

---

This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.  
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

## Funding and implementing crime reduction initiatives

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

© HMSO

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Bullock, Karen, Graham Farrell, and Nick Tilley. 2019. "Funding and Implementing Crime Reduction Initiatives". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/788>.

# **Funding and Implementing Crime Reduction Initiatives**

**Karen Bullock, Graham Farrell and Nick Tilley**

The views expressed in this document are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy)

**RDS On-line Report 10/02**

## **Foreword**

This report describes some of the lessons learnt about problem analysis, project planning and implementation from a series of policing projects set up as part the government's three-year Crime Reduction Programme. The Crime Reduction Programme seeks to encourage crime reduction projects with potential and to learn from them lessons about how to be successful and how to avoid failure. The Targeted Policing Initiative (TPI) has funded 59 projects that seek to reduce crime through the use of problem-solving methodology and a range of these is being evaluated.

This report is based on evidence collected from a variety of sources that included systematic analysis of 97 proposals received for TPI funding and visits and visits to projects and feedback from evaluators. It concludes that the implementation of crime reduction projects is far from trouble-free. It identifies some of the common issues and problems encountered by those involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of projects. It provides a checklist of things to consider for those working in the field of crime reduction and for those running crime reduction initiatives.

**Carole F. Willis**

Policing and Reducing Crime Unit  
Research Development and Statistic Directorate  
Home Office  
August 2002

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution made by a large number of people at the Home Office to this report. In particular, thanks are due to Steve Wilkes, Verity Ridgman and Fiona Mclean. Graham Farrell would like to thank Perri Gottlieb for his assistance in data analysis.

PRCU would like to thank Professor Rob Mawby of Plymouth University and to Karen Swift, co-ordinator of Project Lilac for reviewing this report. Thanks also to Peter Homel for his comments on this report.

### **The authors**

Karen Bullock is a senior research officer in the Policing and Reducing Crime Unit Home Office.

Graham Farrell is an associate professor in the Division of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati and Associate at the Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science, University College London.

Nick Tilley is professor of sociology at Nottingham Trent University and is seconded as a consultant to the Policing and Reducing Crime Unit Home Office.

## **Background**

The aim of the Crime Reduction Programme (CRP) is to fund projects with the potential to reduce crime and to evaluate their progress to further develop the evidence base about which methods are most (and least) effective in reducing crime. The CRP includes several broad initiatives, for example Reducing Burglary, Violence Against Women and the Targeted Policing Initiative. The Targeted Policing Initiative has allocated £30 million in 58 projects aimed at reducing crime using a problem solving methodology.

Police forces, in conjunction with crime and disorder partnerships, were able to submit proposals for Targeted Policing Initiative funds through two rounds of competitive bidding. Projects were short-listed by a panel consisting of representatives from the Home Office and external consultants. Proposals for projects were expected to demonstrate systematic problem-solving methodologies. This meant providing evidence for and understanding of the problem to be addressed, and showing how the proposed interventions would reduce it.

## **Objectives of the study**

The objective of this study was to identify some of the general early lessons for crime reduction that are emerging from the Targeted Policing Initiative projects. Although the examples used relate to the Targeted Policing Initiative the lessons are applicable to most crime reduction projects.

This report is based on:

- Scrutiny of all the original bids received;
- Remarks made by the panels that short-listed projects for funding;
- Feedback from project visits by Home Office staff and academic advisors involved in developmental visits for the second round of competitive bidding;
- The results of the quantitative scoring process for the assessment of bids received for the second round of funding;
- Early formal and informal reports from those conducting evaluations; and,
- Discussions with colleagues, contractors and those at the sharp end of project planning and implementation.

## **Main results**

It is clear that the process of setting up and implementing crime reduction projects is not easy. Much effort and planning is required if projects are to achieve their stated aims but steps can be taken to maximise the chance of effective project implementation. The following five issues have been identified as important factors in the successful implementation of crime reduction projects:

- Problem identification and analysis;
- Development of interventions;
- Preparation of proposals;
- Implementing projects; and,
- Project evaluation.

## **Preparing and implementing crime reduction projects**

<b>Problem identification and analysis</b>	
Problems should be sufficiently identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensure that the problem is clearly identified and stated in the proposal</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify the project's aims and objectives</li> </ul>
Core preventive element should be targeted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interventions should focus on a specific aspect of the problem, such as geographical hotspots or repeat victimisation.</li> </ul>
<b>Development of interventions</b>	
Analysis should inform the intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain how the proposed intervention relates to the problem identification and analysis</li> </ul>
Interventions should be connected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the components of an initiative are related to one another</li> <li>Avoid simply providing a 'shopping list' of options.</li> </ul>
Justify the initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Look for supporting evidence for an initiative and include it</li> </ul>
Consult with partner agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify which agencies should have an input into the project</li> <li>Secure agreement to participate in project from agency at appropriately senior level</li> </ul>
Clarify the interagency components for a proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where more than one agency is involved, specify the commitment from each agency</li> <li>State which agency is responsible for each key task</li> </ul>
Be specific about the nature of the work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the contexts and mechanisms through which change will come about</li> <li>Be realistic about what can be achieved in relation to timescales and money available</li> </ul>
<b>Preparation of proposals</b>	
Identify appropriate expertise and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State who would be responsible for the initiative and who would do the work</li> <li>Ensure that they have the relevant experience</li> </ul>
Clarify development and implementation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an agenda or timetable for implementation.</li> <li>Demonstrate awareness of how long it might take to implement the project</li> </ul>
Avoid proposals that primarily request funding for staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where requests for staffing are included, state how these posts are to be sustained when the funding runs out.</li> </ul>
Ensure that proposals are supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make sure that they are signed by an ACPO member. Failure to do so implies there is a lack of senior support</li> </ul>
Proposals should be sent to the appropriate CRP initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think about the potential sources of funding and identify which is the most appropriate</li> </ul>
Use the application form (if there is one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep to the structure and content</li> <li>Make sure all the relevant issues are covered and information provided</li> </ul>
<b>Implementing projects</b>	
Securing funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow time for money to be released</li> <li>Don't underestimate how long it will take to</li> </ul>

	<p>secure funding even if your proposal for money is successful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please see CRRS paper 7 'Developing Crime Reduction Plans' for detailed information about this area.</li> <li>• Efforts should be made to recruit and retain analysts</li> </ul>
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that adequate time is allowed in project plan for training of staff</li> <li>• Remember that specialist courses often run infrequently thought the year</li> <li>• Training large numbers of people can be especially time consuming. Make sure that this is accounted for in the project plan</li> </ul>
Installation of equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't underestimate how long it will take to procure equipment. If there are tendering regulations on purchasing find out what these are and account for how long this will take</li> <li>• Find out if there are any rules regarding the purchase and use of equipment e.g. there is ACPO guidance on CCTV systems</li> <li>• Make sure that you know where the equipment is to be installed</li> <li>• Make sure that you have permission to install equipment early on</li> <li>• Ensure you know who is going to maintain and run equipment, even after the project funding has run out</li> </ul>
Multi-agency co-operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure aims and objectives of the projects are well explained and agreed by all partner agencies</li> <li>• Ensure all agencies know what they are doing and to what time scale</li> <li>• Ensure that there are nominated individuals within agencies responsible for ensuring that they deliver</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start thinking about sustainability at the earliest opportunity</li> <li>• Agree an exit strategy as soon as possible</li> </ul>
<b>Project evaluation</b>	
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects should where possible, facilitate evaluation by maximising availability of data</li> <li>• Evaluators, Home Office staff and involved agencies should discuss and agree forms of data that will be made available and collected. Ideally this should be agreed in advance or written into contracts, though project changes may require changes in the types of data that need to be used by the evaluator.</li> </ul>
Data protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues should be identified and resolved as early as</li> </ul>

	<p>possible, preferably before the project is agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All forces have a data protection liaison officer who would be able to advise projects on any potential breaches of legislation and clarify how they may be avoided in consultation with evaluators and, if necessary, the Home Office.</li> </ul>
Role of evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role that the evaluators will play in providing guidance for the projects should be agreed in advance.</li> </ul>
Attribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluators should be informed by the projects of any separate ongoing or planned crime reduction initiatives in the area as soon as possible, and of any other known developments that are intended to or might reasonably be expected to impact on the problem being addressed.</li> </ul>

### **Recommendations**

The study also has key lessons for those running initiatives designed to reduce crime, such as the Home Office, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, and other government departments. There are a number of changes that could be made to aid the implementation and administration of such initiatives.

- To speed up the time that it takes between projects submitting expressions of interest and receiving notification that they can begin the project.
- To recognise the time and effort that partnerships spend in preparing proposals.
- To give the police and partnerships longer to prepare proposals, so that good quality proposals can be achieved.
- To consider giving up-front payments to police services and their partners to cover the costs of putting proposals together.
- To consider how crime reduction is to be sustained, this includes strategies for achieving the long-term aims of crime reduction initiatives and their relationship with police and other sources of funding more generally.
- Together with the police, partnerships to consider how best to balance the need for centralised performance indicators and targets against the move towards the identification and solution of crime and disorder problems at the local level.
- To ensure that evaluators are appointed as near to the start of the project as is feasible to ensure that the monitoring data required are available early.
- To think about how the successful local projects can be mainstreamed across the country or how a national strategy can encompass a series of local initiatives.



# **Contents**

## **Foreword**

## **Acknowledgements**

## **Executive summary**

## **List of tables**

## **List of boxes**

### **1. Introduction**

The Crime Reduction Programme

Purpose of this report

The decision-making process relating to funding

Structure of the report

### **2. Analysing local crime problems**

Types of data used

Extent of analysis

Quality of analysis

### **3. Developing targeted responses and interventions**

Targeting interventions

Feasibility of proposed interventions

Expected impact of interventions

Sustainability of projects

‘Rolling-out’ lessons

### **4. Writing proposals**

Demonstrating competence and project implementation

Timetables

Application forms

### **5. Implementing targeted policing projects**

Keeping to timescales

Producing plans and securing funding

Other issues influencing effective implementation of projects

### **6. Evaluating crime reduction projects**

Meeting the data requirements of evaluation

Assessing the impact of projects

Other issues associated with evaluating crime reduction projects

### **7. Conclusions, recommendations for the Home Office and checklist for practitioners**

## **References**

## **Annex**

List of all projects funded from the Targeted Policing Initiative

## **Related RDS publications**

## List of tables

1. Sources of evidence used in the Targeted Policing Proposals
2. Appropriate analysis of evidence
3. Aggregate analysis
4. Typical example of poor analysis
5. Analysis expected in a high quality proposal
6. Problem analysis and responses
7. Targeting interventions to analysis
8. Examples of not very targeted proposals
9. Examples of likely feasible and non-feasible proposals
10. Feasibility of proposals
11. Examples of justifiable initiatives
12. Likely impact of proposed interventions
13. Sustainability scores
14. Examples of poorly conceived interventions
15. Developing proposals
16. Writing proposals
17. Timetable for targeted policing funding
18. Targeted policing rules
19. Examples of difficulties of recruiting
20. Retention difficulties
21. Interagency co-operation problems
22. Implementation summary
23. Avoiding data protection problems
24. Interventions for a project to reduce drug use
25. Summary of evaluation chapter
26. Preparing and implementing crime reduction projects checklist

## **List of boxes**

1. Common difficulties with multi-agency data sharing
2. Example of good use of multi-agency data
3. Targeted preventative mechanisms
4. Specifying the mechanisms of how crime will be reduced
5. Routes to sustainability
6. Showing technical competence
7. Timetables
8. The problem of competing aims
9. Common data problems impacting on evaluation
10. The roles of evaluators as used in the Targeted Policing Initiative

# **1. Introduction**

## **The Crime Reduction Programme**

The aim of the Crime Reduction Programme (CRP) was to fund projects to use and further develop the evidence base about what methods are most effective in reducing crime. The decision to fund the programme was informed by a review of existing research (Goldblatt and Lewis, 1998). This review identified lessons learned to date and knowledge gaps that the programme might usefully fill.

The CRP includes several broad themes<sup>1</sup>. Under each of these themes, diverse projects were supported financially. Up to ten per cent of CRP's funding was set aside for evaluation, though this was not spread evenly across all initiatives.

The Targeted Policing Initiative (TPI) allocated £30 million in 59 projects aimed at reducing crime using a problem-solving methodology. The specific issues addressed are diverse. The projects receiving support are listed in Annex A. TPI builds on approaches currently being developed in many police forces, in particular 'problem oriented policing' (POP) and 'intelligence-led policing' (for a discussion of these see Goldstein 1979, 1990; Leigh et al 1996; 1998).

Police forces, in conjunction with crime and disorder reduction partnerships, have been able to submit proposals for TPI funds through two rounds of competitive bidding. Projects were short-listed by a panel consisting of representatives from the Home Office and external consultants. Proposals for projects were expected to demonstrate systematic problem-solving methodologies. This meant providing evidence for and understanding of the problem to be addressed, and showing how the proposed interventions would reduce it. Development visits were made by Home Office staff and appointed academic advisors to all short-listed projects under round two to clarify and improve the information related to the nature of the identified problems and proposed interventions. These are shown in Annex A. External academics and consultants or Home Office researchers are evaluating a selection of the projects.

## **Purpose of this report**

This online report and the Crime Reduction Research Series document the development and implementation of the Crime Reduction Programme (see CRRS papers 1 and 7). All these publications are important for at least three reasons:

- they promote transparency and accountability in a process through which significant government monies are being invested in crime prevention efforts;
- formal documentation of the process indirectly introduces a form of quality control to the administrative processes of the Crime Reduction Programme; and,
- documentation provides a knowledge-base upon which future crime prevention efforts may draw.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reducing burglary, targeted policing, treatment of offenders, drug arrest referral, On-track (children and families at risk), intervention work in schools, locks for pensioners, domestic violence, vehicle licensing, youth inclusion, sentencing, neighbourhood wardens, design against crime, CCTV and tackling prostitution.

The more specific objective of this report is to identify some of the general early lessons for crime reduction projects that are emerging from the Targeted Policing Initiative. In particular it focuses on five issues:

- problem identification and analysis;
- development of interventions;
- preparation of proposals;
- implementing projects; and,
- project evaluation.

### **The decision-making process relating to funding**

The decision-making process for the funding of projects as part of national-level programmes is a complex process. The Crime Reduction Programme aimed to minimise arbitrariness in the decision-making process and to maximise equity and the likelihood that appropriate high quality projects would be funded.

By assigning scores to bids according to certain criteria, and using the resultant total scores as a platform for decisions relating to funding, the aim was to introduce consistency and equity to an exercise that otherwise risked the appearance of arbitrariness. A scoring scheme was devised to facilitate the assessment of each targeted policing bid according to principal criteria. The criteria related to a bid's qualities in data collection and analysis, problem analysis, the identification and formulation of targeted policing responses, as well as feasibility, expected outcome, and project sustainability. The total score accrued by a bid according to the various criteria was considered alongside a written qualitative assessment of a bid's overall contribution and likelihood of success. Part of this report documents the assessment of applications for funding that were submitted to round two of the Targeted Policing Initiative. As part of the review process, a scoring system was utilised to assess various components of each bid. In this report, data is presented in relation to 97 bids that were assessed in this fashion.

The scoring system was a key component of the decision-making relating to funding for round two. After the independent review and scoring process, bids were further reviewed by a panel of assessors from various arms of the Home Office together with independent consultants. These panels made the decisions on project funding. The panels considered the quantitative scores and the qualitative written assessments of proposals alongside other relevant criteria. These other relevant criteria primarily accounted for the fact that, since a key aim of the CRP is to develop a knowledge base by evaluating projects, all of the research eggs could not go in any one particular basket. The role of the panels was therefore to fund a programme of projects of high quality that had a balance of content appropriate to the national programme.

### **Structure of the report**

The next sections of this report present the results of the quantitative scoring process for the assessment of bids. This is followed by sections detailing early lessons learned in relation to implementation and evaluation. Remarks made by the panels that short-listed projects for funding have been used, as has the feedback from project visits by

Home Office staff and academic advisors involved in developmental visits. The original bids and revised proposals were scrutinised. Early formal and informal reports from those conducting evaluations have been brought together. The first and third authors were involved in project shortlisting, developmental visits and evaluation. Their experience in this, alongside discussions with colleagues, contractors and those at the sharp end of project planning and implementation, have informed the conclusions presented at the end of this report.

Section two of the report examines the ways in which crime problems were identified and analysed in proposals. Section three discusses the types of intervention suggested to tackle the identified problems. It considers the coherence and adequacy of the planned responses to the specified problem, and provides a checklist for those who may wish to apply for funds in the future. The fourth section looks at the means by which targeted policing proposals that have received funding have been implemented in practice. It highlights some of the practical difficulties encountered. Section five addresses issues that have arisen so far in attempts to evaluate the targeted policing initiatives. The final section draws together what has been gleaned so far from work on the Targeted Policing Initiative and describes adaptations made to the programme in the light of experience.

## 2. Analysing local crime problems

This section will look at:

- the types of data used in the proposals received for the targeted policing initiative
- the extent of analysis

Identifying the nature and extent of a local problem is essential if an intervention is going to stand a good chance of reducing crime. Detailed analysis is needed to define problems in ways that open them to creative and relevant responses (Read and Tilley, 2000). Proposals that do not adequately analyse problems cannot move to an appropriately informed intervention. Where there is no demonstrable understanding of a problem there is no reason to assume that a proposed intervention will have any impact.

The following discussion highlights problems in analysis commonly found in the proposals received for targeted policing funding. It considers first the data sources used and second the use of the data.

### Types of data used

The most common data source used in the targeted policing initiative proposals was police recorded crime statistics. Table 1 shows the numbers of sources of data included in 97<sup>2</sup> of the proposals received for funding.

**Table 1: Sources of evidence used in the TPI proposals**

Source of evidence	Frequency	Per cent
No evidence presented	13	13
Police data only	53	55
Police data plus one other source	24	25
Police data plus two other sources	7	7
Total	97	100

A third of the proposals scrutinised contained information from agencies other than the police. The lack of non-police data in two thirds is not surprising, but clearly led to difficulties. Problems of interagency data sharing have frequently been noted, and are summarised in Box 1. Additional, non-police data would have been useful but were missing from several proposals, including:

- probation data in respect of known offender attributes
- education data in respect of truancy and exclusions
- housing data in respect, for example, of disorder and incivilities
- accident and emergency data in respect of, for example, assaults.

---

<sup>2</sup> 97 were a selection of the 167 bids received

**Box 1: Common difficulties with multi-agency data sharing**

- Data protection
- Practical difficulties of exchanging data between different computer systems
- Lack of geocoding to a specific point or geocoding to differing boundaries. For example, police data are organised in beats and basic command units, whilst local authority data are by ward
- Failures to collect/record information
- Failure to code/enter information collected in standard ways

Box 2 gives an example of a proposal where problems of data exchange have been overcome for the purpose of the proposal. Data have been used from a variety of agencies. When viewed in isolation, police data can often misrepresent the extent and nature of specific issues. Not all crimes are reported to the police and not all crimes reported are recorded. Therefore, police recorded data should be examined in conjunction with other data sources (<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/p0306-table3.htm>).

**Box 2: Example of good use of multi-agency data****Analysis of closed drug markets and open sex market in Haringey**

A project seeking to reduce the number of crack houses and the level of prostitution and disrupt the link between the two.

**Police data contained information on:**

- Seizures of drugs
- Information on drug-related offending by ages, gender and ethnicity
- Drug-related crime by age, gender, ethnicity, time of the day, address, offender or victim

**Health authority data contained information on:**

- The numbers seeking treatment for drug dependency
- Growing complexity of market e.g. professional users
- Profiles of those using services by age, ethnicity, gender and drug of choice

**Benefits obtained**

- Multi-agency data helped to emphasise the scale of the problem. For example, police data showed that crack seizures had increased by 16 per cent whereas the health authority data showed a 30 per cent increase in crack use over two years.
- Health data enabled comparisons with police data set. For example, members of the black community are more heavily represented in arrest and offending statistics than they are in health authority referral figures. Similarly, males are over-represented at a higher rate in police data than they are in health authority data



Box 2 shows that by using police data alone the project would have underestimated the increase in crack usage. It may also have wrongly profiled their drug-using population as mainly black males. It may not have identified the links to the open sex market in these areas and the women involved, with the result that interventions would have been poorly targeted.

Using data from agencies other than the police can, then lead to a better understanding of a problem and the context within which it exists. In addition, a proposal that ultimately includes multi-agency interventions should normally include data from participating agencies, to show how their activities are relevant to the problem. Properly targeted projects need to demonstrate how the interventions involving agencies other than the police will impact on that problem.

Even here there is room for improvement. To gain a more in-depth understanding of the problem, interviews could have been conducted with drug agency staff or drugs users.

### **Extent of analysis**

The extent of analysis presented in the proposal varied greatly. Table two shows the amount of appropriate analysis of evidence presented in 97 of the proposals received. This was judged on the extent to which proposals:

- identified crime specific problems;
- used appropriate data;
- focused on the problem; and,
- demonstrated an understanding of the problem.

Proposals were given a score from zero to three, according to the amount of appropriate problem analysis that was evident. Hence a score of one was given where there was basic problem analysis, and a score of three suggests good problem analysis. Table 2 shows that insufficient analysis of the problem was a common problem, with 77 per cent of the proposals scoring zero or one.

**Table 2: Appropriate analysis of evidence**

Score	Frequency	Percent
0	30	31
1	45	46
2	19	20
3	3	3
Total	97	100

### **Why was analysis often insufficient?**

Proposals often focused on general problems or crime types such as ‘disorder’ or ‘drugs’ or ‘young people’ but did not analyse the specific nature of that problem. Problems are usually multifaceted, manifest themselves in a variety of ways and are caused by a range of factors. Few proposals unpicked the nature of the problem in any detail. For example, a proposal might state that there is a ‘drug problem’ but fail to describe the particular ways in which it was manifesting itself, such as in closed crack

houses, street level marijuana dealing, thefts from pharmacies, overt heroin injection, begging, over-prescribing by doctors, presence of syringes in streets and parks, and so on.

Although there were exceptions, few bids attempted to dis-aggregate the relevant statistical data. The result was that few proposals contained enough information about how often or where the problems occur.

**Table 3: Aggregate analysis**

<b>Poorly dis-aggregated data</b>		
<b>Crime type</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Why</b>
Violent crime	‘violent crime is a particular problem, up 18% across the force and 31% in the division’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No breakdown by type of violence, which could be domestic violence, robbery, alcohol-related assaults, gang related and so on</li> <li>• Different types of violence would require different responses</li> </ul>
<b>Appropriately dis-aggregated data</b>		
<b>Crime type</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Why</b>
Drugs	‘the closed drugs market as expressed through crackhouses has been a defining feature of the environment’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal has identified how the drugs problem has manifested itself</li> <li>• Proposed interventions are more likely to be tailored to the specific nature of the local problem than if the problem been identified merely to be one of ‘drugs’</li> </ul>

Inappropriate problem identification and analysis were also common. Sometimes a range of social and economic data was presented, which, while giving background information about the area, its characteristics and those of its residents, did not deal with the crime issue itself directly or explicitly. Inadequate evidence about the scale and attributes of a problem makes it difficult to warrant support for a project targeting it. Where there was no way of knowing whether the problem existed or whether the proposed initiative comprised the most promising response, funding was obviously difficult to justify.

**Table 4: Typical examples of poor analysis<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Analysis presented</b>	<b>What is wrong with this</b>
a) The policing area covers an <u>extensive section</u> of the inner city area. The area has a <u>high population</u> of local community groups who suffer from <u>social deprivation</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no information on the size of the area</li> <li>• It does not specify the size of the population who suffer from deprivation</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Taken from projects seeking to reduce antisocial behaviour

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be better if it specified the nature of social deprivation e.g. high unemployment, and demonstrated its direct relevance to the problem and practical ways of dealing with it</li> <li>• There is no evidence about antisocial behaviour either in terms of amount or what the behaviours consisted of</li> </ul>
b) There is a <u>considerable</u> amount of unemployment, especially youth unemployment and with the over 50s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the information given about the social characteristics of areas may be useful as background, it is vague. Figures should be provided to specify how much unemployment there is, its direct relevance to the problem, and practical ways of dealing with it</li> <li>• As above, there is no evidence about antisocial behaviour either in terms or amount or what the behaviours consisted of</li> </ul>
c) The area suffers with the <u>incessant</u> <u>problem</u> of <u>antisocial behaviour</u> being perpetrated by juveniles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no information on the scale of antisocial behaviour</li> <li>• It would be more useful if the proposal specified the nature of antisocial behaviour e.g. youths hanging around</li> </ul>

The following table summarises the types of information and analysis that would be expected in a good quality proposal.

**Table 5: Analysis expected in a high quality proposal**

	<b>What to include</b>
<b>Focused problem identification and analysis</b>	<p><b>A clear statement of the problem</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be specific about the type of crime that is being focused on</li> </ul> <p><b>Clear indication of the extent of the problem</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a clear statement of it</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence to show where the problems are located</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. what percentage of crime does this crime type account for?</li> <li>• Mapping of statistics to identify hotspots</li> <li>• Analysis of the extent of that crime in a BCU, beat or other identifiable area</li> <li>• Comparative data to indicate whether the problem in these areas is greater than in another</li> </ul> <p><b>An indication of who is victimised</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of risk factors</li> </ul> <p><b>Indication of who the offenders are</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of known offenders, ages, locations etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Are the data from the right sources?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are multi-agency data available?</li> </ul>
<b>Demonstration of understanding of the problem</b>	<p><b>What reasons are presented for the crime manifesting itself as it does?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews of relevant research and literature in the relevant field</li> <li>• Discussions with practitioners and agency staff</li> </ul> <p><b>What is it about a location that makes it a crime hotspot?</b></p> <p><b>Why are offenders focusing on that type of crime?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of criminogenic features of a location e.g. design</li> </ul> <p><b>Why are certain people more vulnerable?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of vulnerability of victims in terms of security of property and other characteristics such as age</li> </ul>

### 3. Developing targeted responses and interventions

This section will look at:

- Targeting interventions at problems
- The feasibility of interventions
- The expected impact of approaches
- The sustainability of interventions

#### Targeting interventions

To be targeted, the preventive ‘grease’ of an intervention must get to the crime ‘squeak’ (cf. Farrell and Pease, 1993; Hough and Tilley 1998). This means that the interventions must focus not simply on a given crime or high crime area, but on some identified and significant aspects or attributes of the problem where crime is concentrated. For example, within geographical hotspots, it might make sense to target repeat victims, hot products, or known repeat offenders (Pease, 2000; Clarke, 1999). Without specifying how the intervention is expected to have its effect by tackling a significant driver of the problem, a proposal is unlikely to be sufficiently focused and thus to use resources efficiently. Even if the preventive mechanism proposed is potentially strong, it must be shown to be targeted and to reach a specified and substantial element of the problem.

#### Box 3: Targeted preventive mechanisms

##### **Reducing absconding from children’s homes, an example of a well-targeted intervention**

##### **Specified and substantial problem**

Children in the community homes represent a disproportionate percentage of those reported to the police as missing. Thirty per cent of young people reported as missing are from community homes, though they represent only one per cent of the population.

##### **Targeted at**

High risk children in the looked after system

##### **Preventive mechanism**

Diversionary activities in evenings and weekends, when they would otherwise have been unsupervised to prevent children absconding.

Good project proposals identify relevant appropriate responses to their analyses which are well defined, targeted and address problems from a number of angles. The proposal may, as Table 6 shows, identify and address the problem using a variety of tactics in terms of the location, victim and offender. Table 6 shows how features of problem analysis can be aligned with specific features of the response. The first column shows the problem analysis; it shows why the problem is considered to exist.

The other columns show features of the response and how they specifically relate to the features of the analysis.

**Table 6: Problem analysis and responses**

<b>Problem 1:</b>			
<b>High levels of youth antisocial behaviour on an estate</b>			
<b>Problem analysis</b>	<b>Proposed responses</b>		
	<b>Location</b>	<b>Victim</b>	<b>Offender</b>
Housing allocation policy resulted in unusually high numbers of young people in a small estate	Discussions with housing department to consider changes to housing allocation		
Poor estate layout e.g. no gardens for the larger flats meaning young people using communal areas	Changes to layout of the estate including e.g. changes to individual access, target hardening		
Estate in poor physical condition	Clean up of estate		
Older residents feeling vulnerable		Target hardening and advice for victims	
Few opportunities for young people			Diversion schemes
<b>Problem 2:</b>			
<b>High level of bike theft in city centre hot spot</b>			
<b>Problem analysis</b>	<b>Proposed responses</b>		
	<b>Location</b>	<b>Victim</b>	<b>Offender</b>
High level of bike usage and insufficient secure parking	Installation and maintenance of bike stands		
Acceptance amongst population that bike theft is 'part of life'		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Registration system to improve recovery rates</li> <li>Publicity</li> </ul>	
Volume and prolific offenders taking advantage of high number of bikes			Dedicated bike squad to identify and disrupt prolific offenders

Table 7 (below) indicates that a common problem in the targeted policing initiative was that analysis was not adequately used to inform the identification of an appropriate intervention and as a result many proposals were not sufficiently targeted.

**Table 7: Targeting interventions to analysis**

Score	Frequency	Percent
0	34	35
1	26	27
2	29	30
3	6	6
4	2	2
Total	97	100

Proposals were scored on a scale of zero to four according to how well targeted they were, with zero being not at all targeted and a score of four being very well targeted (a rare occurrence).

**Table 8: Examples of insufficiently targeted proposals**

Crime type	Suggested intervention	Problem	Suggestion
Burglary	‘Every household will be given a uniformed police officer and given an ultra violet marker pen...’	Visiting every household is resource intensive and expensive	Target high-risk households – e.g. those victimised once, the elderly, students <sup>4</sup>
Rural crime	‘The mobile police station will be tasked to make personal contact with as many members of the public as possible...’	This is expensive and not necessarily getting to those most at risk	Identify and target crime hotspots and where fear of crime is high

Unless well targeted, an intervention is unlikely to use resources effectively or to channel measures to the specified problem and its identified causes.

It was quite common for a string of interventions to be included in a proposal. Quite frequently, the suggested interventions seemed to relate neither to the analysis presented, nor to each other. The implication is that a ‘shopping list’ of options was provided and that not enough thought was given to problem identification or analysis (please see Table 14 for an example).

### **Feasibility of proposed interventions**

It is one thing to identify an intervention in principle that, if implemented, might reasonably be expected to have a significant impact. It is another to show that it is

---

<sup>4</sup> Research shows that victimisation is a good indicator of further victimisation and that students and the elderly are sometimes at relatively high risk of victimisation. However, a strongly targeted proposal would conduct analysis to check if this was the case in that locality.

feasible, and that it can be turned into action on the ground. Changing the composition of a housing estate, abolishing unemployment, wiping out racial prejudice, for example, might all be worthy and germane to some local problems. Their attainability within the scope of a targeted policing project is, though, questionable.

Table 9 gives details of a few of the proposals that were received, some of which were probably achievable and some of which were probably not.

**Table 9: Examples of feasible and non-feasible proposals**

Problem	Scale of interventions	Time and resources	Feasibility	
			Feasible?	Why
Drug dealing	Over 20 diverse interventions focused on a hot spot in central London	18 months and over £2 million	Probably	Adequate resources and well targeted at a relatively small location
Antisocial behaviour	Three main interventions on a small suburban estate (200 homes).	18 months and £30k	Probably	Small resources but small, well targeted focus and small number of interventions
Vehicle crime	15 main components over a force-wide area	18 months and £60k	Probably not	Far too ambitious for the geographical areas and the amount of resources
Alcohol-related crime	A large and ambitious force-wide project focusing on what was identified as a big problem, and a number of interventions	£544k and 18 months	Probably not	£544k is not a lot for a force-wide project, if the scale of the problem was of the size identified

It was clear that there needed to be a match between the size of the proposal (in terms of geographical area covered, numbers of offenders diverted, number of interventions proposed and so on) and the time-scales and proposed resources. Where the scale of the intervention was large and/or diverse but the resources allocated very small or timetable very tight, it is likely that the proposal was too ambitious.

Proposals that contained interventions that were too ambitious for the likely timescale and resources available were quite common. Table 10 shows assessment of the feasibility of 97 of the proposals received. Proposals were scored from zero and five, zero being awarded when the proposal was not deemed feasible at all and five when it was almost certainly feasible. The table shows that proposals frequently scored low marks on feasibility of implementation.

**Table 10: Feasibility of proposals**

Feasibility score	Frequency	Percent
0	27	28
1	26	27
2	27	28



3	14	14
4	3	3
Total	97	100

A significant mismatch between the resource requirements and available resources implies that the proposal has not been given sufficient preparatory consideration.

### Expected impact of interventions

Good proposals produced evidence justifying the proposed interventions. Such proposals were able to explain why a particular intervention would have an impact on the identified problem. Relevant justifications could include reference to previous evaluated projects showing success and an explanation of similarities to the proposed project's problem and its circumstances. They typically included an explanation of the theoretical premise of the intervention and the supporting empirical evidence. Such proposals may also have included background knowledge of previous or related policing initiatives together with evidence on why they were successful. Good proposals would typically lay out how and why the measures would be expected to have their intended outcomes. Several of the successful projects demonstrated a consideration of the potential side-effects of the interventions, such as the potential for displacement. Few projects described the potential for the 'diffusion of crime control benefits' (see Clarke and Weisburd, 1994), suggesting that this concept is still to enter mainstream policing in the UK, this would have been another sideeffect relevant to this category.

**Table 11: Examples of justifiable initiatives**

Problem	Proposed intervention	Justification
Domestic violence	Graded response based on identification of repeat victims and offenders	Research has consistently shown that, once victimised, people are likely to be victimised again (e.g. Hamner, 1999)
Antisocial behaviour	Target hardening for victims of antisocial behaviour	Research shows that, when appropriately tailored to the situation, target hardening reduces crime through reducing opportunity for it (Clarke, 1997)

Table 12 shows the likely crime prevention impact of the proposals. The scores were on a scale of one to five and scoring was based primarily on analysis of the proposed preventive mechanisms. Again, proposals received usually received low scores and 60 per cent scored either nothing or one.

**Table 12: Likely impact of proposed interventions**

Impact score	Frequency	Percent
0	31	32
1	27	28
2	25	26
3	12	12
4	1	1

	5	1	1
Total		97	100

Box 4 presents three proposed interventions and shows how the anticipated change mechanisms and their expected outcomes are related to the context in which the local problem manifested itself. In a fully developed proposal, these accounts of how the project was expected to work would need to be supported by evidence of the nature of the problem and its conditions, as well as, where possible, by references to relevant previous research findings.

#### **Box 4: Specifying the mechanisms by which crime will be reduced**

##### **Enforcement measures e.g. increased, targeted patrolling**

Increased visibility of uniformed officers (the intervention) at 'hot' times and places where behaviour is overt (the context), through incapacitation/increased perceived risk and disruption (potential mechanisms) is expected to lead to a reduction in visible crime and disorder while police are there (the expected intended outcome). One side-effect may be the displacement of some of crime and disorder to other places and times (potential unwanted and unintended outcome) as more determined offenders look for substitute criminal ways of attaining their ends (mechanisms). A second side-effect may be the extension of impact beyond the patrol area (outcome) if its boundaries by time and space are uncertain (context), as potential offenders misconstrue the times and spaces where crime will be too risky or difficult for their comfort (mechanism).

##### **Situational measures e.g. CCTV**

Well-signed, continuously monitored and operated pan tilt and zoom CCTV with high quality recorded images (the intervention) is introduced in areas with clear lines of sight where vulnerable targets and prolific offenders are concentrated (the context). Through incapacitation/increased perceived risk to offenders and greater caution on the part of potential victims (potential mechanisms), reduced potentially observable and recordable crime is expected (the intended outcome). One side-effect may be the displacement of potentially observable crime to similar offences in nearby, similar areas (unintended, unwanted outcome) as potential offenders look for alternative less risky targets for the same crime (mechanism). A second side-effect may be the displacement of crimes to those that cannot be observed in the target area (unintended unwanted outcome) as potential offenders look for alternative, less risky crimes (mechanism). A third side-effect may be reduction of crimes that cannot be observed by CCTV (outcome) as potential offenders avoid operating in an area deemed overall to have become too risky (mechanism). A fourth side-effect may be the reduction of crime beyond the operational limits of the CCTV system (outcome) as offenders misconstrue the range of its capacity to recognise or misidentify them committing crime (mechanism). Over time the outcome-patterns may change (outcome pattern) as offenders become more familiar with the system and its capacities, and adjust their criminal behaviour and MOs accordingly to bring perceived risk within acceptable limits (mechanisms).

##### **Provision of treatment services e.g. drug referral unit**

A well-staffed reputable round-the-clock drug referral unit providing counselling, treatment and supervised prescribed drug-taking (the measure) is established in a readily accessible building in an area with a high volume of crime and disorder that is drug-related (the context). Through reduced dependency on the illicit drug suppliers (mechanism), it is expected that the local market will be undermined and shrink (intended outcome). Through counselling, treatment and supervised prescribed drug-taking (involving a host of mechanisms) reduced dependency on drugs is expected (intended outcome). Reduced demand for illicit drugs lessens the need for money to buy them (mechanism), so less acquisitive crime is expected (intended outcome).

When it comes to identifying justifiable interventions, there are some useful sources of help. The Home Office makes many publications freely available on the Research Development and Statistics website<sup>5</sup>. There is also much potentially relevant information related to problem-oriented policing and crime reduction. Failure to demonstrate any knowledge of the substance of these sources was an indirect indicator that the background to the intervention had not been thoroughly researched.

Proposals were required to provide sufficient detail about the nature of the planned work. It was common for proposals to fail to specify the exact nature of the intervention. For example, proposals may state that ‘treatment services’ would be provided or ‘youth work’ undertaken without saying what this means. Such activities could vary greatly in their content.

### **Sustainability of projects**

The intention was for projects to be sustainable, if proved to be effective, after the initial experiment was concluded because there is a risk that any benefits the project achieved would be lost when the grant ran out. This is especially the case when a project is spending most or all of its money on salaries, though almost all interventions will require some continuing inputs, for example on maintenance, to sustain the measures put in place. Reflecting the fact that there are many preventive interventions that impact on crime, there are also many tactics that a project could seek to sustain the impact of a project beyond the period of funding. In addition, there are a number of strategic and organisational strategies that might improve sustainability.

#### **Box 5: Routes to sustainability**

<b>Specific tactics to sustain crime reduction projects</b>	
<b>(A) Changing the physical environment</b>	
Access control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alley gates</li> </ul>
Deflecting offenders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road layouts</li> </ul>
Controlling means	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ID cards</li> </ul>
Identifying property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registration schemes</li> <li>• Property marking</li> </ul>
Removing inducements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quick clean up of graffiti</li> </ul>
Rule setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enforcing tenancy agreements</li> </ul>
Surveillance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• installation of better lighting</li> <li>• defensible space</li> <li>• CCTV</li> </ul>
<b>(B) Organisational/strategic issues to address</b>	
Effecting (cost-free) changes to routine patterns of work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing awareness of a problem</li> <li>• Improving understanding of problems</li> <li>• Changing cultures</li> </ul>
Ploughing back savings into	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings gained through reducing the</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pubsintro1.html>

sustained new service-delivery	amount of police activity in relation to a problem could be identified and this money set aside for the project
Triggering the start of spirals of improvement and crime decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved quality of life in an area</li> </ul>
Strategies requiring reducing input over time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broken windows initiatives</li> </ul>
Assignment of mainstream funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repeat burglary quick repair and upgrade service</li> </ul>
Applying for other grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single Regeneration Budget (SIB)</li> <li>Communities Against Drugs (CAD)</li> <li>New Deal for Communities (NDC)</li> <li>Safer Communities Initiative (SCI)</li> </ul>

The intention was to fund projects that would prove to be sustainable after the initial term of funding by the Home Office, providing they were effective. Table 13 shows the scores received by 97 proposals for sustainability. Zero was awarded to proposals with no realistic prospects that effects would be sustained and five to proposals that were highly sustainable.

**Table 13: Sustainability scores**

Sustainability score	Frequency	Percent
0	45	46
1	26	27
2	16	16
3	8	8
4	1	1
5	1	1
Total	97	100

The table shows that low scores for sustainability were common, with 73 per cent scoring zero or one. Few projects were evidently self-sustaining and it was unusual for proposals to include plans for long-term sustainability. In many cases, the bulk of the funding required was for additional staff. Seldom was there any firm evidence that funding for these posts would be obtained from other sources beyond the term of the project, or that the project would no longer need funding for its expected effects to be maintained. Where there was little else to projects other than additional staffing, any benefits might be expected to disappear at the end of this funding. The few projects that did include information about how they might be sustained relied on either:

- the project being successful and incorporated into main stream funding; or,
- the securing of additional grant funding – such as SRB – to continue support for the project when the money ran out.

### **‘Rolling out’ lessons**

An initial aim of the CRP was to identify good practice and to roll it out later. The typical absence of mechanisms to sustain projects does, however, raise some important problems for projects, agencies and central government. Proposals for

projects need to address issues of sustainability. More thought needs to be given to how lessons can be rolled out and projects sustained in the absence of any money. Ideally, good practice should be absorbed into routine police practice, rather than project managers becoming adroit at tapping into a range of sources of funding which may eventually dry up. A briefing note on the lessons learned about rolling out crime reduction projects is being prepared and will be available later this year.

Table 14 shows the ways in which interventions included in various proposed projects revealed the kinds of weakness outlined so far in this report.

**Table 14: Examples of poorly conceived interventions**

<b>Problem identification</b>	<b>Example proposed intervention</b>	<b>What is wrong with it?</b>
Vehicle crime	‘Other <u>measures</u> via education, probation and youth offending teams would <u>address identified</u> persistent offenders by <u>new innovations</u> and <u>develop and enhance</u> crime prevention education.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly defined interventions</li> </ul>
Youth crime	a) Diverse tactics b) Protective behaviour c) Increase access d) Creation of youth panels e) Restorative scheme f) Enforcement through legislation g) Introduce 50 youth shelters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed interventions read like a diverse shopping list rather than a co-ordinated programme</li> <li>• There is no supporting evidence regarding their likely effectiveness</li> <li>• None of the array of poorly defined interventions has been properly developed</li> </ul>
Youth crime	Drug awareness scheme in schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No supporting evidence regarding the scheme’s likely effectiveness was specified. The best available evidence on the DARE programme in the USA shows that it has little if any impact upon illicit drug use (see Rosenbaum et al, 1998; Lyman et al, 1999).</li> </ul>

Table 15 presents a summary of the main points raised this chapter.

**Table 15: Summary of preparing proposals chapter**

Problems should be sufficiently identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the problem is clearly identified and stated in the proposal</li> <li>• Specify the project’s aims and objectives</li> </ul>
Core preventive element should be targeted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interventions should focus on a specific aspect of the problem such as geographical hotspots or repeat victimisation</li> </ul>
Analysis should inform the intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain how the proposed intervention relates to the problem identification and analysis</li> </ul>
Interventions should be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how the components of an initiative are</li> </ul>

connected	<p>related to one another</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid simply providing a ‘shopping list’ of options</li> </ul>
Justify the initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look for supporting evidence for an initiative and include it</li> </ul>
Clarify the interagency components for a proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where more than one agency is involved, specify the commitment from each agency</li> <li>• State which agency is responsible for each key task</li> </ul>
Be specific about the nature of the work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the mechanisms through which interventions are expected to have an impact</li> <li>• Be clear what a particular intervention entails in practice</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of how the project will be sustained once the initial grant runs out</li> </ul>

## 4. Writing proposals

The only information that potential funders receive about a project is what is specified in the proposal. It is important to get it right. Even those planning a project who are not seeking funding should consider the following points, especially if, for example, they have to prepare a business case. In any case, it is good practice to consider the points outlined in this section.

### **Demonstrating competence and project implementation**

In round one and round two, application forms for Targeted Policing funding were sent to all Chief Constables and were available on the Home Office crime reduction web site. Proposals were required to demonstrate technical competence. In addition, it is important to be clear about who was going to conduct the proposed work. Proposals should identify who would be responsible for ensuring that key tasks are implemented. Where projects involve a range of partner agencies, it is good practice to specify the level of support gained, especially whether they had understood and agreed to do this work. For example, a proposal seeking funding for a restorative justice scheme sought the support of the local mediation service early on. The mediation service offered the project session time and this was documented in the proposal.

It was often far from clear that the applicants had the expertise or experience in the designated area, or who would take responsibility for managing the project, or whether the necessary co-operation from other agencies would be forthcoming.

Box 6 shows a fairly typical example of problems encountered. The proposal was for 50 youth shelters. As indicated, key questions had not been addressed.

### **Box 6: Showing technical competence**

This project proposed the establishment of 50 youth shelters to help reduce antisocial behaviour. The introduction of 50 youth shelters would require special undertakings. For example:

- Where would the youth shelters be located?
- Who would run 50 youth shelters?
- How will the shelters become self-sustaining once the crime reduction programme money had run out?
- How will they be maintained?

### **Timetables**

A clear agenda or timeline for implementation of projects is essential. Timelines and plans can be developed in a number of ways and there are a variety of project

planning software packages available. Plans will of course be updated and developed during the life of the project. However, an early indication of timescales helps to concentrate minds and shows potential funders that they have been considered. Timetables may include a variety of information, but most usefully will include tasks to be achieved, the key dates and who is responsible for seeing that they are achieved. Below is an extract taken from a timetable received under Round Two that did just that.

### Box 7: Timetables

<b>Cycle theft reduction project: project programme</b>		
<b>Critical dates</b>	<b>Tasks to be completed</b>	<b>Who is involved</b>
<b>June 2000 – October 2000</b>	<b><i>Preparation of the proposals – to release Home Office funding</i></b>	
21 <sup>st</sup> June – 20 <sup>th</sup> July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of project definition form</li> <li>• Specification for police constables</li> <li>• Survey registration schemes</li> <li>• Additional research from county group</li> <li>• Information from trading standards</li> <li>• Preparation of programme of work</li> </ul>	Person A Person B Person C Person D  Person B Person A
Early August 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify further areas of work from the Home Office document</li> </ul>	Person A
Late August 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task group to meet and discuss Home Office proposal</li> <li>• Tidy up the proposals with research and other information</li> </ul>	Person A and task group Person A
End September Early October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback to Home Office</li> <li>• Receive money from Home Office</li> </ul>	Person A

Time plans were frequently not stated in proposals received for funding under the Targeted Policing Initiative. Development and implementation often take considerable time and effort as well as expertise, and if this is not noted in the proposals it suggests that these issues have not been considered or thought through. In turn, the absence of such considerations often meant that the project budget did not conform to what might be required.

### Application forms

If there is a standard application form for proposals it should be used. By not completing it relevant issues may not be covered and necessary items of information omitted. Assessing proposals fairly, in a standardised manner, also becomes more difficult if the forms provided are not properly filled in. Someone of the specified rank



should sign applications. Failure to do so raises uncertainty as to whether the project is supported at the senior level or at all.

**Table 16: Writing proposals**

Identify appropriate expertise and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State who would be responsible for an initiative and who would do the work</li><li>• Ensure that they have the relevant experience</li></ul>
Clarify development and implementation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include an agenda or timetable for implementation.</li><li>• Demonstrate awareness of how long it might take to implement the project</li></ul>
Avoid proposals that primarily request funding for staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where requests for staffing are included, state how these posts are to be sustained when the funding runs out</li></ul>
Ensure that proposals are supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Make sure that they are signed by ACPO. Failure to do so implies there is a lack of senior support</li></ul>
Proposals should be sent to the appropriate source of funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Think about the potential sources of funding and identify which is the most appropriate</li></ul>
Use the application form (if there is one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Keep to the structure and content</li><li>• Make sure all the relevant issues are covered and information provided</li></ul>

## 5. Implementing targeted policing projects

Effective implementation of crime reduction projects is essential if the aims are going to be achieved. There is a long history of partial implementation failure in crime reduction projects (Hope and Murphy, 1983; Curtin et al, 2001; Laycock and Tilley, 2001). Of particular importance is being able to determine whether a project fails because it was poorly implemented, managed or under-resourced or because the theoretical basis for the intervention was ill-conceived.

The following sections identify a number of key factors that impact on the implementation of crime reduction projects funded from the Targeted Policing Initiative. The information is taken from the 59 targeted policing projects that are being funded. Some of the points considered are very common, affecting the majority of the projects to date.

### Keeping to timescales

Delays in implementing interventions and slippage once projects are up and running have been a serious problem. Difficulties have been associated with:

- producing plans and securing funding;
- recruitment and retention of staff, particularly project managers;
- training;
- installation of equipment;
- multi-agency co-operation; and,
- project leverage.

### Producing plans and securing funding

Table 17 shows the timetable for the process through which successful Round Two targeted policing proposals from the second round of the targeted policing initiative went, from announcement of the prospectus to final confirmation of funding.

**Table 17: Timetable for targeted policing funding**

Date	Events
28 <sup>th</sup> December 1999	Prospectus for round two announced
28 <sup>th</sup> January 2000	Expressions of interest due in
Feb 2000	Successful proposals shortlist for development work
April – November 2000	Development work undertaken and more detailed proposals received
June – December 2000	Ministerial permission for projects to proceed received for the first projects
November 2000	Ministerial permission for projects to proceed received for the last project

There are two main points. Firstly, the time between the prospectus and the funding being announced and the deadline for proposals was very short. Many police forces and their partner agencies felt that this did not give them enough time to develop proposals properly.

Secondly, in the very worst case, the time between the announcement of the prospectus and the final project receiving confirmation of funding was about a year. There are a number of factors that influenced this.

- Proposals were not always well developed. Development work was conducted with the projects to improve them. This also took time.
- In the first rounds, high numbers of proposals arriving together overwhelmed the in-house teams. For example, the Violence Against Women Initiative had expected to receive 100 applications. In the event over 200 applications for funding were received. Changes in the targeted policing initiative 'rules' also created some delays. This was partly because the extent to which the Targeted Policing Initiative functions outside mainstream funding criteria was never clear. For example, the CCTV initiative places restrictions on the types of funding that can be applied for and what sorts of equipment are acceptable. The Targeted Policing Initiative did not do this, partly to encourage innovative proposals. In some instances the Targeted Policing Initiative has agreed to fund an aspect of a project, which is subsequently over-ruled by criteria imposed by other policy units.

**Table 18: Targeted policing rules**

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>CRP difficulty</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Rural crime	Digital CCTV (ordinary CCTV was unsuitable because of the very isolated areas)	Home Office moratorium on digital technology because it was untested technology	CCTV aspect of project delayed by 18 months
Vehicle crime	Automatic number plate registration system (ANPR)	National Home Office pilot in operation. Didn't want ANPR used until tested	A number of projects delayed and many took ANPR out of the proposals

Changes in personnel, other work commitments and the time that it takes to consult with all relevant partners have all created delay Whilst this timescale is in some ways exceptional, it is by no means uncommon, and it is as well to be aware of the time that it can take to secure funding. It also takes time to get projects up and running. Staff have to be recruited and trained, premises found and equipment installed. These issues are discussed in more detail below.

### ***Staff recruitment***

It has not always been easy to attract and retain suitable staff to crime reduction projects. Police officers have been required for operational duties as well as running projects. There are competing demands for officer time and in many cases there are not enough officers to second from normal duties. Some projects have got round this by buying overtime. However, in some cases this too has been difficult because police

services rely on overtime anyway. The shortage of officers has led to slippage in some projects.

Recruiting civilian staff and specialist staff can also be particularly problematic. Many projects have seconded staff from local authority departments, which has helped overcome some of the problems of recruiting at short notice for often short timescales. There is also a particular shortage of crime analysts. The problems of recruiting analysts are well known (HMIC, 2000).

As well as leading to delays, the shortage of staff and problems of recruitment have resulted in staff combining roles - taking on crime reduction projects on top of their normal duties. It is particularly common for the analysis required for crime reduction projects to be done on top of the normal duties of force analysts. However, there are also instances of project managers and staff combining roles. We know that crime reduction projects are most successful where there are dedicated full time co-ordinators and staff (Read and Tilley, 2000).

**Table 19: Examples of difficulties of recruiting**

<b>Project type</b>	<b>Type of staff</b>	<b>Difficulty</b>	<b>How it was overcome</b>
Market reduction	Analysts	Could not recruit fulltime analyst for the project	Two force analysts agreed to take on the project requirements over and above their ordinary duties.
Bike theft	Police officers	Shortage of officers. Best value considerations meant that project could not justify specialist officers	It wasn't
Drugs	Officer (police or civilian) to oversee environmental changes	Could not recruit	Secondment from local authority found after a year. In the meantime has been reliant on the good will of architectural liaison officers

### ***Staff retention***

High turnover of personnel is common. When individuals leave crime reduction projects, enthusiasm and momentum for them often leave with them. Previous research has highlighted how effective crime reduction projects are often the result of dedicated individuals who work hard to implement projects which were their ideas (Read and Tilley, 2000). It is not uncommon for the staff who had been responsible for developing the project to leave as it comes to the implementation stages. Projects have suffered because those with the greatest interest and ownership of projects leave in the early stages. In other cases they leave during the project. Both can have an impact on the effectiveness of the project. On a more practical basis, highturn over of staff creates further delays as time is spent trying to recruit new staff.

**Table 20: Retention difficulties**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Type of staff who left</b>	<b>Difficulty caused</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Business crime	Police officer who wrote the proposal	Replacements couldn't find the original proposal's documentation	Delays in developing the proposal
Youth crime	Diversionsary workers	High turnover as voluntary staff moved on to paid work and courses	Delay whilst new staff were trained
Market reduction	Action researcher	Resulted in repetition of work carried out as new staff were unsure as to what had and hadn't been done	Delays

### ***Training***

Projects should be aware of the length of time that it will take to train staff. Clearly, where widespread training is required, delays are more likely and it takes considerably longer to complete. But in projects where only a small number of people require (usually specialist) training, there can also be problems. Specialist courses are typically run infrequently and delays can be incurred whilst staff wait for them.

### ***Installation of equipment***

The need to purchase new equipment (such as CCTV) can have an impact on the start of some projects. This is normally down to the tendering process and it can take a long time to order and take delivery of new equipment and, in many cases, project staff do not anticipate this. It is worth identifying procurement rules early on in a project. In a multi-agency setting it might be worth considering making the budget-holder the agency with the most flexible procurement arrangements. In some circumstances installation of equipment has led to delays. This can be caused by failure to agree where it will be placed and then who will take responsibility for the management and upkeep of the equipment.

## **Other issues influencing effective implementation of projects**

### ***Interagency co-operation***

Effective co-operation with project partners has also been identified as a factor that can impact on the implementation of crime reduction projects. In the context of the Targeted Policing Initiative it appears that interagency projects are more likely to be successful when aims are agreed in advance. Confused or mixed agendas of the steering groups, for example, have been identified as impacting on the implementation of projects. Similarly, in some projects there has been a tendency to lose sight of the project objectives. This has resulted in a reduction in ownership and direction of the projects impacting on their ability to achieve their aims. There is now a growing literature on partnerships working and crime reduction (please refer to Hedderman and Williams, 2001; Audit Commission, 1998; HMIC, 2000).

**Table 21: Interagency co-operation problems**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Problem</b>	<b>Caused by</b>	<b>Resolved by</b>
Hate crime project	Proposal submitted by the police failed to reflect partners, understanding of the problem and cut across existing provision	Failure of police service to consult with partners	Totally re-thinking and re-writing the proposal
Market reduction	Partners unable to share key information as anticipated	Failure to address data protection problems	Not resolved
Prostitution	Partners unable to decide the amount of enforcement activity in relation to treatment services	Conflicting aims	Not resolved

***Project leverage***

It is also important that staff involved in crime reduction projects have sufficient leverage within the organisation where they work. Where staff are not sufficiently senior, for example, there can be problems for project implementation. Within the police service this can be related to gaining additional resources and securing general support for the initiative within the organisation. This also has implications for effective interagency working; multi-agency groups appear to work best where members are approximately at the same level.

***Performance indicators and crime reduction targets***

Performance indicators and targets appear to impact on the ability of partnerships and police forces to implement effective crime reduction projects. The problem is caused because local managers allocate resources to meeting performance indicators and targets. If the aim of a crime reduction project is to reduce a different type of crime or problem, there is less incentive to focus resources in that area.

**Box 8: problems of competing aims****Shoplifting and performance indicators**

Project XX was looking at ways to reduce the market for stolen goods. An assumption of the project was that many stolen goods that end up in second-hand shops are the products of shoplifting. The steering group wanted the project to tackle shop theft. The police argued that shop theft was a low priority because the force was not measured on its performance in regard to shop theft and refused to address it.

**Table 22: Implementation summary**

Securing funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing project plans is a time-consuming process</li> <li>• Don't underestimate how long it will take to secure funding</li> </ul>
------------------	---

	<p>even if your proposals are successful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please see CRRS paper 7 ‘Developing Crime Reduction Plans’ for detailed information about this area</li> </ul>
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don’t underestimate how long it can take to recruit staff</li> <li>• Ensure that you are ready to advertise posts at the earliest opportunity</li> <li>• Be aware that recruiting police officers can be especially difficult</li> <li>• Recruiting civilians at short notice and for short periods of time is difficult. Think about seconding staff from local authorities and other places as a means of speeding up the process</li> <li>• Try and minimise staff turnover. More thought should be given to identifying staff who are committed and whose career paths are such that they are likely to stay for the duration of the project</li> <li>• Consider the use of incentives for staff who stay for the whole of the project’s life</li> <li>• If staff do leave, try and have appropriate hand-over periods</li> </ul>
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that adequate time is allowed in project plan for training staff</li> <li>• Remember that specialist courses often run infrequently throughout the year</li> <li>• Training large numbers of people can be especially time-consuming. Make sure that this is accounted for in the project plan</li> </ul>
Installation of equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don’t underestimate how long it will take to procure equipment. If there are tendering regulations on purchasing, find out what these are and account for how long this will take</li> <li>• Find out if there are any rules regarding the purchase and use of equipment for example ACPO guidance on CCTV systems</li> <li>• Consider making the agency with the greatest procurement flexibility the budget-holder</li> <li>• Make sure that you know where the equipment is to be installed</li> <li>• Make sure that you have permission to install equipment early on</li> <li>• Ensure you know who is going to maintain and run equipment, even after the project funding has run out</li> </ul>
Multi-agency co-operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure aims and objectives of the projects are well explained and agreed by all partner agencies</li> <li>• Ensure all agencies know what they are doing and to what timescale</li> <li>• Ensure that there are nominated individuals within agencies responsible for ensuring that they deliver</li> </ul>

## 6. Evaluating crime reduction projects

Evaluation of projects is of key importance if the crime reduction programme is to meet its aims. If good practice is to be disseminated and replicated we need to know whether a project has had an impact and why. More generally, it is good practice to monitor and evaluate problem-solving projects in order to determine their impact and to assess if resources are being used efficiently. Experience of evaluating the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of projects so far has highlighted a number of issues, which are discussed below.

### Meeting the data requirements of evaluation

#### *Data collection*

Collecting the data that evaluators require for assessing crime reduction projects has not always been straightforward. Sometimes data are not available, or they do not always exist in an accessible form. For example, records may not be computerised or there may have been changes in the way that data have been collected. This is related to a wider problem: records are often kept by the police and other agencies for completely different purposes and therefore can be difficult to translate to the purpose of evaluation.

#### **Box 9: Common data problems impacting on evaluation**

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Record keeping</b> Lack of both routine record keeping and project record keeping	Information on how much the project has been spending, for example
<b>Data quality</b> Data are not often inputted accurately.	For example, fields can be left blank, data entered into the wrong field or entered wrongly
<b>Data manipulation</b> Data can be hard to manipulate.	For example, the date and time might be entered into the same field making it hard to extract and analyse information. Similarly the whole address may be entered into the same field with the same effect
<b>Changes in recording practices</b> Changes in Home Office recording rules have made it hard to compare data over time periods	In April 1998 there were changes to the way that recorded crime statistics were collected for example common assault became a notifiable crime
<b>Data extraction</b> How data are held	Many police forces use systems that are difficult to extract information from for the purposes of analysis and that are difficult to transport into packages that are more commonly used for data analysis (SPSS/Excel).

Lack of relevant data makes it harder to measure how crime rates have changed, impacting on ability to identify what works in reducing crime.



### ***Data protection***

Data protection legislation has had an impact on the evaluation of some projects. There has been concern about how data protection law impacts on evaluations <sup>6</sup>. Data protection legislation states that information related to identifiable individuals that is held on a computer should not be used for reasons other than those for which it was originally intended. Disclosures of personal information are not prohibited; the ways in which such disclosures are made are regulated. Where problems related to data have been identified there are a number of steps that projects have taken to enable the projects to be fully evaluated whilst ensuring compliance with data protection legislation. Most commonly, data protection agreements with the police force or other agencies have been established.

**Table 23: Avoiding data protection problems**

<b>Method</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>How to arrange this</b>
Technical solution	By removing the components of the data that could be used to identify an individual data can be disclosed without contravening the Data Protection legislation	There are companies that can be employed to do this
Administrative solution	The evaluators can be contractually linked to the agencies and can undertake processing work on behalf of other agencies so long as they do not alter the individual records and assuming that the purpose of the processing is in line with the purposes for which the data was collected	The evaluators would be registered as a 'computer bureau' with the data protection registrar
The 'old fashioned' solution	The data could be processed on site within the relevant agencies	The practical arrangements for such an approach would clearly be problematic
Data protection protocols	Draw up a protocol with the relevant police force or other agency, whereby the evaluators agree to formalised arrangements regarding data storage and use	This can be arranged with the force data protection registrar

### ***Process evaluation***

In some cases, practitioners have not understood what is required to evaluate projects effectively. This has inhibited the routine and systematic collection of necessary data. Evaluators make requests for all kinds of information. These might include, for example, requests for crime figures from police control and command systems, recorded crime figures and interviews with project staff and steering groups, and staff records of their daily activities. This is labour-intensive and can seem intrusive. This is particularly relevant to projects where economic evaluations are taking place. Project staff have been asked to record very specific details, including, for example, numbers of telephone calls made.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Data Protection Act 1984 and 1998 have been relevant

## Assessing the impact of projects

Assessing the impact of a project is essential. Crime reduction projects are very complex. They have multiple aims and interventions and are implemented by a variety of different agencies. Isolating the effects of particular interventions under these circumstances is very difficult. Table 24 shows the range and cost of main interventions associated with a project aimed at reducing visible drug use. The sheer scale of the project makes it difficult for evaluators to unpick which interventions were associated with which outcomes. Additionally, the resources required to evaluate such a project in any detail would be enormous.

**Table 24: Interventions for a project to reduce drug use**

<b>Range of activities and cost (£)</b>	<b>Main interventions</b>
<b>Police enforcement</b>	
£900, 000	Intelligence-led targeted enforcement
	Increased patrolling
	Drug testing
	Covert and overt CCTV
<b>Services</b>	
£500, 000	Fast access treatment for drug users
	Outreach work
	Mobile needle exchange
	Health education and public training
	Emergency service provision
<b>Environment</b>	
£200, 000	Environmental audit
	Building and open space audit
	Business watch scheme
	Environmental improvements

Evaluation problems are often compounded by the fact that many areas have received money for crime reduction from more than one source, and many have received money for projects that are intended to have a wide range of benefits, of which crime reduction is one <sup>7</sup>. For example, in Spring 2000, the Home Office announced that it was going to spend £25 million on schemes to fund neighbourhood wardens in residential areas. At least two of the 45 funded schemes were in exactly the same area as separate initiatives funded by the targeted policing initiative, and many more were overlapping. More generally, the larger the number of interventions the harder it becomes to disentangle the crime reduction effects of one initiative from another, or to attribute any reduction in crime specifically to the project.

## Other issues associated with evaluating crime reduction projects

### *Clarity of roles*

There can be lack of clarity of the role of evaluators in projects. The extent to which evaluators should be involved in the implementation and direction of projects is

---

<sup>7</sup> Single Regeneration Budget, Reducing Burglary Initiative, CCTV, New Deal for Communities

debatable. This has been a particular problem where projects are failing to be implemented.

Some evaluators have been willing to offer substantial advice to the projects, assist with project implementation and inform them when they think that things are going wrong. Others have wished to remain fully independent, acting exclusively as observers of what has been done. In most instances, the relationship has been somewhere between the two. Box 10 shows three models, all of which have operated.

**Box 10: The roles of evaluators as used in the Targeted Policing Initiative**

<b>Type of researcher</b>	<b>Definitions</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Examples of use in targeted policing</b>
Independent model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observes and records as neutrally as is possible</li> <li>• Does not intervene in the project</li> </ul>	Low risk of evaluator bias but projects are denied access to the expertise and experience of the evaluator	Most of the projects are being independently evaluated
Action model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research directly aims to intervene in the project, changing its direction on the basis of data analysis</li> <li>• Recommendations for future action are made and fed into the project in an on-going process.</li> </ul>	The evaluator can make suggestions and advise against those interventions already found to have failed, there is a risk they are too involved and blind to failings in the project's principles.	Market reduction projects
Development work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researchers used to help projects work through ideas and develop plans</li> </ul>	Provides advice and expertise early on but can risk becoming too involved (as above)	All round two projects

The advantage of the independent model is that the likelihood of evaluator bias is reduced. Those implicated in developing a project may have an interest in its being judged a success and may thereby be inclined to emphasise achievements and overlook data that suggest failure, or unwanted side-effects. The disadvantage is that projects are denied access to the expertise and experience of the evaluator, which is often extensive. Evaluators are normally better-read in the literature of crime prevention, and will have seen more projects in operation than those designing and implementing projects. The advantage of the action model is that the evaluator knows what is and what is not already known. They can suggest components of the project that will be at the cutting-edge of practice, can counsel against interventions already found to have failed and can steer the project towards better prospects of achievement. With regard to evaluation, they can shape collection of the data that are needed and record-keeping practices that will generate robust data. The disadvantage is that the

evaluator becomes too identified with the project's thinking and becomes blind to possible weaknesses in its underlying principles.

From the start of the Targeted Policing Initiative, development visits made prior to agreement to funding comprised efforts to inject into projects some of the expertise of the researchers in the relevant fields. Proposals writers were asked to revise proposals taking account of feedback. Sometimes researchers providing the feedback won the contracts for the evaluation, sometimes they did not do so. Sometimes their advice was taken fully on board, often not. Over the course of the Targeted Policing Initiative, largely because of the weaknesses in proposals identified in this report, there have been efforts to inject researcher expertise earlier into the process and to retain continuity in researcher participation during the course of the initiative. This obviously increases the risk of involvement-created biases. Without researcher involvement, however, it was felt that the programme would have less impact on crime and disorder, and initiatives would be less likely to be evidence-based and to provide the basis for lessons for the future. That remains to be seen.

Evaluators, of course, remain formally independent of projects and are separately funded. If employed by and accountable to projects, the risks of bias, generated by the agencies who hold the funding have (or are perceived to have), clearly become excessive.

### ***Monitoring and feedback***

The evaluators provide feedback on their progress to the Home Office at regular intervals. In some cases they also report to the project steering group. Inevitably, this will include information on how the projects are being implemented; if certain aspects of an intervention are not in place, they cannot be evaluated. This has caused concern within some projects that evaluators are 'telling tales'.

**Table 25: Summary of evaluation chapter**

Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Projects should, where possible, facilitate evaluation by maximising their accessibility to evaluators</li><li>• Evaluators, the Home Office and agencies involved in projects should discuss and agree forms of data that will be made available and collected. Ideally, this should be agreed in advance or written into contracts, though project changes may require changes in the types of data that need to be used by the evaluator</li></ul>
Data protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Issues should be identified and resolved as early as possible, preferably before the project is agreed</li><li>• All forces have a data protection liaison officer who would be able to advise projects on any potential breaches of legislation and clarify how they may be avoided in consultation with evaluators and, if necessary, the Home Office.</li></ul>
Role of evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The role that the evaluators will play in providing guidance for the projects should be agreed in advance</li></ul>
Attribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluators should be informed by the projects of any separate ongoing or planned crime reduction initiatives in the area as soon as possible, and of any other known developments that are</li></ul>

	intended to or might reasonably be expected to impact on the problem being addressed
--	--

## **7. Conclusions, recommendations for the Home Office and check-list for practitioners**

This report provides an overview of some of the main issues and problems that have been encountered in the Targeted Policing Initiative. It is clear that the process of setting up and implementing projects is far from trouble-free. Much effort and planning is required if projects are to achieve their stated aims.

Table 26 provides a check-list for practitioners based on the experience of the Targeted Policing Initiative. It is hoped that this will be useful for those seeking funding for projects or implementing future projects and who wish to avoid some of the more obvious pitfalls.

Many of the problems identified in this report have been the result of the fact that the Crime Reduction Programme was new and the 'rules' and processes have developed as the programme a its course. We conclude that future programmes should observe the following suggestions:

- Consider ways to speed up the time that it takes between projects submitting expressions of interest and receiving notification that they can begin the project.
- Be aware of the time and effort that partnerships spend in preparing proposals. The possibility of giving police and partnerships longer to prepare proposals is vital if high quality is to be achieved.
- Development work with projects should be considered.
- Could up-front payments be given to police services and their partners to cover the costs of putting proposals together?
- Consider identifying the contexts within which crime reduction can be sustained and think about the long-term aims of crime reduction projects and their relationship with police and other sources of funding more generally.
- The police, partnerships and central government should think about how best to balance the need for centralised performance indicators and targets against the move towards the identification and solution of crime and disorder problems at the local level.
- Provide guidance about all types of evaluation to successful projects early on in the proceedings.
- Ensure that externally contracted evaluators are appointed as near to the start of the project as is feasible to ensure that the data collection required is in place early on.
- Think about how local projects can be mainstreamed or how a national strategy can encompass a series of initiatives.

**Table 26: Preparing and implementing crime reduction projects check-list**

<b>STAGE</b>		✓
<b>IDENTIFYING PROBLEMS</b>		
Problems should be sufficiently identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the problem is clearly identified and stated in the proposal</li> <li>• Specify the project's aims and objectives</li> </ul>	
Core preventive element should be targeted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interventions should focus on a specific aspect of the problem such as geographical hotspots or repeat victimisation</li> </ul>	
Analysis should inform the intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain how the proposed intervention relates to the problem identification and analysis</li> </ul>	
Interventions should be connected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how the components of an initiative are related to one another</li> <li>• Avoid simply providing a 'shopping list' of options</li> </ul>	
Justify the initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look for supporting evidence for an initiative and include it</li> </ul>	
Clarify the interagency components for a proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where more than one agency is involved, specify the commitment from each agency</li> <li>• State which agency is responsible for each key task</li> </ul>	
Be specific about the nature of the work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the contexts and mechanisms through which change will come about</li> <li>• Be realistic about what can be achieved given timescales and resources available</li> </ul>	

<b>WRITING PROPOSALS</b>		
Identify appropriate expertise and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State who will be responsible for the initiative and who will do the work</li> <li>• Ensure that they have the relevant experience</li> </ul>	
Clarify development and implementation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include an agenda or timetable for implementation</li> <li>• Demonstrate awareness of how long it might take to implement the project</li> </ul>	
Avoid proposals that primarily request funding for staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where requests for staffing are included, state how these posts are to be sustained when the funding runs out</li> </ul>	
Ensure that proposals are supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure that they are signed by ACPO. Failure to do so implies there is a lack of senior support</li> </ul>	
Proposals should be directed appropriate funding initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore all the possible sources of funding and identify which is the most appropriate</li> </ul>	
Use the application form (if there is one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep to the structure and content</li> <li>• Make sure all the relevant issues are covered and information provided</li> </ul>	
<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
Securing funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow time for money to be released</li> <li>• Don't underestimate how long it will take to secure funding even if your proposal is successful</li> <li>• Please refer to CRRS paper 7 'Developing Crime Reduction Plans' for detailed information about this area.</li> </ul>	
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't underestimate how long it can take to recruit staff</li> <li>• Ensure that you are ready to advertise posts at the earliest opportunity</li> <li>• Be aware that recruiting police officers can be especially difficult</li> <li>• Recruiting civilians at short notice and for short periods of time is difficult. Think about seconding staff from local authorities and other places as a means of speeding up the process</li> <li>• Try and minimise staff turnover. More thought should be given to identifying staff who are committed and whose career paths are such that they are likely to stay for the duration of the project</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider offering incentives to staff who stay for the whole of the project's life</li> <li>• If staff do leave, try and have appropriate hand-over periods</li> </ul>	
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that adequate time is allowed in project plan for training of staff</li> <li>• Remember that specialist courses often run infrequently through-out the year</li> <li>• Training large numbers of people can be especially time-consuming. Make sure that this is accounted for in the project plan</li> <li>• Efforts should be made to recruit and retain analysts</li> </ul>	
Installation of equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't underestimate how long it will take to procure equipment. If there are tendering regulations on purchasing find out what these are and account for how long this will take</li> <li>• In a multi-agency setting consider having the agency with the greatest procurement flexibility as the budget holder</li> <li>• Find out if there are any rules regarding the purchase and use of equipment e.g. there is ACPO guidance on CCTV systems</li> <li>• Make sure that you know where the equipment is to be installed</li> <li>• Make sure that you have permission to install equipment early on</li> <li>• Ensure you know who is going to maintain and run equipment, even after the project funding has run out</li> </ul>	
Multi-agency co-operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure aims and objectives of the projects are well explained and agreed by all partner agencies</li> <li>• Ensure all agencies know what they are doing and to what timescale</li> <li>• Ensure that there are nominated individuals within agencies responsible for ensuring that they deliver</li> </ul>	
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start thinking about sustainability at the earliest opportunity</li> <li>• Agree an exit strategy as soon as possible</li> </ul>	
<b>EVALUATION</b>		
data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects should, where possible, facilitate evaluation by maximising availability of data</li> <li>• Evaluators, Home Office staff and involved agencies should discuss and agree forms of data that will be made available and collected</li> <li>• Ideally this should be agreed in advance or written into contracts, though project changes</li> </ul>	

	may require changes in the types of data that need to be used by the evaluator.	
Data protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues should be identified and resolved as early as possible, preferably before the project is agreed</li> <li>• All forces have a data protection liaison officer who would be able to advise projects on any potential breaches of legislation and clarify how they may be avoided in consultation with evaluators and, if necessary, the Home Office</li> </ul>	
Role of evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role that the evaluators will play in providing guidance for the projects should be agreed in advance</li> </ul>	
Attribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluators should be informed by the projects of any separate ongoing or planned crime reduction initiatives in the area as soon as possible, and of any other known developments that are intended to or might reasonably be expected to impact on the problem being addressed</li> </ul>	

## References

- Audit Commission** (1998) *A Fruitful Partnership: Effective partnership working* London: Home Office.
- Clarke, R. and Weisburd, D.** (1994) 'Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits: Observations on the Reverse of Displacement', in R. Clarke (ed.) *Crime Prevention Studies*, Vol 2, Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, pp.165-183.
- Clarke, R.** (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Albany NY: Harrow and Heston.
- Clarke, R.** (1999) Hot Products: Understanding, anticipating and reducing the demand for stolen goods, *Police Research Series*, Paper 112. London: Home Office.
- Curtin, L., Tilley, N., Owen, M. and Pease, K.** (2001) Developing Crime Reduction Plans: Some examples from the Reducing Burglary Initiative, *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 7. London: Home Office.
- Farrell, G. and Pease, K.** (1993) Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat victimisation and its implications for crime prevention, *Crime Prevention Unit* Paper 46. London: Home Office.
- Goldblatt, P. and Lewis, C.** (1998) Reducing Offending: An assessment of research evidence of ways of dealing with offending behaviour. *Home Office Research Study* 187. London: Home Office.
- Goldstein, H.** (1979) 'Improving Policing: A Problem Oriented Approach', *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol 25, pp. 236-258.
- Goldstein, H.** (1990) *Problem Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw and Hill.
- Hamner, J., Griffiths, S., and Jerwood D.** (1999) Arresting Evidence: Domestic violence and repeat victimisation. *Police Research Series* 104. London: Home Office.
- Hedderman, C. and Williams, C.** (2001) Making Partnerships Work: Emerging findings from the Reducing Burglary Initiative. Briefing Note 1/01. London: Home Office.
- Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabulary** (2000) *Calling Time on Crime: A Thematic inspection on crime and disorder conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary in collaboration with the Home Office and the Audit Commission*. Local Government Association, Office for Standards in Education, Social Services Inspectorate. London: Home Office.
- Hope, T. and Murphy, D.** (1983) The Problems of Implementing Crime Prevention: The experience of a demonstration project. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 22: 38-50.

**Hough, M. and Tilley, N.** (1998) Getting the Grease to the Squeak: Research lessons for crime prevention. *Crime Detection and Prevention Series*, Paper 85. London: Home Office.

**Laycock, G. and Tilley, N.** (2002) Working Out What to do: Evidence based crime reduction. *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 11. London: Home Office.

**Leigh, A., Read, T. and Tilley, N.** (1996) Problem Oriented Policing: Brit Pop. *Police Research Series* Paper 75, London: Home Office.

**Leigh, A., Read, T. and Tilley, N.** (1998) Brit Pop II: Problem Oriented Policing in Practice. *Police Research Series* Paper 93, London: Home Office.

**Lynam, D., Milich, R., Zimmerman, R., Novak, S., Logan, T., Martin, C., Leukefeld, C. and Clayton, R.** (1999) 'Project DARE: No effects at 10-year follow-up', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 67, No. 4, pp. 590-593.

**Read, T. and Tilley N.** (2000) Not Rocket Science? Problem-solving and crime reduction, *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 6. London: Home Office.

**Rosenbaum, D. and Hanson, G.** (1998) 'Assessing the effects of school-based drug education: a six-year multi-level analysis of project D.A.R.E.', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 35, No. 4., pp. 381-412.

## **Related RDS Publications**

**Farrell, G., Edmunds A., Hobbs, L. and Laycock G.** (2000) RV Snapshot: UK policing and repeat victimisation. *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 5.

**Leigh, A., Read, T. and Tilley, N.** (1996) Problem Oriented Policing: Brit Pop, *Police Research Series* Paper 75.

**Leigh, A., Read, T. and Tilley, N.** (1998) Brit Pop II: Problem Oriented Policing in Practice, *Police Research Series* Paper 93.

**Tilley, N., Pease, K., Hough, M. and Brown, R.** (1999) Burglary Prevention: Early lessons from the Crime Reduction Programme, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 1.

**Curtin, L., Tilley, N., Owen, M. and Pease, K.** (2001) Developing Crime Reduction Plans: Some Examples from the Reducing Burglary Initiative, *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 7.

**Read, T. and Tilley, N.** (2000) Not Rocket Science? Problem-solving and Crime Reduction, *Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 6.

## ANNEX A

### PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE TARGETED POLICING INITIATIVE

Crime or problem addressed	Description and main interventions	CRP Evaluation?
Acquisitive crime, market reduction approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeting prolific offenders and handlers of stolen goods</li> </ul>	Yes
Rural crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A local Multi-Agency Safety Group will identify 'hot spots'</li> <li>Mobile police station</li> <li>CCTV</li> </ul>	Yes
Vehicle crime		Yes
Racist crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tackling offenders, working with victims and witnesses</li> </ul>	Yes
Acquisitive crime, market reduction approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeting known offenders, installation of tracking devices, regular visits to known outlets and use of the local media</li> </ul>	Yes
Absconding, offending and nuisance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual diversion plans for children in the looked after system</li> </ul>	Yes
Alcohol related crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying and challenging offenders</li> <li>Establishment of a licensee's forum to support and advise staff in licensed premises</li> <li>Create an awareness programme</li> <li>Encourage reporting of offending</li> </ul>	Yes
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of hot spots for vehicle crime</li> <li>Working with a range of public and private organisations to encourage the use of longer term preventive measures</li> </ul>	Yes
Prolific offenders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved access to police intelligence data</li> <li>Identification of potential participants via use of a score matrix</li> <li>Assessment Case Evaluation</li> <li>Screening Assessment Profile Package</li> <li>Multi-agency performance assessment meetings</li> <li>Increase level of supervision for perpetrators enrolled in project</li> </ul>	Yes
Anti-social behaviour and crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobile police station</li> <li>High visibility policing</li> <li>Concentration of resources in high crime areas</li> <li>Community involvement and improved the multi-agency co-ordination</li> </ul>	Yes
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of owners at higher risk: media awareness campaign; high risk vehicles to be offered security and property marking free of charge</li> <li>Increase in scenes of crime examinations</li> <li>Disruption of the stolen goods and parts markets</li> <li>Zero tolerance for offences committed by targeted offenders</li> </ul>	No
Violent crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-ordination of research and current practice</li> <li>Area based to identify current trends in order to develop strategies to target problems.</li> <li>Three tier strategy to deal with violent offenders</li> </ul>	No
Drugs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping of the drugs market</li> <li>Identification of key targets, supply routes and analysis of market information to produce an individual strategy for each market</li> </ul>	No
Alcohol related violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immediate help for victims of domestic violence in A&amp;E departments</li> <li>Tackling the sale of alcohol to those under the legal age,</li> </ul>	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Media campaign to highlight negative effects of alcohol</li> <li>Youth workers for those misusing alcohol</li> </ul>	
Antisocial behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IT and resources to identify prolific criminals so they may be tackled with a 'joined up' targeted approach</li> </ul>	No
Crime against businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of Crime Prevention Best Practice Estates.</li> <li>Increased impact of the existing Trafford Park Business Watch.</li> <li>Establishment of a Patrol Net to respond to incidents</li> <li>Use of proactive police initiatives</li> <li>Intelligence analyst to provide link with the Crime Scene Examination Unit</li> </ul>	No
Shootings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-agency crackdown</li> <li>Multi-agency diversion from gangs and prevention</li> </ul>	Yes
Antisocial behaviour/crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of effective measures for tackling witness intimidation</li> <li>Provision of alternative locations for witnesses to meet police</li> <li>Initiatives to divert young people away from crime</li> </ul>	No
Anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extension of North Lincolnshire Council's 'Links' system to allow local people to access council services at a variety of centres</li> <li>One stop shop for antisocial behaviour</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire service identification of burnt out vehicles that merit attendance by Scene of Crime Officers</li> <li>Prolific offender profiling</li> <li>Improved links with local car trade</li> <li>Identification of hotspots</li> <li>Increase use of IT to characterise offences</li> <li>Increase enforcement opportunities</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime and anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Installation of public address system in town centre and at main car parks connection to the CCTV monitoring room to allow messages to be aimed at offenders, potential offenders and potential victims</li> <li>Installation of electronic single line information units in car parks to display warnings and crime prevention advice</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing vehicle crime through target hardening, market reduction and tackling prolific offenders. Multi agency approach to enforce regulations with regard to scrap metal dealers and second hand dealers</li> <li>Identification and targeting of hotspots and prolific offenders.</li> <li>Re-sensitising courses for prolific offenders to re-educate them about the implications of their crimes</li> <li>Increased use of DNA and other forensic techniques</li> </ul>	No
Crime against businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborative partnerships between CJS agencies and the business sector</li> <li>Establishment of Small Business Crime Assessment, Diagnosis and Assistance Service</li> <li>Special assistance for vulnerable groups</li> </ul>	No
Crime and disorder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More proactive neighbourhood policing style</li> <li>Partnership approach providing an opportunity to scan and analyse data from a variety of sources to identify causes and symptoms of the problem</li> </ul>	No
Drugs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnership approach to high profile enforcement, environmental improvement and improved treatment opportunities for drug users</li> </ul>	Yes
Drug and sex markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption of the open sex markets and closed drugs market through enforcement, prevention and treatment interventions</li> </ul>	No
Hate crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local self help groups defined by cultural, ethnic or lifestyle profile and supported by a dedicated co-ordinator to set up</li> </ul>	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'virtual neighbourhood watch'</li> <li>• Use of rapid hate crime intervention officer with access to a range of evidence collection methods</li> <li>• Targeting behaviour or belief modification offenders</li> </ul>	
Anti social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intelligence gathering, surveillance and arrest to direct resources to prolific offenders</li> <li>• Use of anti-social behaviour, civil and repossession orders for those likely to fill the void left by the removal of the prolific offenders</li> <li>• Involvement of partners to improve housing allocation, pre-school education and other amenities</li> </ul>	No
Hate crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the safety of Londoners through context specific understanding of the forms of hate crime and the ability to match them with the appropriate methods of investigation</li> </ul>	No
Crime against businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial estate co-ordinator to evaluate resources and equipment currently available to ensure best usage</li> <li>• To conduct research and analysis so that other security perspectives can be evaluated as the intelligence develops</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of all elements of the Vehicle Crime Reduction Strategy</li> <li>• Interventions include palm-top digital organisers for immediate access to force intelligence systems and the PNC</li> </ul>	No
Alcohol related violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research into linking violence to excessive alcohol consumption</li> <li>• Project strategy is based on the SPEEDE response to tackling alcohol related violence. These are Support, Prevention, Education, Enforcement, Diversion and Evaluation</li> </ul>	Yes
Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase knowledge of violence against staff in hospitals</li> <li>• Provide hospital staff with training to deal with conflict</li> <li>• Development and implementation of a security accreditation scheme with the NHS trusts</li> </ul>	Yes
Hate Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouraging victims to report crimes and improved reporting and recording systems</li> <li>• Full time co-ordinator to facilitate cross-agency working</li> <li>• Expansion of the Anti-victimisation Unit with additional police staff, plus a probation worker and a witness advocate</li> </ul>	No
Crime against businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated crime advisors</li> <li>• Businesses watches to improve communication between businesses and police</li> <li>• Provision of crime education for businesses</li> </ul>	No
Acquisitive crime, market reduction approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educating the public in the part they play in perpetuating acquisitive crime</li> <li>• The project addresses the problem in three stages – initial marketing and getting the public involved, maximising intelligence and hard intervention</li> </ul>	No
Robbery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education, diversion and restorative justice, target hardening, evidence gathering and environmental and situational improvements</li> <li>• Interventions aimed at the offender include diversion, targeting and restorative justice</li> </ul>	No
Confiscations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing the numbers and effectiveness of confiscations imposed by the courts</li> </ul>	No
Cycle theft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University wide scheme registration scheme</li> <li>• Different types of secure cycle parking are being tested and a location for a secure cycle park researched</li> </ul>	Yes
Rural crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment of mobile community safety office, exhibition space and community surgeries</li> <li>• Improved attendance at scenes of crimes</li> </ul>	Yes



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on repeat victims</li> </ul>	
Attrition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of the effectiveness of applying enhanced forensic techniques to burglary and vehicle crime, and of obtaining samples from recordable offences</li> </ul>	No
Robbery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tackling robbery in rural areas, in particular those against small businesses</li> <li>Interventions include a dedicated crime analyst to observe trends and a media campaign to raise local awareness</li> </ul>	No
Arson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Force wide initiative aimed at addressing increasing number of arsons and other deliberate and malicious fires, particularly in relation to vehicles</li> </ul>	No
Organised and volume crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption of organised crime and drug distribution through enhanced technology for intelligence gathering and surveillance</li> </ul>	No
Child prostitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-agency initiative aimed at preventing children and young people from being sexually abused and exploited through prostitution</li> <li>Initiatives include, education programmes, specialist training, development of a database for monitoring, exchange of information and risk assessment</li> </ul>	No
Violent and drug related crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involving the community in the development of solutions for hotspots</li> <li>Shared intelligence and analysis</li> <li>Partnerships to target the right people with the right interventions.</li> <li>Victim profiling and ANPR</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To extend an existing scheme that offers assistance to owners of older vehicles to fit security devices</li> </ul>	No
Fear of crime in a rural area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobile police station for use by police and partner agencies to provide an effective communications network</li> <li>Increased police activity</li> </ul>	No
IT System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extending the West Midland's Police system to neighbouring forces to provide cross-border co-operation</li> </ul>	No
Rural crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhancement of rural policing through target hardening, mobile CCTV, electronic policing, rural policing teams and a domestic violence co-ordinator</li> </ul>	No
Anti-social behaviour and other crimes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the effectiveness of Community Action Tackling Crime and Harassment schemes linking residents and police by radio on two housing estates in Sandwell</li> <li>Dissemination of the lessons learned</li> </ul>	No
Domestic violence & hate crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graded model working with victims and offenders.</li> <li>Based on Killingbeck model</li> </ul>	Yes
Crimestoppers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the national scheme</li> </ul>	Yes
Saliva Drug Screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To determine the suitability of the Saliva Rapiscan testing device for on site use</li> <li>Development of a miniature printer to produce a hard copy of the results</li> </ul>	No
Stop and Search	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of the Stephen Lawrence inquiry</li> </ul>	Yes
Development Resources for the Police National Computer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment of additional systems analysts, designers and programmers to tackle a backlog of developments to the PNC by Ministers, ACPO and the wider criminal justice community</li> </ul>	No
Problem solving training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of a dedicated problem solving team to deliver training to officers at middle – management level to deploy a problem solving approach</li> <li>Maintenance of a 'good practice' database</li> </ul>	No
Vehicle crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing vehicle crime through better use of intelligence and</li> </ul>	Yes

	targeting	
Pilot National Intelligence Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote intelligence led policing on a national level to standardise structures, processes and practices</li> <li>• Improve intelligence flow between local, cross border and international levels</li> <li>• Integration of intelligence responsibilities throughout the force</li> </ul>	Yes

Produced by the Research Development and Statistics Directorate, Home Office

This document is available only in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) through the RDS website

Home Office  
Research, Development and Statistics Directorate  
Communication Development Unit  
Room 275  
50 Queen Anne's Gate  
London SW1H 9AT

Tel: 020 7273 2084 (answerphone outside of office hours)

Fax: 020 7222 0211

Email: [publications.rds@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:publications.rds@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

ISBN 1 84082 899 4

©Crown copyright 2002