

5Is Framework – Master-list of task headings/subheadings

Version consistent with the 5Is book.

Ekblom, P. (2011) [Crime Prevention, Security and Community Safety Using the 5Is Framework](#). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

[5Is book prepublication version](#)

The [Word version](#) of this document uses the **navigator pane** <Ctrl+F> which enables the headings to be expanded/collapsed and jumped to for convenience.

Please note this is a suggested list only, and is intended to develop, differentiate and grow as knowledge-bases are populated and feedback from users and contributors refines it, [learning-engine](#) fashion. Feedback can be posted [here](#).

Where appropriate, links are made to the [Crime frameworks](#) website which holds full material on 5Is and the rest of my frameworks and definitions.

Graphic and spreadsheet versions of the headings are [here](#).

Paul Ekblom

December 2022

1 Intelligence

1.1 General social/geographical context to the problem

Broad background information on town/city where action is implemented, helping to complete the picture and to guide selection, including:

- 1.1.1 **Location/built environment including design and layout issues, and physical state (e.g. dilapidated).**
- 1.1.2 **Demographic including significant recent trends.**
- 1.1.3 **Historical and existing action covering crime prevention and wider social/economic services, projects and programmes.**

1.2 Initiation and demand

E.g. audits, emergent problems, referral and intake processes; external initiatives to mobilise the preventive agency and how to handle them.

1.3 The crime problem (or set of crime problems) that the project aimed to prevent

For presentational purposes this may be combined with 1.2, 1.4 and 1.5 covering initiation and demand, evidence and know-how of data collection and analysis.

1.3.1 Definitional issues and action frameworks

E.g. whether a crime, safety or other problem, an offender problem or case, an area problem.

1.3.2 Aspects of the crime problem, pattern of crime risk and its context. Selective reporting of:

- Types of *offenders* involved.
- *Modus Operandi*, tools, weapons, skills, 'script' and other *resources* used by the offenders.
- *Target goods* typically stolen or damaged.
- Target homes or business premises that were burgled.
- *Owners or managers* of the homes or goods.
- *Target persons* who were assaulted.
- *Immediate physical and social context* of the criminal events (type of street, shop, station etc).
- *Wider physical and social context* of the criminal events (town centre, residential area etc; demographic features e.g. social deprivation).
- *Wider crime and disorder context* in which the specific problem is addressed (draw for example on *Crime & Disorder Audit*).
- *Timing* of criminal events during the day, week or year.
- Whether crime problem recent or of long-standing.
- Whether *repeat victimisation* significant, and if so, any specific pattern of victims.

Note that *victims* can appear under several entries. Note also that some crimes are more complex and involve *multiple scenes* (e.g. steal getaway car, forge security pass, execute robbery, launder money). Where relevant, the '*flow chart*' of scenes should be described, and the features of each individual scene should be described, as above.

1.4 Evidence of crime problem – sources of information and analysis

1.5 The types of *information* that were collected to identify the crime problem, its consequences and causes, and the type of *analysis and causal diagnosis* done. For example:

- Crime pattern analysis (including measurement of repeat victimisation) based on victim surveys or recorded crime statistics, to identify existing patterns of crime risk.
- *Forecasting* from known patterns of risk in similar circumstances: for example, for proposed new housing estate.
- Analysis of *risk and protective factors for offending* a) in potential offenders' life circumstances and/or b) in geographical areas.
- Interviews with actual/potential offenders.

1.5.1 Describe *briefly* any relevant *technical issues* of reliability, validity, bias etc which may have significantly affected the crime picture obtained.

1.6 Know-how in data collection and analysis

1.6.1 Describe any special *difficulties and tradeoffs* encountered in collection or analysis, and any *innovative* approaches adopted.

1.7 Community safety and security: significant harmful consequences of crime problem/s to individual victims and offenders, families, communities or society, covering:

- Immediate effects including trauma, injury or financial cost
- Wider effects including fear, restriction of leisure, economic or domestic activity.
- Specific consequences for further offending, whether by offenders originally involved (e.g. drawing them into a criminal career) or crime propagation (e.g. stolen handbags enabling identity theft).

1.7.1 Describe whether these consequences:

- Fell on particular communities or sets of people.
- Whether these were specially *vulnerable*, or needed *help* to cope.

1.7.2 Existing *mitigation* actions.

1.7.3 Immediate causes, remote causes and risk factors for offending

Describe any identifiable causes of the criminal events; or any risk factors present and protective factors absent. It's *not* necessary to describe every cause – only those significantly relating to the intervention or determining the context for it to work. The causes below (and the Interventions in the next chapter) are based on the [Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity](#) framework (Chapter 9), though others can be used, e.g. Problem Analysis Triangle. An equivalent generic framework is needed for organising knowledge of developmental/career causes and interventions.

1.7.4 *Immediate* causes on the (potential) *offender* side:

- a. Criminality.

- b. Lack of resources to avoid crime.
- c. Readiness to offend.
- d. Resources for committing crime.
- e. Immediate decision to offend.
- f. *Presence* of offender in crime situation.

1.7.5 Immediate causes on the situational side:

- g. *Target* person, property, service, system or information.
- h. Target enclosure.
- i. Wider environment.
- j. Absence of crime preventers.
- k. Presence of crime promoters.

Dynamic configurations – interacting causes can include anything that brings the above individual immediate causes together such as victims’ or offenders’ lifestyles and routine activities and scripts

1.7.6 Remoter, area or higher-level causes can include:

- Criminal *careers* of offenders
- Criminal networks and organisations
- Criminal subcultures
- Criminal *markets* e.g. for drugs, stolen property
- Exclusionary processes
- Lack of *social capital/ collective efficacy* of a community to tackle problem

1.7.7 Multiple scenes/scripts

If the crime problem is complex, involving (e.g. obtain forged passport, open bank account...), it may be necessary to describe the causal preconditions for the offender/s to successfully complete each scene.

1.7.8 Risk and protective factors for offending

These are conditions in offenders’ earlier life, which are known (positive or negative) correlates of later offending, then used in predictive targeting of later cohorts of potential offenders. They cover various ecological levels:

- Individual
- Friends/peers
- Family
- School

- Community

1.7.9 Needs of individual offenders/those at risk of offending

May be important to record if the action is welfare-oriented.

1.7.10 Evidence of causes

E.g. offender interviews covering crime situations/opportunities, provocations, motivation and perhaps developmental history; surveys/analyses of risk and protective factors; site visit.

1.8 Aims and aim-setting – at planning stage

1.8.1 Nature and priority of aims

Should be expressed in the same terms as descriptions of the crime problem, and/or ultimate outcome measures under Impact. Statement of any quantified crime reduction targets. *Scope of action* can be defined using CCO components for example ‘reducing (say robbery) against particular targets, in particular environments, committed by specific types of offenders, using particular MOs’.

1.8.2 Nature of any consultation to set aims, and consultation methods worth reporting for audit and/or for knowledge management purposes.

1.8.3 Nature of any climate-setting activities relating to establishing acceptance and understanding of the objectives, managing expectations, reconciling aims with initial demand etc.

2 Intervention

Interventions are *how the action works, what is done and why*: the causal *principles* and practical *methods* that could be applied to block, disrupt or weaken the causes of criminal events or the risk factors, and strengthen the protective factors, in the service of some crime prevention, security or community safety *aim*. An important distinction is between describing the Intervention task stream as a *process*, and describing the individual interventions as plans or designs which are the *product* of that process, to be passed onto Implementation and Involvement. Depending on the structure and scale of the project it will be necessary to adjust the balance between top-down description of the intervention strategy as a whole, versus bottom-up description via the individual interventions that it comprises.

2.1 Interventions in place prior to start of project

Brought forward from Intelligence; including:

2.1.1 Those focused on crime prevention.

2.1.2 Relevant actions with wider aims

E.g. educational or housing improvement programmes.

2.2 Overall intervention strategy

This is the key rationale relating the problem or case and its causes to the intervention strategy in support of the overall aims, drawing on the account of the design process as appropriate. In design terms, this amounts to a statement of ‘*correlation*’ – how the final design met the requirements and complied with evidence; how conflicts and tradeoffs were resolved, and risks managed and responded to, in the current context.

2.2.1 Aims:

A statement in outcome terms relating to crime prevention, community safety and or security criteria; and/or to wider criteria (such as educational attainment or social/economic regeneration) if applicable. It may be appropriate to justify the aims in relation to Intelligence on problem/s and causes; and to cite the origins of any priorities (e.g. central government policy, local consultation etc.).

2.2.2 Summary and explanation of how individual interventions contribute to the whole, in terms of

- Methods and principles as appropriate
- Whether, taken as a package, they reinforce, complement, synergise or interfere with one another (or at least are all necessary ingredients)
- Whether any *prior action* was replaced/abandoned, developed, embedded within wider strategy
- Description and justification of any *holistic* approach.
- Account of how any potential/actual *conflicts* were handled.

2.2.3 Any overview of *institutional context* (judicial, parajudicial, civil, combination) and the part this plays.

2.2.4 Design process for overall intervention strategy

In the case of a package of interventions this is where to document how the individual ingredients came to be fitted together to maximise synergy and efficiency and to minimise interference. In some programmes a strategic design process may be explicitly incorporated into the procedures of the delivering organisation.

For example, the [Communities That Care](#) programme provides a menu of evaluated interventions, a procedure for setting up local teams and a procedure for individual teams to select and match the interventions to local circumstances.

Methodology-level headings for describing the design process are mainly listed under the 'individual interventions' section below (2.5), but may be applied here too if appropriate.

2.3 Organisational context and working structure of interventions

2.3.1 Structure

Whether interventions are problem-oriented, a case-based service, a reactive response service (e.g. CCTV) etc. (Strictly an Implementation feature, this may be necessary to complete the picture of the intervention design and describe its context.).

2.3.2 Significant contributions to intervention mechanisms from the organisational context

E.g. the ethos on *responsibility* guiding the behaviour of the participants in youth centre, or systems of *reward and punishment*.

2.4 Describing individual interventions – content

Each individual intervention can be described in turn, with common content elements (though not necessarily a common format):

2.4.1 Aim:

Normally expressed in terms of the desired crime prevention, safety or security outcomes.

2.4.2 Method:

In terms of *practical action*, and the *institutional context* in which it operates (judicial, parajudicial, civil).

2.4.3 Principles which the methods are intended to realise:

Referring to theoretical frameworks such as the Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity, and lists or configurations of risk and protective factors.

2.4.4 Integration:

It may be easier to describe and/or supplement all the above in terms of free text proposing in more detail how both methods and principles interact with *context* to

trigger particular causal *mechanisms* operating at particular *ecological levels* (individual, family, community etc.).

Statements such as *the crime prevention outcome [Aim] is to be achieved by [particular principle/s] realised through [particular methods] which are customised to [this context], triggering [specific mechanisms]*.

2.5 Describing individual interventions:

Design process covering how and why both principles and method were selected, adapted or created to fit the requirement.

2.5.1 The requirements capture process

Especially the role of *evidence* deriving from Intelligence on the crime problem or criminality case, plus contextual information.

Implementation and Involvement may impose additional design requirements (for example for efficiency, and for appeal and acceptability to the local community) which may be incorporated here.

In evaluations conducted for strategic, theory- or programme-testing purposes, Impact assessment may make its own requirements on the design of interventions, such as a more easily-testable theoretically 'pure' intervention rather than one based on a combination of principles.

2.5.2 Idea generation, iterations, pilots and consequent improvements made; any use of design techniques; use of evidence of What Works in various forms and sources.

2.5.3 Issues of *co-design* with end-users

Such as residents: how they participated and what they contributed to the design process.

2.5.4 *Risks and tradeoffs* within crime prevention and with other domains of policy or practice:

What the choices were and how they needed to be customised to context.

2.5.5 *Undesirable 'system failure' consequences*

Including offenders' adaptive countermoves such as displacement and offender replacement; and the design responses to those consequences whether these were done in anticipation or as reactive corrections and adjustments.

3 Implementation

The content is to be structured and flagged to reflect and identify the particular arrangements for action. For example, some entries will cover implementation of individual preventive methods, others the project or service organisation as a whole.

3.1 The institutional and organisational contexts

3.1.1 Institutional settings:

[Civil, judicial and parajudicial](#), and any specifics (e.g. 'diversion of offenders from CJS') or cross-setting combinations (e.g. 'court makes referrals of offenders to civil youth centre').

3.1.2 Organisational arrangements:

Whether project or service is stand-alone, embedded in a particular organisation etc; whether action is part of a programme.

3.1.3 Important recent or current *transitions* in institutional or organisational context.

3.1.4 Infrastructure:

Training, guidance, data systems and so forth.

3.2 Mode of delivery

In particular, whether the action is a

- *Project* (generally focusing on a specific crime or safety problem)
- *Service* (generally dealing with a succession of individual cases) or
- *Capacity-building* only (such as training).

Issues of balance or transition between the modes. Free text descriptions will be needed of processes whereby projects become routine services or services generate projects.

3.3 Targeting (target-setting is under 3.7.1)

3.3.1 The *problem, behaviour or condition tackled* is described within the *aim* (stated under Intelligence-aims at 1.8).

3.3.2 The *ecological level of action*

E.g. whether it acts on individual people/places, families, communities.

3.3.3 The targeting strategy, focusing on

- The *basis of selection* including risk & protective factors, known causes, risk patterns (of people, hot-spots etc), or needs; and

- The principle of selection – *Universal, Selective* (e.g. at risk) or *Indicated* (e.g. convicted offenders, repeat victims).

3.3.4 The coverage:

Proportion of the total potential targets, that actually receive the intended intervention.

3.3.5 Targeting issues

E.g. net-widening and any efforts to avoid it.

3.4 Tailoring

3.4.1 Ways in which generic interventions are tailored, for example to individuals or to communities.

3.5 Lifecycle/s of action:

May cover individual intervention case, or entire life history project or service, as appropriate.

3.5.1 Describe

- *Initiation* (linking to 1.2 under Intelligence)
- *Execution* (including conception and definition; planning and scheduling) and
- *Exit* (including handover and closure).

3.6 The basic execution process: planned and achieved

3.6.1 Inputs:

- Running costs, capital costs, human resources, both dedicated and from *infrastructure*.
- Sources, constraints imposed, and support offered as part of context.

3.6.2 Process

3.6.3 Outputs

3.6.4 Practical implementation issues and solutions

3.7 Management, planning and organisational issues:

For individual interventions and/or for project/service level as appropriate.

3.7.1 Setting of aims and objectives

Including numerical targets: content, and how it was done.

3.7.2 Development, building and maintenance of human, material and informational capacity

3.7.3 Scheduling, progress monitoring and quality assurance of operations

3.7.4 Risk management

3.7.5 Structures of internal management

3.7.6 Structures of external management

3.7.7 Change management and wider issues of adaptive capacity

4 Involvement

4.1 Communication

Communication pervades the Involvement task stream and will need to be described at various points throughout the description:

- With whom, for what purpose/s, by what media and methods
- Successes and failures
- Obstacles, issues and tradeoffs, and how they were resolved in practice

4.2 Intelligence actions to guide and support Involvement processes:

Include

- Identifying *stakeholders/ dutyholders* to mobilise, and suitable *partners*
- What *motivates or demotivates* them
- What *enables or constrains*, including ‘human factors’ in influencing performance

4.3 Demand

4.3.1 Initiation:

Conceptually belongs here but often best described under main Intelligence task stream (see 1.2).

4.3.2 Recruitment of crime prevention for other aim e.g. economic regeneration

4.4 Partnership

4.4.1 Structural issues

- *Purpose* of partnership in outcome terms (e.g. reducing crime, increasing community safety, urban renewal)
- Whether partnership is *operational* (delivering interventions), *strategic* (providing environment in which interventions are planned, designed and delivered) or providing *infrastructure* (e.g. protocols for exchanging information or resources)
- *Composition* (which agencies/ individuals/ groups engaged) and *structure* including leadership, balance of power between member agencies, and whether operating on *multiple levels* (e.g. an operational team and a strategic advisory board)
- *Geographical scope*
- *Pooling of resources*: which agencies contribute what, how they complement or synergise

- *Governance* issues: responsibility, authority and accountability; inherent *structural strains* e.g. over welfare versus security or justice
- The *environment* of the partnership, which may include other agencies or partnerships; even higher-level strategic partnerships

4.4.2 Process issues:

- Practical *creation* of partnership: including intelligence for planning the partnership
- Creation and maintenance of partnership *climate*: including building mutual understanding and trust; handling differences of perspective, values and priorities of partner organisations (e.g. security v welfare)
- Handling *boundaries*, both geographical and of responsibility
- Which of the operational 5Is *tasks* the partnership undertakes; and *task-specific issues* such as codes of practice on information exchange, service-level agreements on handling offenders etc
- Partnership *operations*: how it works on a day-to-day basis, including inter-partner communications, decision-making and tactical coordination; partnership *management* (including performance management) and *leadership*
- The working *relationship* between tactical and strategic levels
- *Sustainability* of partnership
- *Dismantling or disengagement* of partnership

4.5 Mobilisation

4.5.1 For each agent mobilised to support the objectives of the project or service, supply the following information based on the [CLAIMED](#) framework:

- Who they *are* and what sort of *entity* (individual, group, organisation or community): including offenders mobilised through *outreach* to participate in their own treatment
- What *roles* they play, tasks they carry out, responsibilities they bear or decisions they take in implementing or supporting crime prevention, community safety or security: clarify whether they normally act as crime preventers (to be mobilised) or promoters (to be demobilised)
- Why they were especially chosen for the role (e.g. their competence, numbers, legitimacy) and how they were identified

Mobilisation methods, principles and theories:

- How they were *Alerted* to the part they could play in crime prevention (e.g. publicity, personal approach)
- How they were *Informed* about the problem or case, its nature, consequences and causes

- How they were *Motivated* (e.g. regulations, legal duty, self-interest, naming and shaming, incentives)
- How they were *Empowered* (e.g. capacity-building including training, equipment, information, guidance, money; legal powers; alleviation of constraints)
- How (if relevant) they were *Directed* (e.g. codes of conduct for confidentiality, performance standards, crime reduction targets)

Beyond initiation:

- *Sustainability* of mobilisation: issues and practices in maintaining participation, and specifically alertness, informedness, motivation etc
- How and why any mobilisation was *brought to an end*

4.5.2 Multiple mobilisations

- *Implementation chains*: how the various agents (and their tasks/roles) connect, ultimately to the 'business end' of the chain in influencing [preventers and promoters](#) in the [Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity](#)
- *Systems of involvement*: how diverse agents work *together* to execute and/or support intervention; or how an interlocking system of agents resistant to crime prevention was *disrupted*
- 'Gateway' mobilisations e.g. referral of client victim or offender to other agency: structure and process

4.5.3 Conflicts, constraints and issues (including ethical issues) in any of the above:

Their *nature* and how *resolved*.

4.5.4 Outreach

- *Who* is 'reached out to'
- By *whom*
- Using what *techniques*
- For what preventive *purpose*.

4.6 Consultation

- With *whom*
- Over what *issues* (e.g. crime prevention/priorities)
- By what *methods* and *media*
- At what *stage/s* in the planning and execution of intervention

4.7 Accountability

- With *whom* (internally or externally)
- Over what *issues* (e.g. crime prevention priorities, performance)

- By what *methods* and *media*
- At what *stage/s* in the planning, execution and review of interventions and the project or service as a whole

4.8 Building collaborative capacity

Actions prior to setting up specific partnerships or undertaking specific mobilisation exercises, intended to create, for example, a residents' or a traders' association or wider social cohesion, as a context within which specific interventions can be implemented, and specific agencies, groups, communities or individuals can be involved.

4.9 The wider climate of opinion in which the action was implemented

4.9.1 Describe

- Whether the local *climate* was initially *hostile/suspicious* or *supportive/accepting* of the preventive action
- How, if relevant, a *positive* climate was encouraged and a *negative* one dispelled
- Assess whether the *methods* of Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation and Involvement employed in the present action only work in a *supportive* climate

4.9.2 More generally, describe

- Other issues of *awareness, expectation and interest in the action*
- Issues of public *attitudes and beliefs* about the crime problem, to offenders and to community safety
- How these affected the *design and performance* of the action

4.10 Risks and blockages to and from Involvement

- Possibilities of *failure* or of undesirable outcomes: including aroused and disappointed expectations, stigmatisation, breakdown of trust, and exacerbated conflict
- How these are *identified and managed* are important practice knowledge

Impact & Process evaluation

5 Impact evaluation

5.1 Aims

5.1.1 Restatement of intermediate and ultimate aims of intervention, in terms of measurable outcomes

5.1.2 How they connect causally to the outputs of the intervention

5.2 Context of evaluation

5.2.1 Evaluation is internal or external to the implementing organisation

5.2.2 Evaluation is independent or not independent

5.2.3 Type of evaluators – academic, commercial consultant, practitioner

5.2.4 Formative or summative evaluation

5.2.5 Routine evaluation or a one-off exercise

5.2.6 Orientation – whether evaluation covered impact, process or both

5.2.7 Issues of achieving a climate of understanding and acceptance of impact evaluation with stakeholders

- In advance at planning stage
- Maintaining it during execution
- In retrospect when presenting results

5.3 Methodology of evaluation

5.3.1 Approach

E.g. Realistic, Theories of Change, Experimental, qualitative

5.3.2 Design

E.g. before-after x action-control (and perhaps how this relates to methodological quality scales e.g. Maryland scale)

5.3.3 Basic parameters such as

- Output measures
- Intermediate and ultimate outcome measures (e.g. self-reported offending, police recorded crime figures)
- Sample size and units (e.g. individuals, families, neighbourhoods), time periods

5.3.4 Statistical testing

Methods and their justification, power considerations etc

5.3.5 Problems, issues and tradeoffs in the above, and any practical resolutions worth sharing

5.4 Implementation and Involvement overview

This is where to report on successes and failures in Implementation and Involvement.

5.4.1 What were the *outputs* achieved by the intervention? Were planned output objectives met in terms of quality and quantity?

5.4.2 What were the *ingredients* of successful Implementation and Involvement?

5.4.3 What were the causes of *failure*?

Were they failures of Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation or Involvement and if so, of which subsidiary tasks?

5.5 Results of impact evaluation

The results of evaluations can be presented in headline form, alone or accompanied by an account in greater depth, showing the logic of inference between observation and conclusion. The following headings embody the latter alternative, building on questions suggested by [Ekblom and Pease](#) (1995).

5.5.1 Was there a statistically significant *change* in (intermediate or ultimate) outcome measures relating to crime, safety and other benefits? If so:

5.5.2 To what extent can this change be *attributed* to the outputs of the preventive intervention as opposed to background trends, coincidental events and ‘masking or mimicking’ effects such as increased reporting of crimes, regression to the mean and maturation?

Depending on the sophistication of the evaluation this can involve simply relying on a ‘control’ design, presenting a few elementary cross-checks or a thorough exploration of alternative explanations.

5.5.3 With multiple sites and/or individuals studied, were the effects confined to *subsets* e.g. only to highly-cohesive areas, or only to offenders with supportive families?

5.5.4 Were there any *adaptive reactions* to the intervention

E.g. by offenders showing diffusion of benefit, displacement, longer-term evolution of countermoves and offender replacement (i.e. arrest Mr Big the drug dealer and Mr Notsobig takes his place)? Did other parties adapt such as potential victims showing ‘conservation of risk’ (for example relaxing their guard on where to park, in the belief that their immobiliser would protect their car from theft)?

5.5.5 How did the intervention *work*?

By what *mechanisms* and dependent on what *contextual contributions*? Were the latter *essential* or did they merely *boost* impact?

5.5.6 With multiple interventions, which ingredients were *essential* to any impact? Which *boosted* impact?

5.5.7 Were there *harmful side effects*:

- On crime and safety (e.g. the intervention made another crime type easier, widened the net for involvement of young people in criminal justice system or increased fear or inconvenience);
- Beyond (e.g. conflicting with other policy aims such as sustainability or inclusion)?

5.5.8 Were there any *beneficial side effects*?

- Did these come from the Intervention method itself or from Implementation and Involvement actions? Assembling a cumulative list of possible harms and benefits can facilitate designs of future interventions and future evaluations.
- In *improvement* terms, did the trial suggest how harmful side-effects could be reduced or avoided and benefits increased?

5.5.9 How big and how cost-effective was the *gross attributable change*? The attributable change *net* of offender adaptations and other side-effects on crime?

5.5.10 How did these changes translate into *benefits*?

At the very least the public and private cost-savings on crimes prevented, and perhaps knock-on benefits of education or area regeneration?

Approaches to identifying and quantifying costs and benefits were systematically elaborated in the UK's Crime Reduction Programme 1998-2003.

5.5.11 How *durable* or *sustainable* was the impact?

Did investigation of mechanisms indicate likely durability of *Intervention* (e.g. CCTV that works by arrest and conviction may have a longer lasting effect than if it worked by merely deterrence); and sustainability of *Implementation* (e.g. how long could payment of extra police overtime be maintained?) or *Involvement* (e.g. would neighbourhood watch members lose interest if crimes were rare)?

5.5.12 If there was *no* significant change in the intended direction in the outcome measures, was this attributable to failure of Impact evaluation, Implementation and Involvement, Intervention or Intelligence?

- And to specific, subsidiary tasks within each of these, interpretable through process evaluation or at least process monitoring)?
- Are any of these susceptible to *improvement*?

5.5.13 How far did the intervention meet its *aims* and any *targets*?

5.5.14 What were the *limitations* on performance and how might these be alleviated through *improvements*?

5.6 Wider performance/selection measures

5.6.1 How *responsive* and *scalable* to crime/safety problems was the action?

5.6.1.1 *Prioritisation of community safety action in terms of severity of consequences of crime/safety problems (and perhaps in line with wider policy targets).*

5.6.1.2 *Accurate targeting*

- On *needs* of victim and wider society – intervening universally or selectively as appropriate
- On *causes* of crime/safety problem – intervening at appropriate levels from local to international.

5.6.1.3 *Coverage on the ground, in terms of what proportion of a given crime problem the policy aims to tackle.*

5.6.1.4 *Scope, in terms of the range of different crime problems tackled.*

5.6.2 Over what *timescale* did the Implementation occur, did the Intervention take effect, did the Impact reliably become apparent?

5.6.3 How *legitimate* or *acceptable* were the preventive actions, within the wider population, within minority subgroups, or even among offenders?

5.7 Learning on evaluation methodology

5.7.1 If the evaluation was inconclusive, was this due in some way to failure of the design or execution of the evaluation (*Impact or measurement failure*)?

5.7.2 What can be learned on *evaluation methodology itself*?

- Things which worked, which failed or were too expensive in relation to the benefit to knowledge?
- Significant unresolved uncertainties?
- Trade-offs e.g. between increased statistical power from measuring in more sites, and quality of implementation?
- Solutions to this and other methodological problems?
- Practical issues of cost, human resource input and timing (time to implement, time to take effect, time for effect to be measurable)?

5.8 Process evaluation

The headings of process evaluation aren't intended to appear in one single location in a 5Is description but to *reappear* at points throughout the various task streams wherever it is appropriate and convenient to present evaluative findings. The listed headings, therefore, don't follow the same number format as the rest.

- a. *Success and failure* of implementing each task, including whether any numerical *targets or quality standards* were met or not met
- b. Whether the task, if successfully implemented to adequate quality, delivered the desired *result*. This could be an *internal* result passed to the next task, or an *output* to the external world
- c. Whether the task engendered positive or negative *side-effects* in *crime or other spheres*
- d. The *enablers and constraints, conflicts, tradeoffs and synergies, collaboration and competition* behind the successes and failures of implementation and its result; how these issues related to the *context* of the action described
- e. How the process problems encountered were *resolved or avoided*, how benefits were *capitalised on* and failures *coped with*
- f. Generic qualities of implementation such as *adaptability and improvement, responsiveness and deliverability*
- g. Existing *benchmarks* applied and/or new ones indicated
- h. Task-specific *techniques* for evaluating and quality-assuring particular processes (e.g. mentoring)

Generic aspects of process evaluation which aren't task-specific may also require documentation.

- i. Overall methods of process evaluation/quality assurance themselves (e.g. observation, interview, document analysis) and how rigorous they were
- j. The relationship between evaluators and practitioners, including independence and whether formative/summative evaluation

These will normally be covered under Impact evaluation (e.g. 5.2-5.3) especially in instances involving external evaluators, since the same team usually cover process and impact.