can only know how you are doing in relation to a particular problem if you know the scale and nature of that problem before you start.

What is the purpose of the evaluation?

While the problem is clearly being analysed you can usefully spend time trying to build a clearer understanding of why you might wish to evaluate any initiative designed to address the problem. Evaluation is not a process that you undertake just for its own sake. It should have a clearly thought out purpose and one of your first tasks should be to gain a clear understanding of the purpose of the evaluation.
In identifying these objectives, we effectively need answers to the following questions.

**Why are we carrying out the evaluation?**
Your reasons may include:

- to understand whether or not the initiative is having an effect on the problem;
- to monitor the impact of the initiative on an ongoing basis;
- complying with the needs of funders who may require the project to be evaluated;
- to identify and share good (and bad) practice.

**What is the evaluation for?**
An evaluation should be designed for a specific purpose, because this affects what you have to measure and what data you collect. Questions you might wish to ask at this stage will include the following.

- Is it to measure impact of a particular project or programme? For example, did the project bring about reductions in crime?
- Is it to measure how effective the processes were/are in supporting the project? For example, did new call-handling processes work effectively?
- Is it to measure how well the structures supported the delivery of the project or programme? For example, did the project board operate as it should have?
- Is it to measure the cost-effectiveness of the project, i.e. what was the cost of the project and was it worthwhile in relation to the costs of the problem?

A clear view of the purpose of the evaluation will help determine the level (or levels) at which the evaluation needs to take place.

**Who are the ‘clients’?**
A clear view of your client group will help to determine what you are doing the evaluation for and how it might be structured. Clients may be internal or external, for example, internal managers, HMIC, Audit Commission, Police Authority, Home Office. Understanding their needs from the evaluation will help you to shape the evaluation.

**What is the time frame?**
Finally, you need to be clear about when the evaluation needs to be completed. A clear view of the time frame will help in structuring your programme of work. Prior to commencing the work, you need to agree with your ‘clients’:

- when the final report needs to be completed;
- whether you need to consider ongoing monitoring and/or snapshot evaluation or both.
Think about an initiative you have implemented or which you are planning. What was the purpose of that evaluation?

**Why carry out the evaluation?**

**What is it for?**

**Who are the clients?**

**What is the time frame?**

Being clear about these criteria is critical to the development of an effective evaluation as we will see as we progress through this Part of the manual.

We will now introduce you to the Case Study. This will be used throughout Part Three to enable you to try out some of the ideas that we have talked about.
Case Study

Scan & analysis
An introduction to Dofton

Wildfield is a large city (population 450,000), comprising a number of local residential and industrial areas surrounding a well-established business district. The focus of the city historically has been the port, which at one time was the largest in Europe. Though now overtaken by other ports such as Rotterdam, the port remains by some distance the largest port in the UK.

As well as an enormous amount of freight, the port also handles a large number of passenger sailings to the European mainland, with an extensive service to France, Holland and Scandinavia. It is estimated that the port deals with approximately three and a half thousand passenger sailings per year, with an estimated annual throughput of three million passengers.

A considerable amount of local industry relates to the port and its operation, though there is a well-established commercial sector and an extensive shopping and entertainments centre in the city.

Not surprisingly, the city has superb road and rail links, with direct rail and road links to London to the south, the cities of the Midlands, the North West, Yorkshire and Scotland. There is also a major regional airport, which offers domestic and European flights.

From a police perspective, Wildfield is covered by four police BCUs, with one BCU covering the city centre. The Wildfield Port Authority police, who have an excellent working relationship with the city area, carry out policing of the port.

You work on Dofton, a large area of primarily terraced housing on the fringes of the city centre. You have been given some very limited data outlining the crime situation in the Dofton area and you are aware of local concerns that the crime situation appears to deteriorating rapidly. The community are also known to be increasingly concerned about the situation with regard not only to the increases in crime, but also the level of drug dealing that is thought to go on in the area. There is, therefore, clearly a problem that needs to be addressed.

Have a look at the data below and try to understand the main problem. Try also to identify what you think the underlying causes are. There is enough data and information to enable you to identify this.
Case Study

Crime Data for six months to March 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary – Dwelling</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary – Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from vehicles</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of vehicles</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABH Assaults/Violence</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crime</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Theft from vehicles in the Dofton area is showing an increase of 33% over the previous twelve months and now represents 50% of all thefts from vehicles in Wildfield BCU.

- Total crime in Dofton has increased by ten per cent in the same period and by just three per cent across the Wildfield BCU as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Crime – Dofton</th>
<th>Thefts from vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2008</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of property stolen (£000’s) – Dofton</th>
<th>Thefts from vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2008</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just less than £80,000 worth of associated damage was caused to cars in the commission of the offences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of thefts from vehicles – Dofton</th>
<th>Car park &amp; waste ground</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2008</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study

Intelligence & Site Report

- The main port entrance opens onto the Dofton area.
- Funding cuts mean that the Revenue Customs cut down staff at the port in August 2007.
- The lighting in the area is poor and there are a number of streetlights which are not working and have not been repaired.
- Increasing evidence of prostitution.
- Informants suggest dramatic increase in the amount of drugs coming through the port since staffing levels dropped at customs points.
- Evidence of drug dealing going on. Dealers using high-speed cars with number plates which suggest that they are not local.
- More offences in hours of darkness, but evidence of prostitution and dealing even during daylight hours.

So, what is the problem and what’s causing it?
Use the box below to enter your answer.

When you have analysed all of the data and identified the problem and its causes have a look at your answer and compare it to ours overleaf.
Suggested analysis

The main points arising from an analysis of the data are summarised below:

- There has been a significant increase in thefts from vehicles since August.
- The breakdown of location is as follows:
  - street 62% of all offences
  - car parks and waste ground 27% of all offences
  - other 11% of all offences
- The problem on the street has also increased significantly since August.
- Some £293,000 worth of property has been stolen from vehicles during the year (average value of property stolen per theft is therefore just over £100, but the average value of property stolen has risen sharply through the year).
- The problem is thought to be caused by drug users committing offences in the area in order to purchase drugs from the increasing number of dealers who frequent the area.
- This is thought to be as a direct result of the staff cutbacks in Revenue and Customs at the nearby docks.
- The poor quality lighting in the area is also thought to be a significant contributor to the problem.
Section Two – response

We have already seen throughout this guide that, as part of the preparation of the response, you need to set up evaluation processes. This has to be done prior to the implementation of any project. You cannot go back once it has started; you need to do this in the planning stage.

So, while the initiative or intervention is being developed from an evaluation perspective you need to be thinking about and addressing the following areas.

Understanding the mechanisms of change

The response that is being developed to address the problem will have one or a number of components, each of which are designed to address the problem. It is important that you understand these ‘mechanisms of change’ and the contexts in which they will be operating as you develop your evaluation strategy. For example, an initiative to address vehicle crime against cars parked on a street may include:

- high profile policing;
- use of mobile CCTV;
- leafleting of all of the houses in the area;
- media campaign stressing the need for people to lock their cars;
- the offer of free windscreen etching.

This will be particularly important in the analysis stage when you seek to explain the effects of the project.

Target setting

When you are clear about the problem you are going to address, you must set clear targets for the project which will be designed to address the problem. Targets should be written so that they can be measured and a common way of making sure that this happens is to ensure that they pass the SMART test.

- **Specific** – all targets should have specific outcomes, e.g. reduce violent crime.
- **Measurable** – the outcome should be capable of being measured, e.g. reduce recorded violent crime by ten per cent.
- **Achievable** – reaching the target can be challenging but can be done within the timescales, with the resources and skills available.
- **Realistic** – targets should not be set too high and should be physically possible to achieve e.g. a 50% reduction in all violent crime by next week.
- **Timebound** – a timescale should be set for when the target is to be achieved by; e.g. reduce recorded violent crime by ten per cent in the next 12 months.
This has sometimes been extended to SMARTER, with the additional letters standing for

- **Evaluated** – an assessment should be made as to whether or not the targets have been achieved;
- **Reviewed** – progress against the targets can be made at any point i.e. monitored.

Below is an example of a SMART target. Which part of the target is specific, which is measurable and which shows that the target is timebound?

*By the end of the project (in six months time) the number of violent disorders in Aytown town centre will have reduced by 20%.*

Write your answer below:
What do you think would happen if the project did not have clear targets? Write your answer down in the space below and compare it to our answers on the next page.
Some of the consequences of not having clear targets for a project are that:

- the people working on the project may be confused about what it is they are trying to achieve;
- the activities may lack focus;
- time, money and other resources could be wasted;
- there could be poor control and management of the project;
- you will not be able to monitor and evaluate the project efficiently.

Another very important reason for setting clear targets for a project is that, ‘What gets measured gets done’. When people are given targets they will work towards achieving them, so it is important to make sure that targets reflect what the project is trying to achieve. If not, a considerable amount of time and effort may be wasted.
For example, a project was set up to improve customer satisfaction from a police call-handling centre. At the same time the centre was given a target of responding to 95% of all calls in 20 seconds. Do you think this was appropriate and what do you think might have happened? Write your answer below and then compare it to ours over the page.
In reality, the call-handlers were so intent on hitting their target that they often cut off callers mid-sentence in order to answer outstanding calls and ensure that they hit their 95% of calls answered in less than 20 seconds figure. In effect, an inappropriate target actually reduced customer satisfaction rather than improved it.

Also, where there are multiple aims be careful not to establish conflicting targets. This can happen in multi-agency projects where the priorities of one partner may conflict with those of another.

People often have trouble setting effective targets because they are locked into a view that says that they can only relate to quantifiable things or things that you can easily count. Examples include crime figures, road accident figures, the number of phone calls received and so on.

While this is perfectly acceptable, there is no reason why targets should not be developed in relation to qualitative things. For example, why not set a target to reduce the level of fear of crime in an area, or a target to improve the public perception with regard to the image of an area. These are completely valid and yet such qualitative based targets are often shied away from.

One reason may be that it is more difficult to measure whether or not you have achieved a qualitative-based target than a quantitative-based one. This does not necessarily have to be the case and rests on how you have measured your baseline position. For example, before implementing an initiative you may survey the community and find out that 50% are fearful of becoming a victim of crime. You could then set a target to reduce this proportion of those surveyed to, say 30%. In this way you are setting a target in relation to a qualitative issue i.e. the perceived fear that people will become a crime victim.
Another view that you may come across when setting targets is that targets should either seek to increase or improve or reduce something, for example, reduce the level of crime or increase level of public satisfaction.

It is not always possible however, to set targets that relate to straight increases or reductions however (remember they have to be realistic). For example, where vehicle theft is rising by 50% per year, it may be unrealistic and unachievable to say that you are going to reduce it by ten per cent in the next twelve months. By being a little more creative in setting your targets, you can deal with this issue and there are two major ways that you can do so.

- Set a target that seeks to maintain current performance. For example, if the level of public satisfaction with the services that you provide is high, it may be unrealistic to seek to improve it. It is quite acceptable to set a target ‘to maintain levels of public satisfaction at the current rate’.

- Set a target that seeks to reduce the rate of increase or decrease. For our example above, we may set a target ‘to reduce the rate of increase of thefts of vehicles to just 10% in the next year’. Again, this is perfectly valid, though sometimes such targets are ‘politically’ sensitive and need to be carefully explained.

Other approaches that might be helpful in setting targets are listed below.

- **Targets based on benchmarking**: this approach involves comparing the local area against other similar areas and setting a target based on what has been achieved elsewhere. Benchmarking against similar areas elsewhere can also take into account the trends in crime in those similar areas as an example of what might be achievable in similar timeframes.

- **Using trend analysis to set targets**: trend analysis looks at the historical trend and extrapolates this past trend into the future. For example, if crime levels have decreased, on average, by five per cent a year for the last five years, we could assume that if the trend continues as before, crime levels would decrease by five per cent again next year. A stretching target would require that the local area exceed this expected five percent reduction. This type of analysis is not exact; however, it gives some indication of what will be achieved simply on the basis of a continued trend.

Whatever method is used to establish targets it is important to take into account the impact that other ‘competing’ priorities might have on what is achievable and the resources that are available.

For detailed examples you may wish to look at good practice guidance for police authorities and police forces at the following web address, [http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police-reform/APACSlguideance?view=Binary](http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police-reform/APACSlguideance?view=Binary)

Note the guidance below has been developed for the purpose of setting recorded crime targets; some of the methods could easily be adapted for use with other data.
Case Study

Response Phase – Target Setting

What targets do you think should be set in relation to the problem identified at Dofton?

Write your answer in the box and then compare it to our answer.
Case Study

Response Phase – Target Setting suggested answer

The main points arising from an analysis of the data are summarised below:

There could be both quantitative and qualitative targets to address this problem, namely the following:

The target is to reduce thefts from vehicles by 50% in the next six months (the quantitative one).

There is an additional target to reduce the proportion of residents who are concerned about crime in their area, from 75% to 25% in 12 months (the qualitative one).

There does not have to be both quantitative and qualitative targets for any initiative. Obviously, you will choose the most appropriate targets, but this just illustrates that it is possible to have both.
Developing measures
In a problem-solving and realistic evaluation context the logical flow so far is as follows:

- Understand the problem and the contexts within which the problem occurs;
- Understand the factors which cause the problem to occur;
- Develop interventions and responses which target the factors causing the problem;
- Develop targets which focus on resolving the problem;

The means by which you will measure whether or not the targets have been achieved (or the extent to which they have been achieved) is through a set of indicators.

There are a number of common indicators that can be used, such as:

- levels of reported crime and incidents;
- numbers of arrests;
- calls for service;
- Levels of customer satisfaction.

While relatively easy to establish, some of these may not be very effective indicators as they may only measure part of the impact of the response. Other less conventional means of assessment could include the following:

- Changes in the perceptions of those affected by the problem;
- Quality of handling of incidents;
- Quality of dealing with calls;
- The extent to which the problem is now perceived to be a police problem or whether responsibility for addressing it has passed to other, more appropriate groups;
- The level of repeat victimisation;
- The level of repeat calls – type and location.

The key is to focus on measures that can demonstrate whether there has been any impact on the targeted problem.

Quantitative or qualitative
Indicators can be quantitative, that is they can measure quantities of tangible things such as the number of burglaries or the number of road traffic accidents. Alternatively, they can be qualitative, measuring intangible things such as the perceptions of groups or individuals. Examples of qualitative indicator’s include the level of fear of crime in the elderly or the quality of service provided by front desk staff.

They can be applied to measure ‘non-quantifiable’ variables by using a series of quantitative indicators, which together might indicate the position of the non-quantifiable variable.
For example, there were concerns regarding the commitment of different agencies to a multi-agency partnership project. Clearly, ‘commitment’ is something which is difficult to define and almost impossible to measure directly. How might you measure the commitment of agencies to this project? Write your answers below and compare them to ours below.
The measures used by the evaluators in this case were:

- the number of meetings attended by each agency;
- the number of contributions to and actions taken from each meeting, by each agency;
- the percentage of actions that were successfully completed;
- the level of funding and other resources provided by each agency to the project.

These were referred to as proxy indicators as they did not directly measure what they wanted to assess, but, taken together, enabled a clear picture to be built up of the commitment of each agency to the project.

Baskets of indicators

It is almost inevitable that when trying to evaluate community safety type work, you will at some point have to use crime data and crime-based indicators. For example, a project targeting burglary is bound to use changes in the numbers of burglaries as one of its indicators. Problems with the use of recorded crime data are, however, well documented and widely known, the data being affected by such factors as:

- variable crime reporting rates;
- changes in the Home Office counting rules over time, which define what can and cannot be counted as a recorded crime.

Notwithstanding the problems with crime data, there is a fundamental danger in using a single indicator (crime related or not) to assess performance. That indicator might be unreliable, it may fail to measure accurately what is being assessed or the data may be unrepresentative of the true position. For this reason, evaluation should be based wherever possible, on a group of indicators, commonly referred to as a ‘basket’ of indicators.

If this conjures up pictures of a supermarket trolley full of indicators then that is not an inappropriate image. Extending that analogy, you could think of the supermarket shelves as packed with lots of indicators. You go down the aisle, picking off the indicators that you need to evaluate a particular project, but the basket of indicators that you use will be different for each different type of project, which you evaluate. For example, the basket of indicators that you use to evaluate a CCTV scheme, will be different from those which you will use to evaluate a drugs referral project, though there may be a few indicators common to both sets.

In effect, over time you can arrive at an ‘ideal basket’ of indicators for different types of projects and programmes. For example, an ‘ideal basket’ of indicators to assess the impact of CCTV in a town centre might include changes in the following:

- crime levels;
- incident levels;
- public perception of crime in the town centre;
• fear of crime in the town centre;
• business confidence and levels of trade.

**Developing your indicators**

People often ask just how do you arrive at a list of indicators? The plain fact is that it is relatively easy to come up with a list of indicators once you have a clear view of targets for the activity being evaluated. A project with a target to reduce the level of vehicle crime on town centre car parks has one obvious indicator: the level and change in thefts of and from vehicles on town centre car parks. It is that simple.

If we only used this indicator, however, we would be basing the evaluation solely on crime data, which we have already seen can be very unreliable. Recent changes in the Home Office counting rules demonstrate how use and comparability of recorded crime data can be problematic and even misleading. Given what we have already said then about the need to use ‘baskets’ of indicators, what else could be used? This is where you need to be a little bit creative. Borrowing heavily from Sir Winston Churchill, this is about “90% perspiration and 10% inspiration”.

Also, as realistic evaluation tells us, we not only want to know if the intervention has had an effect on the problem, but also which of the key mechanisms have brought about the change. This will require us to think carefully about how we might understand this, and which performance measures will help to show this.

**Gathering data**

The next stage in the evaluation is to decide what data you need to collect in order to measure the project’s impact. It is important to collect the right information, at the right time and in the right format. As with everything in evaluation, you will need to have a clear idea of the information that you will need, where you will get it from and how you are going to collect it before you start.

**What data do we need?**

Once you know how you are going to measure the impact of your project you need to consider obtaining the necessary data. This is the ‘reality check’ when you pose a number of questions.

• Is the information I need for the indicators readily available?
• Is it available from one source or a number of sources?
• If the data is not readily available is it feasible to set up processes to gather it from its’ original source?
• If so, how will I gather the data?

There may be a variety of data that you need and some of these might include the following.

• Recorded crime data.
• Reported incidents.
• Detected crimes.
- Numbers of arrests/convictions/cautions.
- Numbers of drug referrals.
- Perceptions of the public in an area or visitors to an area.
- Perceptions of businesses in an area.
- Views of all participating partners in relation to a partnership project.
- Numbers of drug referrals.
- Numbers of empty properties.
- Numbers of repairs carried out by housing authorities.
- Amount of graffiti in an area.
- Business investment into an area.
- Levels of school absenteeism.
- Press coverage.
- Number of drug outlets available.
- Complaints to the police.
- Activity in A&E departments.
- Membership of neighbourhood watch.

When trying to identify your data requirements, there are a number of factors that you need to consider.

**Where does the data come from?**

Data can clearly be gathered from a wide variety of sources using a range of methods. There are clearly some obvious places to consider first of all, making use of existing expertise in the organisation, including:

- Police Force Statistics or Management Information Unit;
- Police Force or partnership analysts;
- Police Force Annual Reports;
- Existing perception surveys;
- Partner organisations;
- Strategic assessments;
- Home Office Research Development and Statistics directorate;
- Information gathered by voluntary organisations;
- Census.
Rather than produce any lengthy list at this stage, you are referred to the Annex to the PRG Paper 91, *Auditing Crime & Disorder*, which is particularly useful (http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fcdps91.pdf). As well as listing some of the data sources it offers hints as to what is and what is not useful and what to watch for when using the data.

Regulations introduced in 2007 outline a range of crime and disorder information that responsible authorities now have to share. As such, they describe where some types of data can be obtained from and the standards to which that data needs to conform. You can view these regulations at the following website http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2007/uksi_20071831_en_1.

A summary of the regulations can be found in the key terminology section of this guide.

**How much detail do you need?**
- Will broad crime data about trends on all crime be acceptable or do you need data in relation to individual crime types?
- Will borough-wide data be sufficient or do you need data in relation to tightly defined geographical areas?
- Do you need data about specific times and dates?

The level of detail you need depends on what you want to use the data for. Detailed data generally helps to pinpoint problems and gives an accurate picture of what has happened, but the general picture is often lost in the detail. Higher-level data is useful for showing overall trends but is not useful for detailed analysis.

Collecting and analysing data can be expensive and time-consuming, so you should plan ahead and only collect as much detail as you will need.

**When and how often is the data needed?**
It is important that you have the data when needed, but try and avoid being bombarded with data not required. When and how often you will need data depends on several factors, including:
- whether there are particular times during the life of the project when data is needed e.g. for monitoring;
- whether you need to produce reports at particular milestone points in the project;
- if some data is only available at certain times.

Knowing the type of data that you need and when you need the data will help you decide whether you can rely on existing data sets, or whether you need to commission special data collection exercises.
**What format is the data required in?**
When you know what data is required, how much detail and when you need the data, the next decision to consider is what format is needed.

You might have particular IT system requirements, or might need the data in a format that is readily accessible to partners without doing too much work. When you have found a particular data source, look at it and decide the following.

- Can the data be used in its current format?
- Is the format compatible with the other sources of data that you have?
- How much work is involved in changing the format and is it cost-effective to carry out the work?

If you are using data from different partners you may find that the formats are not always compatible. Some work may need to be done before data from different sources can be used together and you need to bear this in mind and allow time for the additional work to be done.

**Case Study**

**Response phase – measures & data**
As a result of this analysis, a package of measures or ‘mechanisms of change’ have been suggested and agreed to be implemented immediately. These are as follows.

- High profile policing of the area whenever resources allow.
- Make full use of PCSOs and specials to support these patrols.
- Mobile CCTV surveillance on at selected times and on certain days.
- High profile media campaign in association with local press and radio.
- Crackdown on drug dealing and prostitution
- Work with local drug referral agencies to provide support for users in the area.
- Work with local shelter scheme for sex workers.
- Local authority to embark on a programme to replace all faulty and damaged street lights with new high-intensity lighting
## Case Study

What indicators would you use to measure whether or not the proposed package of measures designed to address the problem in Dofton was having an impact on the problem? How could you identify whether some activities were more effective than others?

Put your answers in the table below and you can then compare it to our answer which is found on the next page. We have included a couple of examples just to help you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High profile policing</td>
<td>Patrol on street at relevant times/days.</td>
<td>Monthly change in recorded theft from vehicles parked on streets in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased use of stop/search and stop/account.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full use of PCSOs and Specials.</td>
<td>Specifically targeting car parks at relevant times/days.</td>
<td>Monthly change in recorded theft from vehicles parked in car parks in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mobile CCTV.</td>
<td>Deployment of mobile CCTV facility to hotspot locations at relevant times/days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High profile media Campaign.</td>
<td>Press articles, radio and TV slots in relation to the need for the public not to keep their property on display in their vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crackdown on drugs and prostitution.</td>
<td>Intense programme of enforcement activity in relation to drug dealing in relevant area over a period of two weeks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intense programme of enforcement activity in relation to prostitution and kerb crawling in relevant area over a period of two weeks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with drug referral agencies.</td>
<td>Integrate enforcement activity with referral agencies to ensure that they have sufficient resources in place to cope with possible increased demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater use of drug referral officers in custody suites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with shelter for sex workers.</td>
<td>Integrate enforcement activity with shelter to ensure that they have sufficient resources in place to cope with possible increased demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting repairs.</td>
<td>Intensive programme of lighting replacement in the affected areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Response Phase – some suggested measures

Some of the indicators that could be used in assessing the effectiveness of this initiative in dealing with the vehicle crime problem are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High profile policing</td>
<td>Patrol on street at relevant times/days.</td>
<td>Monthly change in recorded theft from vehicles parked on streets in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly change in other crime types to check for displacement in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Month-by-month and monthly change for arrest and charge of individuals for vehicle crime.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High profile policing</td>
<td>Increased use of stop/search and stop/account.</td>
<td>The proportion of stop/account and stop/search resulting in arrest.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full use of PCSOs and Specials</td>
<td>Specifically targeting car parks at relevant times/days.</td>
<td>Monthly change in recorded theft from vehicles parked on car parks in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly change in other crime types to check for displacement in Dofton and other areas in the BCU (to check for possible displacement).</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of mobile CCTV.</td>
<td>Deployment of mobile CCTV facility to hotspot locations at relevant times/days.</td>
<td>The number of arrests resulting from the use of the mobile CCTV facility</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of offences prior to, during and after the use of the mobile CCTV in a particular location.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The residual impact, i.e. the length of time, which offences remain at a particular level after the mobile CCTV facility has been removed from the location.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High profile media campaign</td>
<td>Press articles, radio and TV slots in relation to the need for the public not to keep their property on display in their vehicles.</td>
<td>The value of property stolen from vehicles month-by-month and monthly change</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Views of the community in relation to whether the campaign has changed their approach to security of their vehicles.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proportion of the community who are aware of the campaign and have taken steps to protect their property as a result.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crackdown on drugs and prostitution.</td>
<td>Intense programme of enforcement activity in relation to drug dealing in relevant area over a period of two weeks.</td>
<td>Month by month and monthly change for arrest and charge of individuals for drug related offences.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intense programme of enforcement activity in relation to prostitution and kerb crawling in relevant area over a period of two weeks.</td>
<td>Month by month and monthly change for arrest and charge of individuals for prostitution and kerb crawling.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work with drug referral agencies.</td>
<td>Integrate enforcement activity with referral agencies to ensure that they have sufficient resources in place to cope with possible increased demand.</td>
<td>The number of referrals to drug agencies in relation to those living in and/or offending in the relevant area – month by month.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater use of drug referral officers in custody suites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of referrals to drug agencies in relation to those living in and/or offending in the relevant area – month by month</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work with shelter for sex workers.</td>
<td>Integrate enforcement activity with shelter to ensure that they have sufficient resources in place to cope with possible increased demand.</td>
<td>The number of sex workers operating in the relevant area, seeking out sheltered accommodation.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting repairs.</td>
<td>Intensive programme of lighting replacement in the affected areas.</td>
<td>The number of street lights in the area that are not working – month-by-month.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of street lights repaired in the area – month by month, as a proportion of the ones reported as not working.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the views of the community regarding the perceived safety of their vehicles and other property and key mechanisms that affect this perceived safety.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, there will be many other indicators that you could use, but these at least provide an illustration of some of them. As you can see, some indicators can be used across a number of responses.

You should also revisit the original targets and ensure that you are assessing whether or not these have been achieved.

**Testing the data**

Once you have identified a data source, you can apply some simple tests to see whether or not the data will be of the required quality and will meet your needs. These include addressing such questions as those shown below.

- **Is the data readily available?** In other words, can you get it ‘off the shelf’ and relatively easily or do you need to set up some specific processes or procedures to gather it? On the other hand, the data might be collected but you cannot get access to it. If you have to make special arrangements to get access to the data you will have to decide:
  - whether the data is vital to your evaluation;
  - what you need to do to get access to it;
  - whether the time and cost involved in getting access to the data is worthwhile;
  - whether resources will be able to get the necessary data.

- **Are you happy that the data it sufficiently accurate for your needs?** Establishing the accuracy of the data for an evaluation is vital. Inaccurate data can distort the results of any work you do and give a false picture of the success or failure of a project. Sometimes, limited accuracy may be sufficient for your needs, but it may not be. It is up to you to decide the level of accuracy that you require and the extent to which the data source can provide it. Some of the questions you should ask to establish the accuracy of the data are as follows.
  - Is the data recorded correctly; for example, are reported offences recorded under the correct crime categories?
  - If any analytical packages were used, did they produce an accurate analysis of the raw data?
  - Has the data been collected objectively or has the collectors’ bias affected the quality.

No data source is perfect, but you should make sure that it has been recorded as accurately as possible before you decide to use it. Talking to the people who collect and collate the data might give you an idea of how accurate it is.

- **Is the data reliable?** Are you reassured that the data source can provide reliable data? In other words, you may be happy with the accuracy of the data at present, but are you sure that it will continue to be provided to the level of accuracy that you require? If not, you may need to consider using other sources or putting processes in place to maintain data quality at acceptable levels. You also need to know that the required data will be provided as and when it should be, in the required format and that it is as up to date as possible.
As part of this process you will be carrying out a form of gap analysis, i.e. comparing your ‘ideal’ list against what is available. It is very likely that not all of the data you require is available at all times, in the format you need it and with the level of reliability and accuracy that you require. You need to think whether you will have sufficient data to evaluate your project properly.

If you do not, then you need to decide whether to:

- accept the shortfalls in the data and make allowances for it in the evaluation and subsequent report;
- modify your data requirements (and hence the scope of the evaluation) in order to align with the data that is available and suitably accurate and reliable;
- establish processes for gathering data that is missing (if possible). We will consider this in more detail later in this Part.

**Collecting the data**

If you are happy with the quality of data that can be provided, and that this data will meet your requirements, you will need to set up processes/infrastructures to gather the data. On the one hand this could just include an informal agreement between you and those managing the data source so that they will provide you with the required data at the appropriate times.

It could, however, be a more formal arrangement, which might include such features as information-sharing protocols and/or Service Level Agreements particularly in a partnership environment. The requirement to share data is now enshrined in legislation and, as noted earlier, regulations introduced in 2007 outline a range of crime and disorder information that responsible authorities now have to share.

Protocols have become increasingly common in the community safety field and govern the arrangements for the sharing of information between partners. This includes listing what information will be shared and under what circumstances. Sample protocols are now available from a number of sources to “start you off”, including the crime reduction website.

Service Level Agreements are a stage on from protocols and detail the responsibilities in relation to the signatories to the protocol. From a source perspective they list what data will be provided, in what format and by when and from a user perspective they usually outline what the user will do with the data which they are provided with. As such, it provides a form of contract between data provider and user.

It may well be that such protocols and SLAs are not required for the data, which you need, but they can be useful to manage the data collection process, particularly in a partnership environment.

Hopefully, most of the data you will need will be readily available but this is not always going to happen. If the data you need is not available or is not of sufficient quality or relevance, you may need to consider organising the collection of data yourself. In other words, you need to consider the viability and feasibility of collecting primary data.
Think about some of the methods of gathering data and put your answer in the box below. You can then compare your answer with ours over the page.
Methods might include the following:

- **Paper records and other documentary evidence** – gathering crime reports, shift records or fixed penalty sheets;
- **Voice** – phone, direct report, conversation, interview;
- **Magnetic** – downloaded disk or tape (such as taped interviews);
- **Questionnaire** – formal structured or semi-formal semi-structured;
- **Observation** – seeing what is happening and drawing conclusions from what you see; work-study and assessment centres fit into this category;
- **Optical** – gathering data from bar code readers; some in-force activity analysis exercises use this method of data collection.
There are numerous different types of primary data collection techniques. Some of the more common ones are listed in the table below with the relative benefits and disadvantages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal Questionnaires</strong>&lt;br&gt;Need to be well laid out and instructions for completing them need to be clear. They should also be as succinct as possible.</td>
<td>• Excellent way of canvassing large group of people over large geographical area.  &lt;br&gt;• Relatively cheap to carry out.  &lt;br&gt;• Can be flexible and can be designed to meet any requirements.  &lt;br&gt;• Anonymity and confidentiality can be maintained.</td>
<td>• Variable response rates.  &lt;br&gt;• Difficult to check quality of responses.  &lt;br&gt;• Can be severely affected by poorly designed questionnaire.  &lt;br&gt;• Sample must be carefully selected or you may not get a representative sample, which will affect the validity of the results.  &lt;br&gt;• Can be time consuming to collate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Surveys</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sample should be carefully selected and a structured set of questions should be prepared in readiness to ensure that the necessary information is gathered.</td>
<td>• Often high response rates.  &lt;br&gt;• Good for smaller samples, but spread over wide geographical area.  &lt;br&gt;• Usually better quality data than postal surveys.  &lt;br&gt;• Able to probe and ask supplementary questions.</td>
<td>• More costly than postal survey, especially if a large number of interviews are needed.  &lt;br&gt;• Resource intensive.  &lt;br&gt;• Only reach those with access to a phone.  &lt;br&gt;• High refusal rate if “cold calling”.  &lt;br&gt;• Interviewer can influence the responses and distort the data.  &lt;br&gt;• May not be a representative sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Face to Face interview**<br>Can be structured, with a set of questions, or unstructured to allow the discussion to wander over a number of topics. | • Very high response rates.  
• High-quality data provided.  
• Usually better quality data than postal surveys.  
• Good for very small samples in tightly defined geographical areas.  
• Allows individual views to be explored in depth.  
• Interviewer can clear up ambiguities in the response immediately. | • Very costly.  
• Very resource intensive.  
• Interviewer can influence the responses and distort the data. |
| **Focus Groups**<br>A sample of individuals drawn together to consider a particular issue or issues. Often externally facilitated. | • Very high response rates.  
• High-quality data provided.  
• Good for very small samples.  
• Relatively cheap. | • Only of value with very small samples.  
• Usually only of value in relation to very focused issues, not broad areas.  
• May not be suitable for discussing some sensitive issues, although this decision needs to be made on a discretionary basis. |
| **Activity Sampling**<br>Record of work activities over a period of time. | • Useful in internal surveys.  
• Relatively cheap and simple to set up.  
• Can be used to check whether particular activities are having any effect on the problem. | • Major problems with data reliability and accuracy unless very tightly controlled.  
• Places a major burden on those being surveyed, often leading to poor quality results. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Audits</strong></td>
<td>• Useful in internal surveys.</td>
<td>• Usually only of value in relation to very focused issues, not broad areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the structures and processes designed to deliver activities.</td>
<td>• Relatively cheap and simple to run.</td>
<td>• Of value in assessing process issues rather than impact issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desk research</strong></td>
<td>• Can be useful if a comparison with similar projects is needed.</td>
<td>• The researcher may not know what resources are available or select the wrong ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using existing sources of information, for example published statistics.</td>
<td>• Information can be easily available.</td>
<td>• Available data might not be an exact match with the current project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental audits or photographic evidence</strong></td>
<td>• Focuses on collecting observation data over time. Generally it involves keeping a tally of occurrence of negative environmental evidence (e.g. graffiti, broken windows, drug detritus).</td>
<td>• Time-consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is useful to capture data not collated through other means.</td>
<td>• Staff resource-intensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The data is useful to look at evidence of signal crime.</td>
<td>• Costly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you are deciding what data collection method to use, you should ask yourself the following.

- What can I afford in terms of time, cost and resources?
- How important is the data to the evaluation, and does its importance justify the method that I am using to collect it?
Sampling
If you have to carry out surveys, using whichever method, it is highly likely that most of your surveys will involve assessing the views of a sample of the ‘population’. This is because it will probably not be feasible to survey the whole population either in terms of time, or cost. For example, when trying to assess the views of people in a town centre about the CCTV scheme in the town, it is just not possible to obtain the views of everyone in the town at any one time.

The selection of the sample to be surveyed is therefore crucial. It must be as representative as possible of the whole ‘population’ and when preparing a sample, you need to take account of a number of factors including:

- Age;
- gender;
- socio-economic category;
- geographical area of residence.

For example, in our town centre example above, if 20% of the population of the town are males aged 24 and under, you need to try to ensure that your 20% of your sample are in that category. Many surveys, particular face-to-face and phone surveys, operate to a quota, which requires so many people from different categories to be interviewed.

Failure to use a representative sample will probably result in skewed results and cast doubt on the accuracy, reliability and value of the survey.

In simple terms, see below.

- A simple random sample is best used with smaller populations, such as a street or neighbourhood.
- A stratified random sample is one where the participants have the same chance of being selected as others within specific sub groups, for example, age, gender, socio-economic category and so on. These categories should be mutually exclusive so that an individual could not be in more than one group.
- Quota samples are similar to stratified random samples, yet significantly different in that they are not selected at random. Specific numbers are set for those to be included in the sample, for example 300 people in the 16 to 21 age group.

The selection of samples is a complex process and the sample size can vary depending on the level of accuracy that you require. You can find out more about sampling and the concept of confidence limits at [http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm](http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm).

In reality, it is likely that you will not be carrying out surveys yourself, but will require other ‘specialists’ in your organisation to do them on your behalf. However, if you are interested in such work, some of the references at the end of the guide should be of particular assistance.
Comparison groups
Similarly, when setting up some evaluations you may need to consider using comparison groups. To illustrate, several interventions targeted at gang-related offending have introduced a package of measures to some gangs or gang members in a particular area, town or city. The evaluation has then compared the behaviour of this group with another similar group, who have not been subject to the same package of measures.

In pure science terms this is perhaps the most effective (and some would say, most accurate) method of assessing the impact of a particular initiative. This may be the case but it can only be used in certain cases, i.e. where the initiative targets a particular group, or area. For example, it is difficult to use this to evaluate a burglary reduction programme that covers a particular town; how do you find a reliable comparison group. In these cases it is probably best looking for a comparable area, with a similar demographic make-up and susceptibility to burglary offences instead of a group.

The other problem with this approach is that it is often very difficult to find an accurate comparison group. Unless the two groups – the experimental group and the control group – are broadly similar (in terms of all sorts of factors including age, gender, ethnicity, residence etc.), the findings from any comparison may be of limited reliability.

Once again, in reality, it is likely that you will not be designing comparison groups to underpin your evaluations. This is very much at the ‘high end’ of evaluation and will require specialist technical input. However, if you are interested in such work, some of the references at the end of the guide should be of particular assistance.

It is also worth noting that the Home Office performance management data system, iQuanta, uses the concept of comparison groups, through its most similar groups. Here, community safety partnership performance is compared with a group of similar partnerships with similar features, for example, population, socio-economic, demographic, geography.

Benchmarking
One type of comparison that you may consider is the use of benchmarking. This is where you assess the performance of your organisation and/or project with other similar ones. They can be used to measure how successful you are in dealing with a particular aspect of work and to set standards within your own organisation.

For example, if an organisation is trying to assess how effectively it dealt with telephone enquiries, it might compare its performance with other similar organisations doing similar work.

The principle of ‘similar families’ heavily utilises the benchmarking idea.

The benefit of benchmarking for evaluation is that you can compare the success of a particular project by comparing it to other similar projects. You should be cautious with benchmarks, however, and only use them as one indicator.

It is important to remember that benchmarks must be taken from similar work in similar areas to the one that you are evaluating. It is not helpful to use a benchmark if you cannot copy the conditions under which it was achieved.
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Things to watch for when surveying
If you are surveying a pre-and post-project situation, how do you know that any differences between the findings in the two surveys are due to real differences or simply due to the nature of the two sample groups, randomly selected? How do you know that the change is statistically significant? This relates to the concept of confidence limits, which was referred to earlier.

This is relatively technical and you will probably want to make use of specialist advice and support to consider these issues in relation to your surveys. Some of those who can help are found in the table in the Logistics section below.

However, if you are interested in this, several of the references included at the end of this guide will provide more information.

Logistics
Unfortunately, evaluation does not just happen. Someone has to do it and you need to decide how the work is going to be done and by whom. You, therefore, need to think about such factors as the following.

- Have some of the funds of the project been allocated to the provision of monitoring and/or evaluation?
- Who is going to gather the data?
- Who will analyse it?
- How they will liaise with you in carrying out the work?
- Who will disseminate the results?

The first place to look for these resources is within your own organisation, or the partners in the project. The advantages of using internal resources are:

- they are usually more cost-effective;
- they may have ready access to existing data;
- it is beneficial to develop the necessary evaluation skills in-house.

Increasingly critical in this are the crime analysts and data analysts in police forces and partnerships, plus those in other organisations. When starting any evaluation you are encouraged to make contact with the police and partnership analysts if you have them. They will be able to help you to think about how the evaluation might be structured and formulated, help with any points of complexity and offer support generally. It is highly likely that they will also have access to a large amount of data, some of which might be useful for your evaluation. They are, therefore, a very useful data source and it is important that you develop a strong working relationship with them as early in the evaluation process, as possible.
Crime analysts are therefore a key group of practitioners who can provide great support in this process. They are in great demand, however, and you should give them as much notice as possible of your evaluation in order that they can plan their time properly.

In addition to police and partnership analysts, a number of other organisations can help out with the evaluation, either in terms of offering advice and support to carrying out the evaluation itself. The table overleaf considers some sources together with advantages and disadvantages of using them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of help</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local schools, colleges and universities often have students who are studying research methods and who need projects to work on. Some universities also carry out evaluations using their research departments.</td>
<td>• Relatively cost-effective.</td>
<td>• Cannot always guarantee the level of skill of the students doing the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helps strengthen links with local communities.</td>
<td>• Some institutions may not have the facilities to do complex kinds of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficult to ensure confidentiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students may not be able to work full time on the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External consultants.</td>
<td>• Will have expertise in evaluating projects.</td>
<td>• Can be expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will have access to external data sets and up-to-date research methods.</td>
<td>• May need extensive background briefing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will evaluate objectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of help</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local, regional and national research groups. This includes the Home Office research unit and the regional research teams, which operate out of each regional Government Office. (The contacts for each regional team are found in the reference section). | - Will have expertise in evaluating projects.  
- Will have access to external data sets and up to date research methods.  
- Familiar with limitations and other issues relating to specific data streams (i.e. criminal statistics, recorded crime, etc.).  
- Will evaluate objectively.  
- Often have experience of similar projects.  
- Can call on extensive resources. | - May need extensive background briefing.  
- They are a relatively scarce resource and so are in high demand. It may, therefore, be difficult to involve them for any length of time. |
There is also much guidance and support available now and some of these are included in the reference section. These include:

- Effective Practice Database;
- Tilley Awards;
- guidance for effective partnerships, (Hallmarks for National Standards);
- crime reduction learning zone.

Once you have decided who is going to do the work, for complex evaluations, this will need to be carefully managed. In such cases you should put together a project plan, which, as a minimum should:

- list all of the key stages of the work;
- show the dates by which they need to be completed;
- show what resources are needed for each stage;
- show who needs to be involved;
- be updated regularly to reflect any changes.

There are a number of methods you can use for effectively managing complex projects. One of these is called PRINCE (PRojects IN Controlled Environments) and though it was developed to manage large information technology projects, over the years it has increasingly been used to manage major programmes, for example the implementation of problem oriented policing in a number of police forces.

The advantage of methods like PRINCE is that they make it possible to keep tight control over projects, particularly where such projects are complex. They are, however, often time-consuming to set up and maintain and so are best used for large and complex projects.

You can find out more about PRINCE at the following website, [http://www.ogc.gov.uk/methods_prince_2.asp](http://www.ogc.gov.uk/methods_prince_2.asp).

Another useful method is Gantt charts.

- All the tasks for the project are shown down the left-hand side.
- The duration, start and finish dates for each task are also shown in text down the left-hand side.
- The start date for each task and how long each is expected to take is shown by the bars on the calendar.
- The lines linking tasks show which tasks are dependent on each other.
- The names by the side of the tasks show who is responsible for completing them.
A Gantt chart is basically a calendar so you could create one manually on a wallchart or in a spreadsheet.

Almost every book on project management will include a section on Gantt charts and a number of project management texts are included in the references section at the end of this guide.

There are many other methods that you can use to help to manage projects and you can even buy special project planning software. It is probably best to find the method that is used in your organisation and use that.
Section Three – assessment

Once your project is implemented you need to start the evaluation proper.

Analysing the data

Once you have your data, how can you analyse it? First of all, you need to ask whether or not you need to analyse the data, or is it in such a form that you can easily apply it? For example, can data gathered from a perception survey give a clear picture of the level of satisfaction with the quality of service provided by your call-handlers? If it can, then you may not need to consider any further analysis of the data.

If you do need to analyse your data (for example, public perception and changes in such perceptions over time) you then need to consider if there are appropriate analytical facilities readily available either within your organisation or with one of your partners. If so, again, you can explore whether or not they are able to carry out some analysis for you.

If not, you may consider carrying out some basic analysis yourself. There are numerous textbooks available in relation to statistical theory and analysis and some of these are included in the references section at the end of this guide, if you are interested in learning more. It is not the purpose of this guide to consider such techniques, which include:

- summarising data;
- frequency and distribution;
- measures of central tendency;
- measures of dispersion;
- significance testing and tolerance limits;
- forecasting;
- regression and Correlation;
- probability.

Computerised spreadsheet packages such as Microsoft Excel or Lotus 123 include comprehensive data analysis facilities. If you have data in such formats, it would be worth spending a little time exploring these facilities. They are relatively easy to use and yet can enable useful analyses to take place.

In addition, more detailed packages such as SPSS can provide a thorough analysis of data, though they are, not surprisingly, more complex to use. Again, you will probably want to make use of specialists within and outside your organisation to help with this.
Three simple data review techniques, can be particularly useful.

**Cross tabulation**
This is a simple means of summarising and presenting data. For example, the table below shows the age and gender split of a population in an area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a relatively simple way of presenting data but can show how two variables relate.

A refinement of this approach is the proportional analysis.

**Proportional analysis**
This provides a different perspective to summarised data and gives a slightly greater insight into the data. It also enables conclusions to be drawn from the data more easily. The table below shows the above data in percentage terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of percentages however comes with health warnings. In particular, they are of limited value where small numbers are involved and especially when you are looking at percentage increases or decreases. For example, an increase in robberies from two to three represents a 50% increase in such offences! On its own, this appears quite alarming until you see the raw numbers behind the percentages.

When analysing percentage data, therefore, you may need to consider the raw data in order to set the findings into context.

**Period on period change**
If you are comparing the situation before the intervention was in place, with the situation after, you may want to carry out period-on-period comparisons. There are a number of ways you can do this, the most common being:

- this month compared to last month;
- this year compared to last year;
- this month compared to the same month last year;
- This year to date compared to the same period last year.
Identifying trends with moving averages

While period-on-period analysis is quite helpful, it does not help you spot the ‘bigger picture’. It is helpful to look at the trend of measures over time, say a year or even longer, to look at how and if they are changing.

One of the problems with this is that due to the nature of the data and the fact that trends often emerge over a long period, it is sometimes difficult to spot the underlying trend in a set of raw data. The graph below illustrates this

A simple way of ‘smoothing’ out the peaks and troughs to identify the underlying trend is through a simple technique called moving averages. The box below shows how a three-period moving average works on the above data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Moving average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In simple terms you take the first three pieces of data (1994, 1995 and 1996) and average them out. You then take the second third and fourth piece of data (1995, 1996 and 1997) and average them. You then take the third, fourth and fifth piece of data (1996, 1997 and 1998) and average them and so on. In that way you ‘roll’ through the data. This has the effect of dampening the impact of peaks and troughs on the data and makes it much easier to spot the underlying trend. The graph below shows the same data as that in the previous graph, but smoothed out by a three-period moving average.

![Graph showing smoothed data](image)

This clearly shows an underlying downward trend, with an indication that this may be changing right at the end. The identification of this trend in the original graph would have been very difficult without using moving averages to smooth the data.

You can use whatever period you like for the moving average, but the higher proportion of the period compared to the complete data set, the more tightly the smoothing is applied, and vice versa. For example, a six period moving average applied to a data set of ten items will produce a fairly flat trend (i.e. much of the trend will be smoothed out, which is not really helpful). Similarly, a two period moving average applied to a data set of 20 items will barely smooth out any of the underlying trend making it equally difficult to spot the trend.

As a rule of thumb, a three month moving average is often about the right level for 12 months worth of data.

**Taking account of context**

For those projects with a target to reduce crime or the fear of crime, one of the indicators will clearly be changes in the level of crime or fear of crime. Taking an example of vehicle crime in town centre car parks, as we noted above, one way of measuring impact will be changes in the level of such crime on the car parks. Let us say that after a six-month period we note that vehicle crime has gone down by 20% in the town centre car parks, against a target of a ten per cent reduction. This could be the signal for much celebration and back-slapping, but what if we then discover that vehicle crime in the town as a whole has fallen by 40%!
The analysis must take account of the underlying trends or environment in which the project is operating. For example, rather than measuring the number of thefts from vehicles in the town centre car parks, contextualise it and measure the number of thefts from vehicles in the town centre car parks as a proportion of all thefts from vehicles in the town. This is a form of indexation and ensures that you do not lose sight of the underlying trends against which performance has been achieved.

As well as contextualising in relation to underlying trends, you can also do so in relation to specific groupings. For example, measuring the number of elderly people who are victims of crime, is relatively meaningless on its own, unless set into the context of the whole population. It may be better to look at the ratio of victims per 1,000 population, for those aged 60 and over, and then compare it to the overall ratio.

Taking into account context will ensure that your analysis is meaningful and gives a clear picture of performance compared to underlying trends.

**Effect size**

It may be possible to not only measure whether or not a project or particular intervention has had an impact on the problem, but also to measure the size of the effect.

This is a relatively complex process and beyond the remit of this guide but, essentially, the techniques can adjust the data for ‘confounding variables’ and external noise, to tease out the precise size of the effect generated by the intervention. In addition, you also need to be able to isolate those factors that may have brought about change (an idea at the heart of realistic evaluation). This can only take place in certain circumstances and requires accurate and tightly controlled data sets and a carefully managed evaluation.

However, it is possible and if you require an effect size element within your evaluation you should approach specialist evaluators either within or outside the organisation who may be able to assist.

**Cost Benefit Analysis**

Cost Benefit Analysis is an analytical technique that is often used with, and as a subset of, process evaluations. In simple terms it seeks to identify the cost of carrying out an intervention or project and compares it with the identified or potential cost savings generated as a result.

While it is relatively easy to understand and quantify the costs of running the project, it is often somewhat more difficult to quantify the impact. The Home Office has developed a simple model, which outlines the costs of crime. This considers not only the costs of dealing with a crime such as police, court and probation time, but also the costs incurred as a consequence of the crime. These include value of property stolen or damaged and estimates of emotional impact, lost output, and health and victim services. While it does not profess to be accurate to the penny, it does give an indication of some of the ‘ball park’ costs of crime.

You can find the model at [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/rdsoir3005.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/rdsoir3005.pdf).
It is probably best to use an example to illustrate.

Say £10,000 is invested into a crime reduction project (given the cost of buying equipment or publicity material, staff payment, overheads of offices and utility bills, etc) and over the period of the project a ten per cent reduction in dwelling burglary is achieved or 100 offences. Using the Home Office model the unit cost of crime reduction would be 100 x £3,268=£326,800. This shows clearly that the initiative is cost-effective and that for every £1 invested £33 was saved from crimes not taking place.


In another example, an initiative was developed to focus on a relatively small group of offenders in an area who were responsible for a very large number of offences of different types. The formal evaluation of this project found that as a result of the package of measures adopted, there had been about a 50% reduction in the level of offending by these offenders over a two-year period, since the project started. This sounds impressive.

Using the Home Office Cost of Crime model some attempt was made to identify the cost saving as a result. This analysis suggested that this translated into a resource saving of over £900,000 over the two-year period; again an impressive finding.

It is immediately stated that this does not mean a saving of about £900,000 in hard cash. What it does mean is that police and other agency resources to the value of over £900,000 were not being used to deal with the activities of these prolific offenders. Resources to that value were, therefore, available to be used elsewhere.

This makes use of the Economic concept of “Opportunity Cost”, which states that while resources are being used in one activity, they are not being used elsewhere. In this case, the opportunity cost of the activities of the prolific offenders was that over £900,000 of resources were not available for use and deployment elsewhere; the opportunity cost saving of this initiative, therefore, over £900,000 of resources.

This all sounds very impressive, but we are only looking at one side of the equation i.e. the ‘benefit’ accruing from the intervention. But what about the ‘cost’?

The cost to deliver that project over the two-year period was £1.2 million; therefore, in simple cost terms, it cost £300,000 more to deliver than the benefits which it generated. So, is it worth continuing with this project? After all, it is losing money.

Like everything, it is not as simple as two sides to the equation. Though it appears to be costing money, rather than saving resources in net terms, there are other things you need to think about.

- The project did help to reduce crime and the ‘knock-on’ benefits of that in terms of perceived improved community confidence may be significant.
It is difficult to translate factors such as this into simple cost terms – hence while it is relatively easy to understand the cost of a project; it is much more difficult to measure the benefits in cost terms. This is because many projects are designed to make people feel safer and improve their quality of life. How do you put a value on such factors? One approach is to use proxy indicators referred to earlier in the guide and this is what the Home Office has done in their Cost of Crime Model.

True benefits may be achieved over the longer term. The residual impact of the project may continue to deliver resource savings long into the future and long after the project has ceased to exist. In other words, over time, the project may move from net cost to a net benefit position.

The timing of the Cost Benefit Analysis is crucial. Too soon in the life of the project and it will inevitably deliver net losses; too late in the project and some of the early impact may have waned.

And that is a key point about Cost Benefit Analysis. It is one of a number of techniques that can be used to analyse data. It should not be used in isolation to assess the impact of any particular project or intervention. The results from the Cost Benefit Analysis need to be taken into context with all of the other analyses to get a rounded view of the project. In other words, though it can be important, it is still only one ‘ingredient’ in the ‘basket’ of indicators.
Section 4 – presentation

All your work will be wasted if the end results cannot be understood, so there are a number of things you should consider.

• **Who is your audience?**
  This is normally the people who asked for the evaluation, but you need to think about who else should receive it. The intended audience will have an effect on how you present your information. For example, a report for local councillors will differ from a report for technical experts and may again be different from a report intended for the general public.

• **Do those receiving the evaluation have the skills and time to interpret it?**
  It is important to get the level of complexity and the length of report right, while still making sure that the key messages are clear. If your report is a written one, you might want to include a summary of your main findings at the beginning so that people can decide how much they want to read. This is often referred to as an Executive Summary. Many of your readers may be senior managers, in which case they will not have time to read a lengthy report (however well written and thorough it is). A short summary report gives them the key points and they can then read the full report if they are sufficiently interested.

  It is worth mentioning here that the Home Office has recently introduced a 1:3:25 rule for all of its written reports. Any research that it carries out should be published through:

  – a one-page bullet point list of key findings;
  – a three-page summary report;
  – a twenty-five page full report.

  This is a useful guide for you to consider when writing evaluation reports.

• **What techniques are you going to use to show your findings?** A written report is the most common way of getting your information across, but there are other techniques you could use.
What techniques for presenting your findings can you think of? Write down as many as you can think of and compare your answers to ours over the page.
The list below shows some of the techniques that can be used and some thoughts on when they could be used.

- **Written reports** – the most widespread method used and usually a requirement in order to document the findings of the evaluation. Where appropriate it may be useful to consider the following to help in the understanding of the findings.
  - **Tables** – useful for summarising and comparing information as we have already seen.
  - **Graphs and charts** – can summarise a lot of information easily and one clear graphic can have more of an impact on the reader than many words. We have already seen this in relation to moving averages. Different types of graphics include:
    - line graphs – good for identifying trends;
    - bar graphs – good for period on period comparisons;
    - pie charts – good for showing the size of individual components compared to the overall picture, e.g. how overall crime is split between various broad categories.
  - **Maps and plans** – useful when looking at spatial data. Many IT systems can now produce map-based analyses of problems that make it very easy to identify hotspots.
  - **Photographs** – especially useful when you are doing before and after visual audits of graffiti and other anti-social behaviour.
  - **Sketches and diagrams.**

Any form of graphic can be useful to illustrate information quickly. They have immediate impact but may not always present data as fully as words or a table. All graphics should be clear and easily understood with an accompanying explanation where necessary.

**Presentations** – usually with visual aids, are useful if you want to make an immediate impact. They have the advantage of being interactive so that your audience can ask questions about the evaluation and get an immediate reply (or a promise to look into something that you cannot answer immediately). They are also useful for generating discussion about the project. The presentation, speaker’s notes and copies of any visual aids could be copied to the audience as a record but will not include points that emerge from the discussion.

- **The internet** – can be a useful way of reaching a large audience very quickly. However, it is difficult to keep information confidential if you choose to publish it this way.

At all times you need to consider the most appropriate way of communicating your findings to your intended audience. Always ask yourself the question, “How should I present my findings so that people can understand what the data is saying and interpret it clearly?”.
So what?
When you have published your findings how do you ensure that the results of the evaluation do not just sit on a desk gathering dust? How do you ensure that they drive forward change, if required?

If recommendations result from the evaluation, how do you make sure that they are regularly revisited to check progress in adopting them and their impact? There are structures and processes that you can put in place to support such work.

- Adoption of a COMPSTAT style or other regular review structure, where progress against agreed targets is assessed and reviewed on a regular basis. This is sometimes referred to as a rolling review programme.

- In relation to individual projects or programmes, the utilisation of milestone reviews. Milestones, if they are to be meaningful, must be related to specific ‘work packages’ or events and reviews can take place to consider progress towards their achievement. In effect it is a form of focused review and this is particularly important in relation to decisions regarding exit strategies.

- Where organisations have adopted planning models such as EFQM, consideration needs to be given to how the evaluation will link in with them. For example, EFQM caters for internal self-assessment on a continual basis. Some of the issues arising from the evaluation of a project could be fed into the EFQM self-assessment process and, as such, could improve the operation of the organisation as a whole.

- Where an evaluation has given rise to a number of recommendations, the structures in place to manage the evaluation must cater for such recommendations. Not only should processes be put in place to ensure that the recommendations are acted upon, but also they should be able to assess the impact of the adoption of the recommendations.

At the end of the evaluation, you may also want to look back and reflect on what you have done. This may help you identify lessons and learning points which may help your carry out evaluations more effectively in the future.
Summary – Part Three

Scanning and analysis phase
When the project is in the scanning and analysis phase, from an evaluation perspective you need to be:

- developing an understanding of the baseline position - this relates to a clear and detailed understanding of the problem that is to be addressed;
- finding out what the purpose of the evaluation is – e.g. impact, process, ongoing monitoring, point in time evaluation;
- finding out what those who have called for the evaluation want out of it;
- understand what time scales you are working to.

Response phase
When the project is in the response phase, from an evaluation perspective you need to be doing the following:

- Understanding how the proposed project will work including the mechanisms of change;
- Finding out what the targets are for the project, i.e. what is it trying to achieve?
- Deciding how you will measure impact. This includes:
  - developing performance measures which may be either quantitative or qualitative;
  - building a basket of measures rather than focusing on just one or two.
- Setting up the processes for gathering the necessary data. This includes:
  - understanding what data you will need – depth, detail, format and so on;
  - identifying data sources;
  - testing the data to make sure that it is available and reliable;
  - collecting the data where it is available from existing sources;
  - where the data is not readily available, setting up processes in order to gather the data (if it is felt to be worthwhile) - this will also include thinking about sampling and the use of comparison groups and benchmarks.
- Thinking about the logistics including the following.
  - Who is going to gather the data?
  - Who will analyse it?
  - How they will liaise with you in carrying out the work.
  - Who will disseminate the results?
  - Planning the evaluation.
Assessment phase
When the project is in the assessment phase, from an evaluation perspective you need to be doing the following.

- Deciding how you will analyse the data. Some simple techniques include:
  - cross tabulation;
  - period on period comparison;
  - trend analysis;
  - contextualising the data for surrounding conditions;
  - trying to measure effect size;
  - Cost Benefit Analysis.

Presentation
You need to decide how you will present your findings, by thinking about the following:

- Who your audience is;
- How much time or what level of expertise they have to interpret the findings;
- The best ways that the information can be presented including the use of visual aids;
- How the results can be acted upon.
Part Four – other issues to consider

Introduction
For every evaluation you do you will have to think about a wide range of things that are out of your control, but which may affect your work.

Objectives
By the end of this part you will be able to:

- list some of the issues you need to consider when planning an evaluation;
- describe how you could reduce the impact of external factors on your evaluation.

Overview
In this section we have identified eleven factors which you might have to take into account. They are:

- cause and effect;
- standards of evidence;
- displacement;
- impartiality;
- logistics;
- boundaries;
- incompatible systems;
- data sharing and availability;
- lack of evaluation culture;
- fear of failure and the blame culture;
- hitting the balance.

In this part we will look at each of these factors in turn and some of the ways of minimising their impact.

A summary of the key points can be found on page 110.
Cause and effect
What does this mean?
A key reason for evaluating a project is to measure what effect it has had on the original problem.

There is a danger in assuming that the outcomes are a direct result of the project. There are lots of other things which can have an effect and you need to be aware of them. In technical terms, it is dependent on how ‘closed’ you feel the system that you are implementing the project in is. In a closed system you are able to closely control factors to achieve a positive outcome. In the social ‘real’ world situation the system is not usually particularly closed, i.e. you have limited influence over many external factors.

For example, imagine you are evaluating a project designed to reduce domestic burglary on an estate. In your evaluation, you find that there has been a dramatic decrease in burglaries during the life of the project. On the face of it, this looks like the result of the work carried out by the project team – whether it is fitting locks, giving advice to householders or setting up neighbourhood watches. Imagine that, at the same time, the two most prolific offenders on the estate have been arrested. It could be that the drop in burglaries is partly down to those arrests, rather than entirely down to the project.

Conversely, some projects exhibit what is termed in the medical world the ‘iatrogenic effect’. This is where introducing one solution solves a problem but at the same time initiates another problematic scenario. An example of this is where attempts to use early biometric approaches to prevent theft lead to more violent outcomes, e.g. where fingerprint identification access has the potential for motivated thieves to chop off fingers to gain access (note that later systems required a pulse, which counteracted this iatrogenic effect). Alternatively, in the language of economics these are called the troublesome trade-offs, where one has to balance the crime preventive benefit of a method against any negative impacts on stakeholders and the public.

Paul Ekblom outlines the main potential troublesome trade-offs in his paper Future crime prevention – a ‘mindset kit’ for the seriously foresighted.

- **Safety** – e.g. as discussed above, biometric approaches leading to potentially violent approaches taken by the offender to bypass the protective systems.

- **Convenience** – e.g. installing alleygates prevents and slows access to residents.

- **Cost** – e.g. increased activity in a council may introduce a burden on families in terms of council tax increases.

- **Privacy and freedom** – e.g. CCTV cameras if inappropriately or incorrectly placed may cause breaches of privacy and personal freedom.

- **Profit** – e.g. introducing safer designs of products may reduce revenue from sales.

- **Social inclusion** – for example the generation of exclusion zones as part of an ASBO (Anti-social behaviour order) where it conflicts with access to medical services.
• **Sustainable environment** – e.g. Where landscape is altered to increase natural surveillance with a negative impact on the habitat of wildlife.

• **Legal and ethical norms** – e.g. use of illegal measures to protect the home – i.e. firearms against burglary, non-standard measures on walls to prevent them being scaled (glass fragments).


**What can you do?**
The first thing is to be aware that an evaluation cannot be conclusive proof that a project has worked. An evaluation is an indication that a project has worked, and there are three steps you can take to make sure that the results are as accurate as possible.

• **At the planning stage of your evaluation**, list all the factors that might have an effect on the project. For this you need to be aware of the area where the project is being carried out and what other work of a similar nature is being done in the area.

• **Collect data** for your evaluation from as wide a range of sources as possible. The wider you spread your net, the more confident you can be that the results of your evaluation are accurate.

• **Look closely at the analysed data** to make sure that what it is telling you is a true picture of what has happened. If you spot any inconsistencies, check them out further.

When you present the findings, you should make it clear that other factors might have had a bearing on the results.

**Standards of evidence**

**What does this mean?**
How do you know whether or not the quality of your evaluation is at the level at which you require? How can you be sure that the results of your evaluation are as reliable as possible? In addition, when you are carrying out desk research, how can you know whether or not the evaluations you are reading are of a high enough quality?

It is one thing to carry out the evaluation but if the quality of the evaluation and the research method adopted is questionable, then this may cause you and others to view the findings with some suspicion.

**What can you do?**
There are a number of approaches to testing the quality of evidence, one of the most common being the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods. You can find out more about this at [http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/171676.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/171676.pdf).
The Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods (Sherman et al, 1998) was designed by a group of researchers in the University of Maryland for their review of ‘what works’ in crime prevention. It is a five-point scale used to classify the strength of scientific evidence; it does not classify the strength of a programme’s or intervention’s effect. Sherman argues that only studies with a robust comparison group design can provide evidence of causality. This equates to Level Three and above in the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods, details of which are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level One</th>
<th>Correlation between a crime prevention programme and a measure of crime or crime risk at a particular point in time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level Two</td>
<td>Temporal sequence between the programme and the crime or risk outcome clearly observed, or the presence of a comparison group without demonstrated comparability to the treatment group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three</td>
<td>A comparison between two or more comparable units of analysis, one with and one without the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Four</td>
<td>Comparison between multiple units with and without the programme, controlling for other factors or using comparison units that evidence only minor differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Five</td>
<td>Random assignment and analysis of comparable units to programme and comparison groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In simple terms, the more robust the research methodology adopted in your evaluation, the more reliable the findings.

Other useful information regarding quality of evidence is found in the GSR (Government Social Research) Magenta Book, which is a guide for police evaluation. This can be found at the GSR website, http://www.gsr.gov.uk/professional_guidance/magenta_book/index.asp.

Finally, in 2003 the Cabinet Office developed a framework or checklist for assessing the quality of qualitative evaluations and the standards of the evidence being produced from them. It tests a number of features of the evaluation including the findings, design, sampling approach, data collection, data analysis and reporting. The framework can be found at http://www.gsr.gov.uk/downloads/evaluating_policy/qqe_rep.pdf.

**Displacement**

**What does this mean?**

There are numerous definitions of the term displacement but a common thread running through all of them suggests that displacement occurs

“..when an intervention does not deter the offender but displaces the offending behaviour in some way.”
Displacement can occur in a number of ways and there are six broad types of displacement.

- **Temporal** Offending behaviour is moved to a different time of day or time of year.
- **Target** Offending behaviour focuses on a different target.
- **Spatial** Offending behaviour is moved to a different geographical location.
- **Tactical** Offending behaviour is modified and new methods of offending are adopted.
- **Perpetrator** Offending by one offender (group of offenders) is stopped but new offenders appear to commit the same types of crime.
- **Crime type** Offending behaviour focuses on a different type of crime.

Some crime reduction programmes aim to displace offending in some way, often in combination with other interventions. By altering or displacing offender behaviour, such programmes seek to disrupt the offender leading either to his/her apprehension or the termination of offending behaviour. As an example, the recent Home Office toolkit, *Communities against drugs*, specifically states that displacement is central to drug market disruption (though it does not state which type of displacement).

Often, however, displacement is an unintended and usually unwanted consequence of carrying out a project or intervention. When people talk about displacement, they invariably mean spatial displacement, i.e. the launch of an initiative pushing offending into another area.

Research carried out in Sheffield suggests that 85% of all trips to offend are less than two miles and that:

- high volume crime is a highly localised phenomenon;
- even where longer-range travel is involved, it is invariably to places which have strong traditional connections with either the offender and/or his or her home;
- there is little evidence that new travel opportunities change traditional travel to offend patterns.

This suggests that if spatial displacement of offending does take place, it will only be into the area immediately surrounding the location from which it has been displaced (within a radius of about a mile of the focus of the preventative project). You can read more about this in Wiles, P and A. Costello (2000). ‘The “Road to Nowhere”: The Evidence for Travelling Criminals’. (Home Office Research Study No. 207.) London, UK: Home Office.

Later work in Wolverhampton and West Bromwich (not yet published) refined this and found a “sterile area” immediately around where the intervention was based.
What can you do?
You must make sure that your evaluation can take account and pick up any potential displacement, of whatever type. For example, if your evaluation is looking at vehicle crime in a particular area, you need also to look at vehicle crime in the surrounding areas to see if there has been any significant change while the intervention has been in place. Remember what we said earlier about “cause and effect” however.

If your intervention focuses on particular time slots, you will need to ensure that you also look at what is happening at other times to make sure that you are picking up any possible temporal displacement.

At the heart of this is developing a clear set of measures and gathering as broad a set of data as possible so that you pick up the possible effects of displacement.

Impartiality
What does this mean?
It is vital that evaluation is a neutral process and is seen as such. There is a danger in using the same people who work on the project to evaluate it. It is very difficult for someone who has worked on a project to detach himself/herself from it and take an objective and impartial look at the results. The result may be that the findings are skewed or the data interpreted in a particular way.

This is unlikely to be a deliberate process, but anyone who has worked on a project will want it to succeed and will look for evidence to prove this. An independent evaluator will look to see where a project has worked and where it has not.

What can you do?
Ways to reduce this problem include:

- use **external evaluators** on large projects;
- if the project team is evaluating the project, use someone from **outside the team** as a quality control check.

Logistics
What does this mean?
We have already mentioned logistics in Part Three of this guide, but it is an important part of the evaluation process and needs mentioning again.

Evaluation does not just happen; it needs to be carefully planned before any work is carried out, preferably at the start of the project. The plans should show timescales and resources, so everybody is clear about what is going to be done, when it needs to be completed, who is going to do it and what it will cost.

What can you do?
You should make sure the **project team is aware** of the **work needed for the evaluation**, but you should also make sure the project sponsors are clear about it too.
Boundaries
What does this mean?
You may find that a common problem is that different organisations do not cover the same geographical area. A phrase you might hear is that the boundaries are ‘non-coterminous’.

If organisations do not share the same boundaries, it can cause difficulties when trying to combine and compare data. This may be a problem, particularly with partnerships.

If partner organisations are not collecting data for the same geographical areas, it is difficult to make exact comparisons. This can lead to the results of data analysis becoming distorted.

What can you do?
The first thing you should do is identify the impact of any missing data and what distortion this might have on your analysis. If the impact is large, you might have to gather data from other organisations not involved in the project, or collect it yourself.

You also need to be careful when analysing the data to make sure that you do not include information from areas outside the project.

Incompatible systems
What does this mean?
This is another common problem when working in partnerships. When agencies use different systems for collecting information it may be difficult to share data easily. Another problem is that there may be some gaps where additional data has to be collected.

You may also find that other organisations use terms and phrases in different ways.

What can you do?
Generally, data has to be put into a common format and analysed again before direct comparison can be made.

You also need to make sure that everyone involved understands and uses terms and phrases in the same way.

Data sharing and availability
What does this mean?
Sometimes you may have problems getting hold of the data you need or in sharing it between partners. There are several possible reasons for this:

- lack of an evaluation culture may mean the data is not collected in the first place;
- there may be some suspicion about why the data is needed and how it is going to be used;
- there may be concerns about confidentiality.
What can you do?
Although this problem is becoming less common, the situation may need careful handling.
One way of doing this is to have a data sharing agreement between the partners. The agreement would set out what data is to be collected, how it is going to be used and how it will be presented.

As we noted in Part Three, the Prescribed Information Regulations 2007 No. 1831 stipulate the information in relation to crime reduction and community safety that responsible authorities are now required to share. This issue should, therefore, become less of a problem as time goes on. These can be found at http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2007/uksi_20071831_en_1.

Lack of evaluation culture
What does this mean?
Quite simply it means that some agencies, groups or organisations do not have a background of evaluating and monitoring their work.

This can cause several problems:
• people will not understand the purpose of evaluation or see the need for it;
• lack of understanding may slow down the progress of evaluation;
• some data may not be available as agencies might not have seen the need to collect it in the past.

What can you do?
You can do two things in this situation. The first is to spend some time 'selling' the idea to your partners and educating them about the process. Quite often, the language of evaluation can be quite intimidating, so this needs to be explained too.

The second thing you can do is to involve the partners in the process of evaluation. Getting people working on an evaluation is a good way of making the process clear. It will help them to understand the importance of effective evaluation.

It is also noted that evaluation now forms a key part of the guide to effective partnership working and is now backed up by statutory requirements. In other words, there is now a real and strong imperative for individuals and organisations to fully embrace evaluation.

Fear of failure and the blame culture
What does this mean?
As you have seen in this guide, the purpose of an evaluation is to measure the achievements of a project, or the effectiveness of its processes. However, this will not be the view of everyone you deal with.
You will find some people are not used to having their work measured and feel uncomfortable with the idea. Evaluation is often viewed with great suspicion and you may meet with some hostility when developing your evaluation plans. It can be seen by some as a way of identifying and punishing poor work. This is particularly the case when an organisation is seen to be operating a blame culture.

The fear of failure and the blame culture often make it difficult to establish clear targets for the evaluation and the accurate measuring and reporting of results.

**What can you do?**

The answer to this problem lies in **communicating your purpose clearly** and educating people about the importance and purpose of evaluation.

If you are likely to have problems of this sort, it is a good idea to have a **period of consultation with management**, the **people involved** in the project and trade unions. The aim should be to reach a **common agreement about the need for evaluation** and how it will be carried out.

**Hitting the balance**

**What does this mean?**

As we have seen, in some organisations it is difficult getting people to support evaluation or monitoring work. But once you have gained people’s support you may be faced with the opposite problem.

There is a danger that evaluation can take over a project and people spend more time on the details of the evaluation rather than on what the results are telling them. In simple terms, ‘the evaluation tails starts to wag the project dog’.

**What can you do?**

There is a need to **balance what you need** from the evaluation **against the time and resources** you can put into it. It is here that having really **clear objectives** and a **plan** for the evaluation become really important.
Summary – Part Four

This section looked at some of the wide range of factors that might affect your evaluation work. It suggested ways you could reduce the impact of some external factors on your evaluation.

**Cause and effect** – make sure that the data you have analysed presents a true picture of what has happened.

**Displacement** – some interventions can shift offending behaviour and location. You must make sure that your evaluation is broad enough so that it can pick up these effects.

**Impartiality** – evaluation is a neutral process – an independent evaluator may be more likely to show where a project has worked and where it has not.

**Logistics** – evaluations need careful planning before you start.

**Boundaries** – different organisations may cover different geographical areas. This may cause problems when you try to combine and compare data, it might distort the results of your data analysis.

**Incompatible systems** – different organisations may use different systems for collecting data, which may make it difficult to share data easily.

**Data sharing and availability** – you may find it difficult to get hold of the data you need or share it with partners. This might be because data is not collected; there is suspicion about why the data is needed or how it is going to be used. There may be concerns about confidentiality.

**Lack of evaluation culture** – some organisations are not used to monitoring and evaluating their work. This may mean that people do not understand why evaluation is important, which may slow things down.

**Fear of failure and the blame culture** – fear of failure and the blame culture can make it difficult to establish clear targets and accurately measure and report results. Evaluation is often viewed with suspicion because it is seen as a way of identifying and punishing poor work.

**Hitting the balance** – Once you have gained people’s support, there is a danger that the evaluation takes over the project and people spend more time on the evaluation than what the results are telling them.
... finally

Congratulations! You have now completed the Passport to Evaluation. We hope you found it useful and that you feel more confident about evaluating projects.

Below are the objectives for this guide. You might want to spend a few minutes checking that it has helped you to achieve them all. Hopefully you will be able to:

• define evaluation and monitoring;
• explain why crime reduction work should be evaluated;
• describe some different types of evaluation;
• describe how evaluation fits in as part of the process of problem solving;
• describe the process for evaluating a project;
• evaluate a crime reduction project using the process;
• list some of the issues you need to consider when planning an evaluation;
• identify skills and knowledge which you can take back to your own work.

This guide is an introduction to evaluation, and should help you make a start on evaluating projects. Hopefully you will now get the opportunity to practise some of the skills you have learned, as this will help you become more confident about evaluating projects.

Good luck!
Key terminology

There is often a bewildering range of terms and phrases used in the process of evaluation. This part of the guide should help clarify them. The definitions are arranged alphabetically so that as well as helping you to understand what they mean, this part can also be used as a reference. For each word or phrase, there is a definition and, in most cases, an example.

**APACS**
APACS stands for Analysis of Policing and Community Safety and it is a unified performance management framework for policing and community safety. It streamlines and aligns the way performance is measured and assessed across policing, crime and drugs.


**Appraisal**
Another term for evaluation

**Assessment**
Another term for evaluation. Also, the fourth element of the SARA process (see SARA below).

**Baseline**
The baseline is the situation at the start of a project before any preventive work has been carried out. This is the information that helps to define the nature and extent of the problem that the project is trying to address.

For example, an initial analysis of vehicle crime in a town centre may show that 100 offences have taken place in the town centre in the last three months and that 50% of these have taken place in one particular car park. This gives you a start point; it is your baseline position. You can look at the level of vehicle crime after the project has started and the proportion of offences on the problem car park.

**Benchmark**
This is where you assess the performance of your organisation and/or project with other similar ones. They can be used to measure how successful you are in dealing with a particular aspect of work and to set standards within your own organisation.

For example, if an organisation is trying to assess how effectively it dealt with telephone enquiries, it might compare its performance with other similar organisations doing similar work.

**Confidence limits**
A confidence limit of 95% means that you can be confident that in 19 out of 20 cases, the responses from a sample are representative of those that the base population would give. The higher the confidence limits, the more representative the sample will be of the base population. You can use your required confidence limits and the population size to calculate your required sample size.
Cost Benefit Analysis
Cost Benefit Analysis is an analytical technique that is often used with and as a subset of process evaluations. In simple terms it seeks to identify the cost of carrying out an intervention or project and compares it with the identified or potential cost savings generated as a result.

Cross tabulation
This is a simple means of summarising and presenting data. For example, the table below shows the age and gender split of a population in an area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a relatively simple way of presenting data but can show how two variables relate.

Displacement
Displacement occurs when an intervention does not deter the offender but displaces the offending behaviour in some way. Displacement can occur in a number of ways and there are six broad types of displacement.

Temporal Offending behaviour is moved to a different time of day or time of year.

Target Offending behaviour focuses on a different target.

Spatial Offending behaviour is moved to a different geographical location.

Tactical Offending behaviour is modified and new methods of offending are adopted.

Perpetrator Offending by one offender (group of offenders) is stopped but new offenders appear, to commit the same types of crime.

Crime type Offending behaviour focuses on a different type of crime.

Effect size
Not only measuring whether or not a project or particular intervention has had an impact on the problem, but also the size of the effect. The approach is relatively complex and can usually only take place in certain circumstances. It requires accurate and tightly controlled data sets and a carefully managed evaluation to exclude ‘external noise’.

Evaluation
Evaluation is the process of assessing, whether or not a project is achieving or has met its own objectives based on collected data. It may also include a discussion of what processes, mechanisms and interactions were put in place to achieve these objectives.
Feasibility study (also known as pre-project evaluation, appraisal, piloting or pathfinder evaluation)

In a situation where there may not be enough financial support or evidence to suggest rolling out a new or untried method of crime prevention to a wide area it is often useful to attempt a small-scale version of the project in a specific area experiencing a crime problem. The evaluation and project length tend to be carried out within a short timescale – usually limited by the available funding.

Formative evaluation
A method of judging the worth of a project/intervention while activities are forming or happening.

Impact evaluation
This approach has a focus on understanding what the impact has been following the implementation of an intervention. In simple terms, did the project meet (or is it meeting) its objectives?

iQuanta
iQuanta is an internet-based analysis tool which turns statistical data routinely collected by the Home Office into useful information for understanding and improving police performance. iQuanta supports all indicators available in the Assessments of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) framework.

It provides both graphical and tabular summaries of performance trends. A number of different chart types are available, covering comparison against peer group, current performance relative to historic performance and trends in performance (projections, progress against targets).

You can find out more about iQuanta at the following website, http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/performance-and-measurement/iquanta/.

Indicators
An indicator is the means by which you will measure the impact of the project on the problem. For example, a project to tackle theft from cars in a town centre car park has a target to reduce the number of offences by 20% over a six month period. One of the performance indicators would be the change in thefts from vehicles in the car park.

This is an example of a direct indicator.

In another example you may wish to measure if a project has reduced fear of crime on an estate. It is difficult to measure this directly but we can use a group or basket of proxy indicators, such as:

- The use of local facilities such as library, community centre etc.
- The level of trade in local shops
- The number of calls to the police to attend incidents on the estate.
- Whether local residents, when interviewed, say they feel safer.
**Initiative**
An alternative term often used to describe a project; this term in some cases may also refer to a number of concurrent projects.

**Inputs**
The resources that need to be dedicated to any project in order to achieve the desired outcomes. These can be financial, material or human for example staff time, printing costs, CCTV cameras.

**Intervention**
An alternative term often used to describe a project.

**Monitoring**
This is the process of continually assessing whether or not a project is achieving its targets and how or why it is doing it. Monitoring is also used to check whether the processes being used are working effectively.

**Moving averages**
A simple way of “smoothing” out the peaks and troughs in data to identify the underlying trend. In simple terms you take the first three pieces of data (for example 1994, 1995 and 1996) and average them out. You then take the second third and fourth piece of data (1995, 1996 and 1997) and average them. You then take the third, fourth and fifth piece of data (1996, 1997 and 1998) and average them and so on. In that way you “roll” through the data.

**Objective**
That which you wish to achieve through carrying out any project or initiative. In other words, a desired outcome, for example, reduce the level of anti-social behaviour in an area.

**Outcomes**
What you hope an intervention will achieve, for example a decrease in anti-social behaviour. Obviously this should relate to the overall objectives of the intervention.

**Outputs**
The tasks that are completed in order to achieve the final purpose of the project or desired outcome, for example distribution of crime prevention packs to residents, installation of a CCTV system. During the life of a project the outputs should be monitored to ensure that they are being delivered on time and within resource constraints.

**Period on period change**
A comparison of data in one period with data from another previous period, for example, data from March 2008 compared to data from March 2007.

**Prescribed Information**
The Prescribed Information Regulations 2007 No, 1831 outline a range of crime and disorder information that responsible authorities now have to share. You can find out more at [http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2007/uksi_20071831_en_1](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2007/uksi_20071831_en_1).
Problem Analysis Triangle (PAT)
A simple problem solving technique, which helps you to analyse any problem from the three main perspectives of offender, victim and location.

Problem-Solving/Problem-orientated approach
The problem solving approach has become the standard way of identifying and addressing crime reduction and community safety problems. It is based on the idea that you need to identify and focus on the root causes of crime and community safety problems in order to address them effectively.

Process evaluation
This approach has a focus on understanding what the systems, processes and interactions are of the intervention and whether or not they have supported or hindered the delivery of the project objectives.

Programme
A group or collection of projects.

Project
A series of activities that need to take place in order to address identified problems and achieve specific targets.

Proportional analysis
This provides a different perspective to summarised data and gives a slightly greater insight into the data through the use of percentages. The table below shows the data from the Cross Tabulation section above, in percentage terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rapid Evidence Assessment
A streamlined version of a systematic review, which can be less resource intensive and can be completed in a shorter period of time.

Realistic Evaluation
Built around the work of Nick Tilley and Ray Pawson, realistic evaluation is concerned with understanding causal mechanisms and the conditions under which they are activated to produce specific outcomes.

Realistic evaluation says that what works to produce an effect in one circumstance/context may not produce it in another. You therefore need to be aware of the context and circumstances in which the initiative is being operated.

At the heart of realistic evaluation therefore is the question “What works for whom and in what circumstances”. Traditional evaluations have tended just to ask the question “What works?”
**Summative evaluation**
A method of judging the worth of a project or intervention at the end of all activities.

**Systematic review**
A very structured and thorough review of existing literature, which focuses on a particular issue, and takes a comprehensive and systematic approach to the review of evidence.

**Qualitative Indicators**
Indicators that measure qualities, often quite intangible, such as perceptions or feelings of individuals, groups or communities. An example would be the level of fear of crime in the elderly in an area.

**Quantitative Indicators**
Indicators that measure tangible things or events, such as the number of burglaries or percentage of homes burgled in an area.

**Sampling**
The selection of a subset of the total population in an area. If you have to carry out surveys, using whichever method, it is highly likely that most of your surveys will involve assessing the views of a sample of the “population”. This is because it will probably not be feasible to survey the whole population either in terms of time, or cost.

For example, when trying to assess the views of people in a town centre about the CCTV scheme in the town, it is just not possible to obtain the views of everyone in the town at any one time.

The selection of the sample to be surveyed is crucial as it must be as representative as possible of the whole “population”.

**SARA**
One of the most commonly adopted problem solving models, it stands for:

- **Scanning**: An early review of clusters of similar, related or recurring incidents. From these one, or a small number of specific crime and/or community safety problems, are selected for further examination.

- **Analysis**: A detailed review of data to identify the underlying causes of the particular problem. This also makes use of another simple tool, namely the PAT triangle, which helps you to analyse the problem from the three main perspectives of offender, victim and location.

- **Response**: The activities designed to address the causes of the problem, as identified in the analysis.

- **Assessment**: The measurement of the impact of the response on the problem.
Targets
Objectives can be converted to targets so that progress towards their achievement can be measured and a common way of making sure that this happens is to make sure that they pass the SMART test. This means that they are:

- **Specific** – all targets should have specific outcomes e.g. reduce violent crime.
- **Measurable** – the outcome should be capable of being measured e.g. reduce recorded violent crime by 10%.
- **Achievable** – reaching the target can be done within the timescales, with the resources available.
- **Realistic** – targets should not be set too high e.g. 50% reduction in all violent crime by next week.
- **Timebound** – a timescale should be set for when the target is to be achieved. E.g. reduce recorded violent crime by 10% in the next 12 months.

You may also hear the acronym SMARTER, which suggests that targets should also be **Evaluated and Reviewed**.

Theory based evaluation
Theory based evaluation lays a strong emphasis on trying to understand the relationships between inputs and specific actions carried out in interventions and both the long and short term outcomes.

Trend analysis
Looking at data over a period of time, say a year or even longer, to look at how and if it is changing. This is often shown in graphical form.
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Key Contacts
Home Office Regional Research teams
These teams are sited in the regional Government Offices around the country. Phone numbers and contact points for your relevant Government Office can be found at www.gos.gov.uk.

The teams will also have details of local and regional researcher networks and key academic and training organisations in your region.