

PILOT STUDY PLAN

# Family Support (The Transition and Resilience Project)

The University of Hertfordshire

Principal investigator: Professor Joanna Adler

## Pilot study plan template

The University of Hertfordshire

***Family Support (The Transition and Resilience Project)***

---

Project title	<b><i>Family Support (The Transition and Resilience Project)</i></b>
Developer (Institution)	<i>Family Support (Khushali Supeda, Transitions Manager, Family Support)</i>
Evaluator (Institution)	<i>University of Hertfordshire (UH)</i>
Principal investigator(s)	<i>Professor Joanna Adler.</i>
Evaluation plan author(s)	<i>Dr Tim McSweeney, Dr David Wellsted, Natalie Hall, Amanda Busby and Rosemary Davidson.</i>
Evaluation setting	<i>Schools in Hammersmith and Fulham, London</i>
Target group	<i>School age children (Intensive multi-intervention package to support children to stay in school).</i>
Number of participants	<i>Up to 25 children.</i>

### Study plan version history

Version	Date	Reason for revision
1.2 [ <i>latest</i> ]		
1.1	24.2.22	Responding to feedback from the YEF

1.0 [original]		<i>[leave blank for the original version]</i>
----------------	--	---

*Any changes to the design need to be discussed with the YEF Evaluation Manager (EM) and the developer team prior to any change(s) being finalised. Describe in the table above any agreed changes made to the evaluation design, research questions and approach, and the rationale for these.*

## **Background and rationale**

### **Background and rationale**

Family Support offers support through trauma informed and Systemic Practice (Centre for Systemic Social Work 2018) alongside signs of safety approach models and theory to underpin their work. In several areas of practice and research the idea of working in a trauma informed manner has become increasingly prevalent, particularly in relation to trauma and adverse childhood experiences (ACE) (CDC 2020). What a trauma informed approach means may vary, but a useful way to conceptualise it and the principles at the heart of most trauma informed practice are usefully (and accessibly) summarised by the University of Buffalo Institute on Trauma and Trauma Informed Care (Buffalo Center for Social Research 2019). It should be noted that in 2018, NICE concluded that *There is very little evidence demonstrating measurable impact of TIC or TIA. The evidence that does exist is of a low quality and come(s) almost exclusively from the US.* (NICE Guideline NG116, p149 2018). One year later, the Long Term Plan for the NHS clearly advocated a Trauma-Informed approach in the care and support of young people in the Health and Justice System (point 12 p118 NHS England 2019) ).

Family support advocate for and support children. They aim to enable progression of outcomes by understanding the family context and a child's basic rights (UNICEF 1989). Family Support aims to strengthen the home environment and empowers families to make positive changes. Safeguarding and protecting children is fundamental to their service delivery. Whilst the focus of work stays with the child of concern, they ensure the pathway of support encompasses the whole family, considering all children within the family unit. Family Support understands that all families are unique and have their own defining features. Family Support aims to work at the point of prevention as opposed to crisis.

### **Intervention approach**

Family Support is an Intensive wrap-around project being delivered in Hammersmith and Fulham recruiting via school-based referrals. The Wrap Around approach was developed in the USA. A consensus statement on its operating principles was reached by their National Wraparound Initiative (Bruns & Walker, 2008). The ten principles centre on ways of working in a family centred, community embedded way within multi-faceted, culturally aware teams. Wraparound has been shown to be promising and/or effective by analyses for the WSIPP (2020). Delivery relies on maintaining school and family commitment to the intervention. Various interventions initially offered included a family practitioner supporting the child and family intensively, group work and peer mentoring, Brain in Hand (personalised support accessed from phone or i-pad that was withdrawn during the feasibility phase), TIC+ counselling sessions (TIC+ n.d.), virtual reality-based intervention (Round Midnight n.d.) and ASE Mentoring (ASECIC n.d.) providing up to six support sessions at the end of the intervention. There is some evidence that mentoring can be effective as an early intervention (Joliffe and Farrington 2008). The national evaluation of the Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes failed to demonstrate a reduction in offending. However, one of the resulting recommendations was that delivering mentoring to younger age groups who

were at risk of offending may be more effective (St James-Roberts et al. 2005). The strength of the mentoring relationship seems to be a critical factor in reducing reoffending. An international meta-analysis (Tolan et al. 2013) found stronger effects when mentoring meetings were in depth and frequent, also where emotional support was emphasised. More equivocal findings have been noted where mentoring relationships break down (Tarling et al. 2004).

### **Referral process**

Referrals are largely received from schools. Criteria for referrals are impulsivity behaviour, ADHD, being aged between 10-14 years, having school attendance issues (e.g. being considered at risk of exclusion), experiencing early childhood trauma, or demonstrating low educational attainment.

### **Screening**

The screening process considers elements of the project's inclusion criteria and general areas of need using the MOSAIC social care case management system.

### **Site contact**

Site: Khushali Sup<sub>u</sub>dea, Transitions Manager, Family Support

Dr Tim McSweeney and Rosemary Davidson – University of Hertfordshire (UH) contact responsible for the Family Support and ASSIST projects (Site contact).

### **Participant Inclusion criteria**

The inclusion and referral criteria for the Family Support project is focused on

- The child's age (10 to 14 years)
- Risk of school exclusion,
- Evidence of ASB, impulsivity and or hyperactivity,
- Low school attainment, and
- Early childhood trauma

Behaviours to be addressed include at least one of the following; school refusal, regular absconding, violence, substance misuse, offending, defiant or severe oppositional behaviour or harmful sexual behaviour.

### **Exclusion criteria**

Not meeting inclusion/referral criteria outlined above.

### **Sample size**

The project begins work with its final cohort for the pilot study in 2021. It anticipates working with up to 25 children and their families up to April 2022

### **Recruitment and follow up**

Following recruitment into the programme, the clients<sup>1</sup> will be followed up at one (t1), three (t2) and six months (t3).

### **Adherence to Intervention**

Adherence to the intervention will be assessed by recording attendance at therapeutic interventions and follow ups assessments.

### **Service user experience:**

Qualitative interviews with families (e.g. parents, carers, guardians and children) to investigate their experience of participating in the intervention will be completed

### **Analysis – additional measures**

Family Support utilise a range of longer-term outcomes linked to improved educational (e.g. reduced levels of truancy and exclusions, improved attainment) and offending outcomes (e.g. fewer children subject to a Youth Offending Order), which are specified in the Theory of Change Model. However, these outcomes will accrue beyond the scope of the pilot study.

## **Objectives**

The Family Support project has already been through the feasibility phase of the evaluation process and has progressed to a pilot study. The pilot study has a cohort design (N=25) and will assess change over time in main outcomes, and continued success of delivery. A further aim is to determine whether it is possible to deliver a large-scale evaluation of the intervention.

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer to all study participants (young people and parents) as clients for simplicity. Where necessary the subject will be specified more exactly.

## **Overall aims**

The overall aim for the pilot evaluation is to investigate the potential for Family Support to improve children and young peoples' outcomes. The outcomes listed below cover problem behaviour, emotions, trauma, family functioning, and engagement in criminal behaviour.

## **Family Support objectives**

- The main objective is to assess the improvement in emotion, problem behaviour, and family functioning, distress related to trauma, and reduced engagement in criminal behaviour by the children involved in the programme.
- To assess the potential effect size of the Family Support intervention.
- To evaluate the methods for recruiting clients from the intervention's target population and retaining clients in the programme once enrolled.
- To evaluate the potential to delivering a larger scale randomised trial.

## **Core measures**

YEF specifies a standard set of measures to be used and compared across a range of commissioned interventions and evaluations. This is referred to as the core measures dataset and are specified below. Additional optional measures have been agreed with individual grantees.

## **Primary outcomes**

Psychological well-being:

- Strength and difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)
- SCORE 15 Index of Family Functioning and Change
- The Impact of Events Scale (IES) and the Children's Revised Impact of Events Scale-Eight Items (CRIES-8)
- Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime (ESYTC) – sweep 3

## **Adherence to Intervention**

- Adherence to the intervention will be assessed by estimating the number of missed appointments and missed follow-up assessments.

## **Service user experience**

- Qualitative interviews will be completed with families (parents, carers and children) to investigate their experiences of participating in the intervention.

### **Family Support specific outcomes**

Family Support have also articulated a range of longer-term outcomes linked to improved educational (reduced truancy and exclusions, improved attainment) and offending outcomes (fewer children subject to Youth Offending Orders). These outcomes are outlined in the Theory of Change below (Figure 1), but they cannot be evaluated within the pilot study as most will occur beyond the scope of the programme.

**Figure 1.** Theory of Change: The Family Support Transition and Resilience Project

<b>Problem statement</b>	To prevent children and young people from becoming involved in crime and violence by providing a positive experience of their school transition between Years 6 and 7.		
<b>Inputs</b>	<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Short-term outcomes</b>	<b>Mid/long-term outcomes</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensive Inclusion Practitioner (IIP) support</li> <li>• Group work</li> <li>• Peer mentoring</li> <li>• Brain in Hand mobile app (withdrawn after 2021)</li> <li>• TIC+ counselling</li> <li>• Virtual reality software</li> <li>• ASE mentoring</li> </ul>	<p>Schools support children to access the project.</p> <p>Families are engaged with the project.</p> <p>Children access, engage with and complete a range of interventions offered by the project.</p>	<p>Improvements (as measured using YEF’s core measures) observed in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems and prosocial behaviour (SDQ);</li> <li>• quality of family life (SCORE 15);</li> <li>• levels of distress experienced due to traumatic events (IES-R and/or CRIES 8); and</li> <li>• self-reported delinquency (ESYTC).</li> </ul>	<p>Improved educational outcomes (e.g. reduced levels of truancy and exclusions, improved educational attainment).</p> <p>Improved offending outcomes (e.g. fewer children subject to a Youth Offending Order).</p>
<b>Impact</b>	Improved educational and offending outcomes for project participants.		

## Research objectives

The Family Support Transition and Resilience intervention has already been through feasibility testing and has now progressed to a pilot study.

**Aim 1:** To evaluate improvement in core outcomes over time.

Research questions:

Describe the client sample at baseline.

Describe the magnitude and direction of change in behaviour (SDQ), and Family functioning (SCORE 15) over time (before-after) at 1, 3 and 6 months in comparison to baseline, and describe progress towards achieving Goals at 6 months for clients engaged in the programme.

Describe changes in trauma (CRIES) and engagement in crime (ESYTC).

Where possible, describe and evaluate the effect of baseline status on change over time

**Aim 2:** To evaluate effect size

Research questions:

To estimate the likely effect size of the Family Support Programme on behaviour (SDQ) and Family functioning (SCORE 15).

**Aim 3:** Describe the referral and screening process

Research questions:

To describe the flow of young people from referral, through evaluation, to engagement on the programme, including reasons for not progressing on the programme (Flow Chart)

To evaluate potential bias in selection, by considering sample characteristics at different points in the referral process and where possible, comparison across subgroups (eg referral sources)

**Aim 4:** Client retention and data completion

Research Questions

Do more than 75% of clients complete the intervention, and for clients who complete the intervention are more than 80% of the outcome measures completed.

**Aim 5:** To evaluate the potential to delivering a larger scale randomised trial.

See success criteria

**Aim 6:** To assess implementation process

Research Questions:

Has the intervention been implemented with fidelity?

Have service users felt engaged?

How responsive has the intervention been to service user, staff and volunteers (where appropriate)?

## **Success criteria**

The main success criteria for the pilot will be the readiness for a definitive trial, through the potential to scale up the intervention to meet a large sample size (typically  $N > 300$ ). The estimated sample size for a trial to evaluate effectiveness of the intervention will be estimated from evaluation of the potential effect size. Key criteria to assess evidence of promise will be:

- Referral process: If bias in the referral process is identified, can this bias be addressed?
- Retention of at least 75% of young people in the intervention once the intervention was started, or evidence that retention can be addressed.
- Completion of at least 80% of outcome measures at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months, or evidence that completion can be improved in a larger scale trial
- Given the likely required sample size for a larger scale trial:
  - a. What population size is required to achieve that sample size, and
  - b. Can likely delivery centres with a sufficient population be identified?

## **Methods**

### **Data collection**

Family Support offers intensive wrap around support in Hammersmith and Fulham, recruiting via school-based referrals. Delivery relies on maintaining school and family commitment to the intervention. Various interventions are offered: A family practitioner providing intensive support to child and family; Group work and peer mentoring; TIC+

counselling sessions; Round Midnight, a virtual reality-based intervention; and ASE Mentoring, which provides up to six support sessions at the end of the intervention.

The Family Support evaluation draws upon different data sources and methods. These include the use of routine monitoring data collected by the projects, core measures specified by YEF relating to project participants (N=25), and qualitative data from interviews and focus groups with project participants and professional stakeholders.

### **Data collection methods**

The majority of quantitative data collected will involve either data routinely collected within the Family Support programme, or the specified YEF core dataset.

As far as possible all identified data for each grantee programme will be collected by direct online entry to the REDCap system, stored securely on servers at UH, by members of the grantee team. Staff will receive training on data collection and use of the online system.

Data collection, data entry and queries raised by a member of the grantee team will be conducted in line with the Data Management processes as agreed between the grantees and the evaluation team.

Data will be routinely collected during the referral and screening process (as agreed with each grantee). Once clients are accepted onto the grantee programme the agreed core data will be collected (t0), and follow-ups with the clients will be arranged at 1 (t1), 3 (t2) and 6 (t3) months.

## **Evaluation data**

### **Routine monitoring data**

The evaluation will undertake analysis of aggregated and anonymised data collected by the four family focused grantees relating to information about referrals into the service, the screening and assessment processes, and any formalised reviews. These data will also enable the profile of the source population to be characterised. By monitoring referrals, the evaluation team can assess whether appropriate referrals are being made (as measured against each project's referral criteria), and the extent to which selection bias occurs in accepting clients into the programme.

### **Key Demographic Data**

Each programme will capture key client specific and demographic data, including age, ethnic

heritage, gender, relationship to other grantee clients and index of deprivation<sup>2</sup>.

## **Core measures**

YEF specifies a standard set of measures to compare across the range of commissioned interventions and evaluations. This is referred to as the core measures dataset. Any additional optional measures have been agreed with individual grantees.

**Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, SDQ** [Family Member, Teacher<sup>3</sup> and Young Person completed]

<https://www.sdqinfo.com/>

This is a widely used and well validated measure which has several versions including one for 11 to 17-year-olds, for parents and for teachers. It is used to evaluate antisocial or other behaviour problems.

**SCORE 15 Index of Family Functioning and Change** [Family member, and Young Person completed]

<https://www.aft.org.uk/view/score.htm>

A self-report outcome measure, which is widely used in systemic, family-based interventions and has been validated for use by CAMHS. It is well manualised, and has versions for use with younger children and for implementation within families

**The Impacts of Events Scale (IES) and the Children's Revised Impact of Event Scale – 8 (CRIES – 8)** [Young Person completed]

<https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/adult-sr/ies-r.asp>

<https://www.childrenandwar.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/English-CRIES-8-with-instructions.pdf>

These are freely available measures of PTSD and trauma. The adult version is a self-report measure that was designed and revised in line with DSM-IV. It is widely used and allows adults to first identify a stressful life event, then report on the level of distress or intrusion (“difficulty”) into their lives that the event has been associated with over the preceding

---

<sup>2</sup> The particular index of deprivation to be used, and the implications for data processing, are still being discussed at the time of writing.

week. The children's (CRIES-8) is widely used as a pre-and post intervention measure. It is also self-report, is aimed at children over eight years old who can read independently and is eight items long.

**Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime – sweep 3 (ESYTC)<sup>3</sup>** [Young Person completed]

<https://www.edinstudy.law.ed.ac.uk/>

The questionnaire used in sweep 3 (when children were aged up to 14) contains the original 15-items with an additional four items on bullying, harming or injuring animals, selling drugs and racial assault or harassment.

Table 1 provides a summary of the data collection schedule.

**TABLE 1: SCHEDULE OF PLANNED DATA COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENTS**

	Referral	Screening	Baseline (t0)	1 month follow-up (t1)	3 month follow-up (t2)	6 month follow-up (t3)
<b>Demographics</b>	X					
<b>Programme Specific process</b>	X	X				
<b>SDQ</b>			X	X	X	X
<b>SCORE 15</b>			X	X	X	X
<b>IES-R</b>			X	X	X	X
<b>CRIES 8</b>			X	X	X	X
<b>ESYTC</b>			X	X	X	X
<b>End of intervention, or engagement form</b>			To be completed if a client withdraws, or when they complete the intervention.			

Notes:

- SDQ – Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; SCORE 15 - Index of Family Functioning and Change; IES-R - Impact of Events Scale Revised; CRIES 8 - Children's Revised Impact of Event Scale; ESYTC - Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime – sweep 3. All scales were agreed as part of initial contracting and are outlined in section 3.
- It may not be possible for clients to be followed up to 12 months for all grantees. Further, it is noted that decisions about whether to move from initial feasibility to pilot will be made before 12 months has elapsed. The expectation is thus that where 12 months data are possible to collate, they will feed into assessment of the pilot phase, not initial feasibility.

<sup>3</sup> We have previously noted concerns with the ESYTC and the general limitations of self-report delinquency data. We thank the YEF for their consideration of these concerns and helpful responses.

## **DATA SOURCES:**

To simplify description of the data we use 'clients' to encompass the young people and/or families being considered for intervention, as appropriate. Data is captured separately for young people and their parents or carers. Please note that each client sub-set will be recorded in both aggregated and dis-aggregated ways to allow the evaluation to capture the different referral routes and their different potential experiences of the grantees' interventions.

The following objectives have been defined as core objectives that will be measured across all four Family Intervention Programmes.

- **Aim 1:** To evaluate improvement in core outcomes over time.

The key data source will be the data collected on the REDCap database.

- **Aim 2:** To evaluate effect size.

The effect size will be estimated from the core dataset specified in aim 1.

- **Aim 3:** To describe the referral and screening process for the Family Support programme.

Data relating to screening and referral has been identified for each grantee programme, and where possible this has been incorporated into the REDCap database. Where the relevant data cannot be captured in this way, the source data are the records held by the grantee, and transfer of anonymised data will be an ongoing process on a data format separately specified.

- **Aim 4:** Client retention and data completion

Attendance at therapeutic sessions, and the client completion record will allow evaluation of engagement in the Family Support Programme, and the database record will provide data on data completion.

- **Aim 5:** To evaluate the readiness to deliver a larger scale randomised trial.

Evaluation of this aim will utilise all the data collected in a summary process after all other aims have been evaluated.

## **Qualitative Interviews: Aim 6**

The key focus of our pilot qualitative work will be to better understand: the factors that support or interfere with the intervention's delivery; the ongoing Implementation processes of the intervention's recruitment, retention and reach alongside service users' experiences and views of the intervention. The interviews will help us to further assess acceptability of

and engagement with Transition and Resilience by the young people and their families. Interviews with practitioners/referrers will also help us to assess whether and potentially how successfully, processes can be managed and upscaled.

We anticipate inviting up to five children and their parents, carers, or legal guardians from each project to participate in an interview to inform the pilot evaluation. Professional stakeholders (up to five per project), including managers and delivery staff, will be sampled purposively. Across the full programme of four projects we therefore propose to conduct up to a total of 60 qualitative interviews – individually and in focus groups for the pilot study programme of work (up to 15 participants for Family Support).

Interviews with the children and their carers may be individual, or as a joint interview depending on the particular context.

The data will be transcribed sufficiently for deductive thematic analysis. In some cases the clients may refuse to be recorded for the interview, in such circumstances a contemporaneous account of the interview will be taken and used for the analysis.

### **Referral process**

Family Support referrals are largely received from schools in Hammersmith and Fulham (London). Criteria for referrals are impulsivity behaviour, ADHD, being aged between 10-14 years, having school attendance issues (e.g. being considered at risk of exclusion), experiencing early childhood trauma, or demonstrating low educational attainment.

### **Inclusion criteria**

Participants will be considered eligible for enrolment in this pilot evaluation if they fulfil at least one of the criteria and none of the exclusion criteria as defined below.

Family Supports referral criteria are focused on:

- The child's age (10 to 14 years)
- Risk of school exclusion,
- Evidence of ASB, impulsivity and or hyperactivity,
- Low school attainment, and
- Early childhood trauma, including experience of early childhood adverse experience.

Behaviours to be addressed include at least one of the following; school refusal, regular absconding, violence, substance misuse, offending, defiant or severe oppositional behaviour or harmful sexual behaviour.

### Exclusion criteria

Not meeting any of the inclusion, or referral criteria outlined above.

### Screening

The screening process considers elements of the project's inclusion criteria and general areas of need using the MOSAIC social care case management system.

### Sample size

The Family Support programme (*The Transition and Resilience Project*) has planned to recruit 25 young people and their families during the pilot phase, giving a pragmatically determined sample size. Assuming a sample of this magnitude and a two-sided paired test, with 20% drop out,  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $1-\beta=0.8$ , the minimum detectable difference is equivalent to  $d=0.66$ .

### Recruitment and follow up

Once clients have been accepted onto the Family Support programme baseline assessments (t0) will be collected along with other routine data agreed with the grantee programme and provisioned on the database. The clients will be followed up at one (t1), three (t2) and six months (t3).

### Data analysis

#### Methods overview (adapt as necessary)

Research methods	Data collection methods	Participants/ data sources (type, number)	Data analysis methods	Research questions addressed
Secondary analysis.	Routine monitoring data collected by Family Support (including core measures).	Those referred, screened, accepted, discharged, AND completing Family Support services. Includes progress against outcomes, as measured using	Descriptive and where appropriate inferential statistics.	Aims 1 through 4.

		YEF's core measures.		
Primary data collection.	Qualitative interviews.	Purposive sampling of professional stakeholders (N=5) and opportunistic sampling of parents/carers (N=5) and children (N=5) accessing Family Support services.	Thematic analysis.	Aims 1 through 5

The analysis plan provides a framework that is applicable to all 4 grantees. The particular referral and screening processes are outlined above. The following measures will be collected and analysed for all projects; SDQ – Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; SCORE 15 - Index of Family Functioning and Change; IES-R - Impact of Events Scale Revised; CRIES 8 - Children's Revised Impact of Event Scale; ESYTC - Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime – sweep 3.

### **ASSIST – additional measures**

Family support do not specify any additional measures that can be considered within the framework of this evaluation.

The overall aim for the pilot evaluation is to investigate Family Supports the potential to improve the outcomes of young people referred into the programme. In addition, the data will be used to assess the potential for this programme to be evaluated in a larger randomised trial designed to evaluate either the efficacy or effectiveness of the intervention.

### **Objectives**

**Aim 1 and 2:** To assess the direction and magnitude of change in the main outcomes for the young people in the programme. To assess the potential effect size of the intervention.

The analysis will consider each of the 4 YEF core measures independently. The initial analysis will be considered through descriptive statistics for the sample, as a whole, for all time points, including all demographic and other factors. The analysis will describe change

over time as a mean change from baseline, and estimated effect size (with confidence intervals) at 1 (t1), 3 (t2), and 6 (t3) months.

Sensitivity analysis will consider the influence of baseline characteristics, and missing data. As the dataset is small, any models will have to constrain the number of variables included. The analysis will seek to demonstrate gross effects of baseline variability, and missing data (by replacement of missing values) and interpret any influence on the observed change over time.

**Aim 3:** Describe the referral and screening process

Analysis of the referral and screening process will be descriptive. A flow chart will be used to show the flow of client from referral through screening to completion of the intervention. Focus will be placed on why clients are not selected for the intervention at each stage. Descriptive analysis will seek to evaluate through tabulation the extent to which selection of clients is subject to bias, excluding particular groups of clients. Numbers of clients will be small, but where possible analysis will use  $\chi^2$  to aid interpretation of the data

**Aim 4:** Evaluate client retention and data completion in the programme.

For clients starting the programme, retention to the end of the programme is important. Retention is defined as completing at least 66% of treatment sessions. This can be through missing sessions regularly through the treatment period, or by withdrawing from the program early.

The number of young people and families failing to attend scheduled appointments will be estimated, with the number and proportion of missed appointments and assessment sessions at each time point described. Overall adherence to the intervention (appointments) will be estimated as an overall proportion of appointments missed for each family, and the proportion of families attending at least 66% of treatment sessions. Characteristics of families who do, and do not complete the programme will be tabulated and differences highlighted.

Data completion will be tabulated for each outcome.

**Aim 5:** Evaluation of success criteria

Readiness to progress to a larger scale efficacy or effectiveness trial will be assessed. It is likely that a sample size of 300 clients or more will be required. The progression criteria will consider the potential to deliver a trial of this magnitude. It is anticipated that the main analysis (Aim 3) will provide an estimate of the likely sample size required for such a trial.

Progression to a larger scale efficacy or effectiveness trial will consider four main criteria.

1. Bias in the referral process and whether bias can be addressed.

Bias will be evaluated by highlighting any differences between groups of families who start therapy, compared to those who are referred but are not accepted on to the treatment programme. The reasons for not progressing will be listed.

2. Retention of clients in the intervention.

Retention is an important secondary indicator of bias. Retention will initially be evaluated by determining whether Grantees are successful in retaining at least 75% of families who start the programme. Secondary analysis will consider any apparent differences between families who do and do not complete the programme.

3. Sufficiently robust and unbiased data completion.

Data completion for each of the outcomes will be tabulated. Data will be defined as complete for scales where sufficient data for each outcome has been completed to evaluate a scale score.

4. Whether a trial of sufficient magnitude could be delivered

Analysis will proceed by tabulating the assessed outcomes from analysis of each of the first 3 aims and any mitigation identified in the qualitative analysis. This will provide a summary statement of the success criteria, any bias in selection, and any adjustments that can be made in future studies. The potential number of recruiting centres will be estimated by considering how many young people and families could be recruited from treating centre per year, and the total number of treating centres required to achieve the required sample size.

### **Data management**

Data relating to YEF's core measures collected by Family Support will be entered on to REDCap and securely stored on servers based at UH. The database will be username and password protected and only accessible to members of the YEF evaluation team, members of the grantee team and external regulators if requested.

Access to the evaluation database is controlled and administered by UH Data Management, and access is via end-to-end encryption. The servers are protected by UH firewalls and anti-virus products and are patched and maintained (including back-ups) according to best practice.

The database software (RedCap) provides a number of features to help maintain data quality, including; maintaining an audit trail, allowing custom validations on all data, allowing users

to raise data query requests, and search facilities to identify validation failure, and missing data. Rigorous testing has been carried out on the database, prior to use by grantees, in line with UH SOP's.

After completion of the evaluation the database and associated design documentation will be routinely archived for a period of five years.

## **Outputs**

The UH evaluation team will provide YEF with pilot reports for each of the four grantees for peer review and publication (at YEF's discretion). In consultation with YEF, findings from the research may also be submitted for publication in academic journals and other outlets (e.g. conference presentations).

## **Ethics and registration and approvals**

These studies were not pre-registered. They are a continuation of feasibility evaluations that will not be moving to RCT. The grantees began their interventions before data sharing protocols that are now normative for the YEF were in place and before the evaluators were appointed. As such, referral processes to the interventions and the potential for post evaluation data unmasking, and data linkage will not be possible.

The University's ethics and integrity policies and processes can be seen at: <https://www.herts.ac.uk/research/research-management/ethics-and-research-integrity>. In accordance with this process, the four pilot studies have full approval from the UH Health, Science, Engineering and Technology Ethics Committee (protocol number: LMS/SF/UH/04697). This approval grants the ability to collate data until 31.03.22

The team are bound by the codes of conducts of our relevant professional and statutory bodies--the British Psychological Society (professional body), Health and Care Professions Council, British Society of Criminology and, or Social Work England. We are all used to working to the DPA, 2018 and GDPR and within trauma informed ethical frameworks where we prioritise participant vulnerability, risks and legislative requirements.

## **Safeguarding**

In line with the process adopted at the feasibility evaluation, within the pilot studies, interview participants will be made aware that there may be situations, under the safeguarding framework, where there is a statutory obligation for members of the evaluation team to break confidentiality and provide information back to the organisation

providing the intervention, or other statutory bodies. As outlined above, the research team would not process identifiable data, but participants need to be clear that for safeguarding reasons, anonymisation is not complete.

The team are used to conducting evaluation and practice with young people and adults who may be vulnerable by the situation in which they find themselves (Care Act, 2014; SVGA, 2006; Sexual Offences Act, 2003). Anyone conducting fieldwork and/or data analysis will be DBS cleared as appropriate and versed in the safeguarding protocol for that evaluation. The initial intention was that we would be following the safeguarding protocols provided by each grantee, working in close liaison with project managers from the grantee. Given the developments and dramatic changes to policy and process, we have now developed our own overarching practice which works in continued consultation with project managers. If a safeguarding concern is raised or identified, then we will enact the following process using common key principles including: if an immediate risk is identified, other work ceases until the police and/or social services are called; once identified, information is passed to the relevant duty safeguarding officer or project manager. Although information is protected by default, all research participants and grantees are aware that data will be shared appropriately to the circumstances of any particular safeguarding risk that may be identified. We will also use a precautionary principle in pre-identified situations of low/medium risk so that children are neither put at further risk, nor unnecessarily criminalised.

## **Consent**

Most of the administrative data being collated for this evaluation is being shared, stored and processed under the principles of legitimate interest. Additionally, there are interviews being undertaken (with service users, stakeholders and service providers) that will proceed on the basis of consent. When providing information and gaining consent from young people, will also ensure that parents/primary caregivers/legal guardians are informed and provide consent where possible. We are mindful that in some circumstances, parental interests will conflict with young people's rights. In such circumstances, we will prioritise the children's interests. Wherever possible, we will also seek to avoid unnecessary criminalising of children and young people following principles embedded in CPS and policing guidance. When being invited to participate in interviews specifically for the evaluation, all prospective participants will be provided with an Information Sheet (PIS) and given time to read it fully, before any interview may proceed. Any questions will be satisfactorily answered and if the participant is willing to participate, written informed consent will be obtained. During the consent process it will be made completely and unambiguously clear

that the participant is free to refuse to participate in all or any aspect of the pilot evaluation, at any time and for any reason, without incurring any penalty or affecting their continued involvement in the intervention. We will ensure that: information is provided in accessible, age and cognitively appropriate ways; consent is treated as an ongoing process; that consent and participation can be withdrawn without penalty; that findings and data will be anonymous where possible, confidential throughout and, where appropriate, depersonalised or anonymised as soon as possible according to principles both of the GDPR and UK anonymisation network.

## **Data protection**

Given the sensitive nature of the data, its protection and security are of the utmost importance. UH has well-established procedures relating to confidentiality of information. We are registered and fully compliant with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) and the Data Protection Act 2018. UH is certified through Cyber Essentials (the UH Cyber Essentials Certificate number is IASME-A-09513).

For these grantee evaluations data will be transferred to the University of Hertfordshire in pseudonymised form and analyses as specified in the Statistical Analysis Plan. As specified in the DIPA the data will be stored on secure servers and only available to personnel directly involved in the evaluation, or as required by statutory authorities. The data will be electronically archived, and destroyed 5 years after completion of the final evaluation reports.

## **Access to Data**

Access to the evaluation database is controlled and administered by UH Data Management, and access is via end-to-end encryption. The servers are protected by UH firewalls and anti-virus products and are patched and maintained (including back-ups) according to best practice.

## **Archiving**

The pseudonymised evaluation data will be electronically archived on secure servers at the University of Hertfordshire for 5 years after the final evaluation reports have been completed. Access to the data will be managed, and only made available to members of the evaluation team, to YEF personnel, or where necessary for statutory regulatory processes.

## **Confidentiality**

An important principle is to maintain the separation of anonymised client data collected for the pilot evaluation and the client's personal details. This will be achieved by ensuring that all data captured via REDCap is anonymous to the evaluation team. Pseudo anonymity will be achieved by providing each client with a randomly generated study id, used in the dataset that is unrelated to their personal details. All reporting will only provide summary data which avoids the potential to identify individual clients. Where quotes are included from qualitative interviews any identifying material will be removed or modified as appropriate.

By using a random id to protect the identity of the beneficiaries and service users, the projects can provide the data required for the evaluation while maintaining a level of protection against disclosing the clients' identities. We are adopting a relatively routine way to do this, which is for the organisations to retain a key which would allow identification of the clients from the random code. If subsequent data linkage had been possible then this key would also allow longer term follow-up from public and institutional databases. As it has now been agreed that these studies will not be moving beyond RCT (confirmed by the YEF Evaluation Manager via email, 14.09.21), there will be no need to unmask the data as no grantee in these evaluations will be required to collect and share identifiable data for depositing in YEF's data archive.

## **Central Monitoring**

UH staff will review Case Report Form (CRF) data<sup>4</sup> for errors and missing key data points. The pilot evaluation database will also be programmed to generate reports on errors and error rates. Essential study issues, events and outputs, including defined key data points, will monitored and documented.

## **Direct access to participant records**

Participating investigators must agree to allow pilot evaluation related monitoring, including audits and research ethics committee (REC) review, by providing access to source data and

---

<sup>4</sup> The data collection process is organised around Case Report Forms, which is a generic description for the data collection forms that are provided at each time point, or to capture other important events (like withdrawal, or the end of evaluation case report forms).

other pilot evaluation related documentation as required. Participant consent for this must be obtained as part of the informed consent process for the pilot evaluation.

## **Personnel**

*Khushali Supeda, Transitions Manager, Family Support.*

Professor Joanna Adler (University of Hertfordshire), Programme leadership including YEF liaison and report oversight.

Professor Brian Littlechild (University of Hertfordshire), Programme leadership.

Dr Tim McSweeney (University of Hertfordshire), Project management, grantee liaison. “Hands on” in all stages of the evaluation. Oversee and conduct ethics, fieldwork, analysis and write up.

Dr David Wellsted (University of Hertfordshire), Programme leadership including YEF liaison and report oversight. Oversight of analysis and evaluation.

Natalie Hall (University of Hertfordshire), Set up of REDCap and training (external and internal). Data Monitoring. Fieldwork (both interviews and focus groups), initial analysis, write up contribution.

Dr Rosemary Davidson (University of Hertfordshire), Fieldwork (both interviews and focus groups), initial analysis, write up contribution.

Amanda Busby (University of Hertfordshire), Statistical support

## **Declaration of Interests**

The investigators named on the protocol have no financial or other competing interests that impact on their responsibilities towards the scientific value or potential publishing activities associated with the pilot evaluation.

The investigators are not aware of any conflicts of interest. None of the co-applicants have raised any issues in relation to any conflicts or potential conflicts of interest, including any facts that, should they come to light at a future date, could lead to a perception of bias. This includes any relevant personal, nonpersonal and commercial interest that could be perceived as a conflict of interest. There is no commercial sector involvement with the application or the study.

## Risks

### Risk Assessment

Area	Risks	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Robustness of evaluation	1. Incomplete/inaccurate Data Upload	Medium	Medium	1. Close liaison with grantee data entry personnel. Data Audits and Data Quality Monitoring.
	2. Unreliability of interview data	Low	Medium	2. Checking for internal and ecological validity within interviews. Ensuring participants are secure during interviews.
	3. Idiosyncratic interview analyses	Low	High	3. Inter-rater reliability checks and comparisons within and between projects.
	4. Data breach	Low	Med	4. All administrative data are pseudo-anonymous and there will not be data linkage made. Interview data will be transcribed, redacted and deindividuated. All reports will be based on aggregate or depersonalised data
Safeguarding	1. Immediate participant safeguarding.	Low	High	1. Depending on the risk identified and imminence of threat, interview stopped, police or social services called and grantee protocol invoked.
	2. Retrospective participant safeguarding	Low	High	2. Close reading of comments fields in RedCap and of Interview transcripts to monitor and take prompt, appropriate action, again invoking grantee safeguarding protocols as necessary.

	3. Safeguarding risk to others identified	Low	Low	3. As per 1 above, adopting general safeguarding principles if the identified vulnerable person is not part of a grantee intervention.
Timely Delivery	1. Further lockdowns or other Covid mitigations	Med	Med	1. Most of the pilot evaluation is virtually implemented however, some of the grantee activity is still face to face. We have already extended deadlines to allow for ongoing delays and are hopeful that will be sufficient to keep to the timelines in this document.
	2. Staff sickness	Med	Low	2. We have already dealt with team ill health and if needed, could do so again. Assist have also coped with ill health as needed. Again, we think that the timelines allow sufficient space, assuming that the pandemic does not significantly deteriorate further.
Reputation	1. Mismatch of expectations between the YEF, grantees and/or evaluators	Med	Med	1. Continue to encourage project management and project evaluation teams to liaise more closely with grantees.
	2. Use of findings in unintended ways	Med	Low	2. Reach agreement with the YEF as to how findings may be shared with grantees and with grantees as to how they can be shared more broadly.
	3. Publication management not completed in a timely manner	Med	Med	3. Close ongoing liaison and consultation with the YEF to ensure that findings are open access ideally, and certainly in the public domain.

The Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) considerations for the YEF Project evaluation are based on the formal Risk Assessment performed, that acknowledges the risks associated with the conduct of the evaluation and proposals of how to mitigate them through appropriate QA and QC processes. Risks are defined in terms of their impact on: the rights and safety of participants; project concept including pilot design, reliability of results and institutional risk; project management; and other considerations.

QA is defined as all the planned and systematic actions established to ensure the pilot evaluation is performed and data generated, documented and/or recorded and reported in compliance with the principles of GCP and applicable regulatory requirements. QC is defined as the operational techniques and activities performed within the QA system to verify that the requirements for quality of the pilot evaluation related activities are fulfilled.

## Timeline

*Timetable including specification of who completes each task.*

Dates	Activity	Staff responsible/ leading
31.05.22	Completion of all qualitative fieldwork	McSweeney/Davidson
31.05.22	REDCap data, download and cleaning	Wellsted
30.09.22	Submission of draft final report for Family Support	McSweeney/Davidson
30.11.22	Peer review response and production of final report	McSweeney/Davidson

## References

asecic.org.uk. (n.d.). Who. [online] Available at: <https://www.asecic.org.uk/who> [Accessed 10 Feb. 2022].

Bruns, E. J., Walker, J. S., & The National Wraparound Initiative Advisory Group. (2008). Ten principles of the wraparound process. In E. J. Bruns & J. S. Walker (Eds.), *The resource guide to wraparound*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center for Family Support and Children's Mental Health [https://nwi.pdx.edu/NWI-book/Chapters/Bruns-2.1-\(10-principles-of-wrap\).pdf](https://nwi.pdx.edu/NWI-book/Chapters/Bruns-2.1-(10-principles-of-wrap).pdf) [Accessed 10 Feb. 2022]

Buffalo Center for Social Research (2019). *What Is Trauma-Informed Care?* - University at Buffalo School of Social Work - University at Buffalo. [online] Buffalo.edu. Available at: <http://socialwork.buffalo.edu/social-research/institutes-centers/institute-on-trauma-and-trauma-informed-care/what-is-trauma-informed-care.html>. [Accessed 7 Feb. 2022]

CDC (2020). Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). [online] [www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov). Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/aces/index.html>. [Accessed 7 Feb. 2022]

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. (2008). *The influence of mentoring on re-offending*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.

NHS England (2019). *The NHS Long Term Plan*. [online] Available at: <https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/nhs-long-term-plan-version-1.2.pdf>. [Accessed 8 Feb. 2022]

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2018). Final Post-traumatic stress disorder Evidence reviews for organisation and delivery of care for people with PTSD *NICE guideline NG116 Evidence reviews..* [online] Available at: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng116/evidence/evidence-review-i-organisation-and-delivery-of-care-for-people-with-ptsd-pdf-6602621013> [Accessed 8 Feb. 2022]

Round Midnight. (n.d.). Virtual\_Decisions. [online] Available at: [https://www.roundmidnight.org.uk/virtual\\_decisions/](https://www.roundmidnight.org.uk/virtual_decisions/) [Accessed 17 Feb. 2022].

St James-Roberts, I., Greenlaw, G., Simon, A. and Hurry, J. (2005). National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes 2001-2204. [online] Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/4157305.pdf> [Accessed 8 Feb. 2022].

Tarling, R., Davison, T., and Clarke, A. (2004). *The national evaluation of the youth justice board's mentoring*. Youth Justice Board; London. Retrieved from <http://yjbpublications.justice.gov.uk/en-gb/Resources/Downloads/mentoringfull.pdf> [Accessed 8 Feb. 2022].

Tic+. (n.d.). Young Hammersmith & Fulham Foundation. [online] Available at: <https://www.ticplus.org.uk/resources/hammersmith-fulham/> [Accessed 17 Feb. 2022]

Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M. and Bass, A. (2008). Mentoring Interventions to Affect Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Problems. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), pp.1–112.

UNICEF (1989). *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)* - Unicef UK. [online] Unicef UK. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org.uk/what-we-do/un-convention-child-rights/>.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) 2020 [https://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1727/Wsipp\\_Updated-Inventory-of-Evidence-Based-Research-Based-and-Promising-Practices-For-Prevention-and-Intervention-Services-for-Children-and-Juveniles-in-the-Child-Welfare-Juvenile-Justice-and-Mental-Health-Systems\\_Report.pdf](https://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1727/Wsipp_Updated-Inventory-of-Evidence-Based-Research-Based-and-Promising-Practices-For-Prevention-and-Intervention-Services-for-Children-and-Juveniles-in-the-Child-Welfare-Juvenile-Justice-and-Mental-Health-Systems_Report.pdf). [Accessed 10 Feb. 2022]



[youthendowmentfund.org.uk](https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk)



[hello@youthendowmentfund.org.uk](mailto:hello@youthendowmentfund.org.uk)



[@YouthEndowFund](https://twitter.com/YouthEndowFund)

The Youth Endowment Fund Charitable Trust

Registered Charity Number: 1185413

---