

## Safer London Problem Oriented Partnership (POP) Awards 2010

### Guidance for entering a Project for the Award

#### Introduction

This guidance has been written to provide guidance for people entering their project to the Safer London POP Awards. It has been designed to help you:

- decide which project is to be entered into which award;
- put together the best possible application;
- know what to do with your application; and
- know what to expect from the process and when.

Please read this carefully and ensure that you follow the guidance closely.

If your application is not in the correct format or not received by the deadline, it will not be considered for the award. If you have any queries about the application procedure please contact Steve Colgan on 07900 138147.

#### What are the Safer London POP Awards?

There are three separate awards that you can enter:

- **Safer Communities POP Award**

Entries can focus on any aspect of police or partnership work including, for example, projects undertaken to reduce specific crime and disorder problems. Past examples have included business crime, volunteer-led crime reduction initiatives, burglary reduction, community cohesion projects etc.

- **Safer Travel POP Award**

Entries can focus on any aspect of police or partnership work that has led to significant reductions in crime, disorder or the fear of crime among people using the public transport network. It can also be awarded to innovative new projects that foster safety in other forms of transport such as safer bike routes to schools etc.

- **Safer Night Time POP AWARD**

Entries can focus on any aspect of police or partnership work that has led to significant reductions in crime, disorder or the fear of crime during the evening and night time, particularly around licensed premises; restaurants, clubs, pubs, bars etc.

For all three awards the judges - a mix of academics, senior police staff and senior partners - will not simply be looking for a reduction in crime and disorder but also for evidence of a true problem solving approach being used on a consistent basis. They will be looking for good identification of the core issues, appropriate analysis to identify the factors causing the problem, innovative or well-considered and implemented responses, and evaluation of the project.

You may enter up to two individual projects for each award (maximum = six). **You may not enter any individual project for more than one award.**

### **What Is The Prize?**

The highest scoring entry for each award will win a monetary reward of £2500 to help enable further improvements to their borough and local neighbourhood. An overall winner - the **Safer London POP Award 2010** - is then chosen from the three award winners and will receive an additional £7500 (total first prize £10k). The Awards will be presented at the Safer London POP Conference on 22nd February 2010 in London.

### **Who Can Enter?**

The awards are open to anyone who has been involved in partnership work leading to a reduction in crime, disorder or fear of crime. One of the partners must be the Metropolitan Police and, in the case of the Safer Travel POP Award, Transport for London. Previous winners include tackling business crime, volunteer-led crime reduction initiative, safer neighbourhoods initiative, community engagement etc.

### **How to enter**

You may enter up to two entries for each award (maximum six). You may not enter the same project for more than one award.

Only submit an application if you are confident that it meets the criterion set out below. It is very important that you understand what you need to demonstrate for your project to have a reasonable chance of being short-listed.

Applications for the award must be submitted on the correct application form. It can be found by the link on this page or request a copy from [steve.colgan@met.police.uk](mailto:steve.colgan@met.police.uk).

All applications should be completed in full and emailed to [steve.colgan@met.police.uk](mailto:steve.colgan@met.police.uk) by **9am Friday 13th November 2009**.

It is your responsibility to ensure that applications have arrived by the deadline and to ensure that your application has been received. No applications will be considered after that time in any circumstances.

## The Judging Process

There are two stages to the judging process: short-listing and judging.

### Short-Listing

All entries are initially read and scored by a team of POP experts. The scores for all entries are collated and only those with the highest scores will be passed to the final judging panel. The three top scorers for each award will be submitted to the final judging panel.

### Judging

The nine top scoring entries will then be passed to an independent judging panel made up of senior MPS staff, senior partner agency staff and academics from universities that are involved in POP, crime reduction and community safety. Each judge will read and score all nine of the short-listed entries. The scores from each judge are then collated and the highest scoring entries for each award will be identified as the winners. Judges are asked to comment on the entries and this forms the basis of the feedback that is sent to the authors of entries.

### Judging Criteria

The Safer London POP Awards mirror the national Tilley Awards and the international Goldstein Awards in that entries follow the SARA model:

Scan - Analyse - Respond - Assess

Although the MPS uses a different nine stage model, it still equates to the same basic stages that a POP project passes through. The diagram below shows how the two processes knit together:

Scan				Analyse	Respond		Assess	
Demand	Problem	Aim	Research	Analysis	Options	Response(s)	Evaluation	Review

The judges are asked to score the strengths and weaknesses of the entry using the following criteria. We strongly suggest that you consider these questions for yourself in preparing the entry, as these are the criteria against which entries will be marked.

### Scan

We need to see clear, specific and realistic objectives, clearly defined success criteria and the problem must be of significant concern to the community. We would like to see appropriate involvement from the police, the community and other agencies in identifying the problem. We want to 'see your workings'; what research you engaged in. How was the problem first highlighted? Who did it affect? Where was it happening? How often? Since when? Think in terms of the Problem Analysis Triangle (Victim-Offender-Location).

### Analyse

We want to see that the information has been collated intelligently and that appropriate analysis has led to discovering the causes and underlying conditions that created the problem and sustain it. The analysis must demonstrate knowledge about the nature and extent of the problem and show how gaps of information were identified and taken into account. All the agencies that have a stake in this problem should have been identified, consulted and involved. Do you now understand the problem? Why does it affect people's lives? Why do the offenders do what they do? Why and how does the location encourage the problem?

### Respond

We need to see a clear relationship between the analysis and the design of the response and why particular responses were chosen over others. You should explain how you intended to measure success and provide evidence of your evaluation criteria. The project should demonstrate effective use of partnership working and ownership of the response, within and outside your organisation. The response should have been planned and implemented and costed with adequate resources allocated. Any difficulties will be identified and well managed and there should be evidence of an effective ongoing review mechanism and explain what changes were made in response to this process. If you can show that the response is creative and innovative and how you arrived at the idea, it would be very useful.

## Assess

We need to see how clear use of evaluation data was used to both inform and improve the response. You should explain how evidence of success was collated and whether the response achieved what was intended. Explain your methods of evaluation and why you considered them appropriate. What impact did your response(s) have? How much did partners contribute? If you were not as successful as you'd have liked, what went wrong and why? Did your evaluation extend your knowledge and understanding about the problem, the underlying causes and/or the potential solution? Is the solution sustainable and can it be transferred to similar problems?

## Written Presentation

While we are not judging you on grammar, syntax, punctuation or spelling, we do award a few extra marks if the entry is well presented, easy to read, makes appropriate use of graphics (within the document size limit). It should be plain English, should flow logically and not be full of 'waffle'. Stick to the important points.

## Coherence of Project

These marks are awarded if you clearly show that each stage of the project grows logically out of the preceding stages. For example, the response clearly does address the problem highlighted by the analysis. Or the evaluation does measure the appropriate factors that relate to your aim/objective.

The judges will give feedback to all the projects short-listed. Feedback for those not short-listed will be available on request only.

The summaries of all the projects (short listed/submitted) for the award will be placed on a database and details of the projects will be available to others. Please note that by submitting a project to the awards you are agreeing to any information included in your entry - including photographs - being available to others.

## Key Dates

Deadline for applications is 9:00 am on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> November 2009. Short-listed entries will be notified in early December. Winners will be announced at the 5th Safer London POP Conference on the 22nd February 2010.

## Information for the Application Form

### Section 1:

It is imperative that the application form is completed in full giving:

- Title of project;
- Indication of which Award the entry relates to;
- Name of OCU/ Borough Safer Neighbourhoods Team/Agency/CDRP; and
- Name of one contact person with position/rank (this should be one of the authors), and their email address, address, telephone number, fax number and the name and contact details of the local Operational Command Unit Commander/ Business Director.

### Section 2:

The summary of the application must be fewer than 400 words and will include:

- Outline of the problem that was addressed by the project;
- Description of the initiative designed to address the problem;
- the main intervention principles and what they were designed to achieve;
- the main outcomes of project particularly in relation to the problem; and
- what evidence was used in designing the programme and how the project was evaluated.

### Section 3:

A description of the project in no more than 4000 words set out using the SARA process.

### Section 4:

A simple paragraph setting out how your partnership would use the prize money if you win £2500 or the grand prize of £10,000.

### Section 5:

A letter from the OCU Commander/Business Director endorsing the entry.

## Entry Format

All entries must be submitted on the official application form. All entries must be prepared in the following format:

- Size 10 Arial font
- File size not to exceed 1 (one) MB (excluding endorsing letter). To meet this limit may entail removing or resizing graphics and photos as these make particularly high use of memory.

### Hints for Entries

The Safer London Problem Solving Award is seeking to demonstrate excellence in problem solving policing. Excellence could be demonstrated in different ways, as laid out below:

- Projects entered could describe work to reduce specific crime and disorder problems and can cover the full range of problems encountered by the MPS and their partners. However, the judges will be looking to see how far the project demonstrates a wider adoption of problem solving, and that it is used on a systematic basis to address safer neighbourhoods, rather than one-off problems.
- You will need to show the end result has improved delivery of problem solving and how this particular project helped to improve their areas. Examples might include change management programmes to introduce problem solving, training, or changes to the performance management process to ensure problem solving is adopted properly. Similarly, projects might use problem oriented principles to provide reassurance to the public or provide a better service to victims
- Projects that develop and support effective partnerships. Points to bear in mind include: entries should demonstrate that the work forms part of the local crime and disorder strategy and impacts on local community priorities.
- Although the police should lead in preparing the entry, they may not necessarily have been the lead agency in the project. It is important to show that the project was a joint enterprise and the contributions of each agency should be made clear.

### Common pitfalls

Significant work can be involved in preparing an entry. There are a number of pitfalls that you might like to bear in mind in considering whether to enter and preparing your entry:

#### *Joint Application / Partner Contribution*

It is strongly recommended that you consult with all your partners and the local community when filing in the application. It is important that the application submitted reflects partnership working and has inputs from partners.

### *Entering Projects too early*

The ultimate measure of a project's effectiveness is if it has reduced crime and disorder or can be shown to have been effective in helping to ensure the delivery of problem solving. If the project is entered at too early a stage then it is usually not possible to demonstrate an effective outcome and such entries lose marks in the evaluation and coherence categories. It is simply not possible to win if these scores are low.

### *Poor presentation of the entry*

There are many aspects to presenting an entry, including style of writing, structure, grammar, clarity of diagrams/charts and spelling. The content of a well written report is more likely to make an impact because it will show to best effect what is important about the project and also shows that the author knows how to structure their thinking in a logical way. We strongly advise you to have your entry read in early draft form by someone not associated with the project, who can provide feedback on it – can they understand the project? You may also want to have someone proof read it at a later stage.

### *Executive summaries*

Summaries help the judges to gain a quick over-view of the project before they read the main report. It is helpful to read the full report with a sense of context. The summary pack, which is widely circulated, also contains copies of all summaries without the main report. The summary should therefore be treated as an important, stand-alone document that provides a succinct description of the project. Although sections of the main report are likely to form the basis of the summary, these do need to be summarised rather than simply used in full length. Ensure it is no longer than 400 words and that it contains no diagrams or charts. It should fit onto one side of A4.

Good luck!