



## Restorative Justice Delivery Partner: Call for Proposals

### Purpose

The Youth Endowment Fund is seeking to appoint a delivery partner for a new **Restorative Justice (RJ) fund**. The delivery partner will develop a model of direct RJ, support the recruitment of Youth Justice Service (YJS) teams already delivering RJ, coordinate the delivery of this model amongst these YJSs, and work with an independent evaluator to ensure a robust evaluation of this. The delivery partner will be involved in planning and co-design from August 2025 and, **subject to our Grants and Evaluation Committee approval**, the delivery and evaluation would be expected to begin in **March 2026**.



## About the funder

### The Youth Endowment Fund

The Youth Endowment Fund (YEF) is a charity with a mission that matters. We exist to prevent children and young people becoming involved in violence. We do this by finding out what works and building a movement to put this knowledge into practice. Children and young people at risk of becoming involved in violence deserve services that give them the best chance of a positive future. To make sure that happens, we fund promising projects and then use the very best evaluation to find out what works. Just as we benefit from robust trials in medicine, children and young people deserve support grounded in the evidence. We build that knowledge through the programmes and evaluations that we fund. Our strategy sets out how we will achieve our mission

## About Restorative Justice

### *Background*

Restorative Justice (RJ) in the UK is a commonly used practice aimed at repairing the harm caused by crime through facilitated dialogue between victims and those who have caused harm. It focuses on accountability, healing, and making amends, rather than just punishment. The process typically involves voluntary participation from both parties, with the support of trained facilitators.

Key components of Restorative Justice in the UK include:

- **Face-to-face interaction:** Victims have the opportunity to express how the crime affected them, while those that caused harm take responsibility for their actions and offer apologies or reparations.
- **Community involvement:** In some cases, the wider community may be involved to help repair the social fabric damaged by the crime.
- **Voluntary participation:** Both the victim and those that caused harm must consent to the process, ensuring it is consensual and respects both parties' needs.
- **Prevention of reoffending:** Restorative justice seeks to reduce reoffending by helping those who have offended understand the impact of their actions, thereby promoting empathy and accountability.

In the UK, restorative justice is used at various stages of the criminal justice process, including pre-sentencing, during sentencing, and post-conviction. It is applied to a range of offences, from minor to more serious crimes, and is supported by various government and non-governmental organisations. The UK government has recognised its value, and Restorative Justice services are now provided across many regions, although access and implementation can vary.

### *Existing evidence*

Whilst various forms of Restorative Justice are widespread in the UK, there is little robust evidence of its impact on reoffending and involvement in violence from the UK. The [YEF Toolkit](#) suggests that Restorative Justice can have a moderate effect on re-offending amongst children and young people, but this is based almost exclusively on US research.



Most of the impact evaluations that have taken place in the UK focus on adults and have shown non-significant results.

Research suggests that direct RJ practices such as face-to-face dialogues and conferences can be more impactful than indirect RJ practices (e.g. written letters facilitated by a mediator) in terms of building empathy and promoting long-term behavioural change.

## Aims of the fund

Given the evidence gap on the impact of RJ within the UK, and its widespread implementation, the YEF believe there is significant value in funding a **Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) and Implementation and Process evaluation** of **direct RJ** involving children and young people who have offended.

RJ presents a number of challenges for the type of robust evaluations that the YEF seeks to fund. However, the opportunity to generate important implementation learning and test the feasibility of future evaluation approaches is significant. Our approach has been informed by scoping work recently undertaken by Alma Economics on behalf of YEF and consultation with evaluation and RJ experts.

The fund will have two core aims:

1. Design, develop and co-ordinate the delivery of a shared practice model<sup>1</sup> of direct RJ Practice across 5-10 Youth Justice Service teams in the UK.
2. Successfully run a Pilot RCT and Implementation and Process Evaluation of direct RJ Practice.

This will be a multi-phase project, incorporating two 'transition decision points' that will be determined by (1) whether the shared practice model is feasible to implement and can achieve its intended outputs, and (2) whether the programme is evaluable and has potential for improving its intended outcomes. The first 'transition decision point' will be after appointment of the successful delivery partner and independent evaluator to move into the co-design phase where the delivery partner and evaluator will work together to develop the programme and evaluation in more detail, the second will be to progress to delivery after the co-design phase.

Should decisions be made to proceed at both transition decision points, delivery is estimated to start in March 2026 and end in October 2028.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Shared Practice model will be developed by the delivery partner, YJS teams and the appointed evaluator. It is a replicable model of delivery that incorporates core components (based on evidence-based practice) of the intervention to enable consistent delivery across multiple sites.

## **Programme design for this fund**

We are now looking to appoint a Delivery Partner (or a consortium of partners) who will act as an ‘umbrella organisation’. They will be responsible for developing the shared practice model in collaboration with recruited Youth Justice Service (YJS) teams and the independent evaluator (appointed by YEF). Whilst we have a broad approach in mind, we encourage applicants to propose a model of delivery based on their experience in delivering/managing RJ practices.

### *Finding out what works*

Being a YEF delivery partner is a big commitment. This entails not only ensuring high quality, consistent delivery, but also doing so in the context of a robust evaluation that requires additional considerations and activities to be able to take place. It’s important that you’re aware of what we’ll need from you to make the partnership work for everyone – find out more about [what to expect](#). If your application is successful, YEF and your assigned evaluator will work with you to co-design the best possible evaluation to find out if, how and why direct RJ works to reduce youth violence (and its impact on other relevant outcomes). We’ll be working as a team to ensure that you’re supported throughout the evaluation process. To find out more about the process you can watch this video explaining our [approach to evaluation](#) and read through our [guidance](#) explaining the relationship with the evaluator and your role and responsibilities.

Please note that we don’t expect successful applicants to have any technical expertise or knowledge of evaluation techniques. We only expect that you’ll commit to the independent evaluation of direct RJ and work closely with the evaluator throughout the project, including set-up and design stage, delivery, data collection and reporting.

### **The roles and responsibilities of the delivery partner would be to:**

- Recruit and onboard ~5-10 YJS teams in England and Wales who have a track record of delivering direct RJ.
- Provide project management for the project across all YJS teams onboarded.
- Work with recruited YJS teams and the independent evaluator to create a ‘shared practice model’ based on best practice in delivering direct RJ.

- Work with the appointed independent evaluator to develop a robust infrastructure and mechanisms for collecting high-quality monitoring data.
- Acts as a single point of contact for the independent evaluators and the YEF.
- Effectively manage and disburse grants to YJS teams.
- Oversee delivery of the shared practice model across all YJS teams, ensuring delivery is on-track, as intended, consistent and quality assured.
- Support YJS teams to mitigate risks, overcome challenges and share learning.
- Consolidate monitoring data and quarterly reports for the YEF.
- Work closely with the evaluator to support the delivery of a high-quality evaluation.
- Translate evaluation activities for YJS teams, ensuring the evaluation is understood and on-track.
- Champion the YEF's approach to evaluation and uphold evaluation deadlines.
- Work in partnership with the YEF and the evaluators to keep them informed of progress, successes and challenges.
- Provide opportunities for the YJSs to share learning.

## ***Who should apply***

### *Eligibility criteria*

1. **Location:** your organisation must be planning to deliver in England and/or Wales.
2. **Your organisation:** your organisation must be a registered charity, company, statutory body or CIC.
3. **Children and young people:** projects must be supporting children and young people, as outlined in the 'young person eligibility' section.
4. **Willingness to engage in an independent evaluation:** the YEF exists to better understand what works to prevent children and young people becoming involved in violence. To help us achieve this, you will need to work with an evaluation partner throughout your project. There are certain evaluation tools and approaches that we employ that you must agree to utilise if in receipt of our funding – in particular, you'd be agreeing to take part in a randomised control trial (RCT). Please find further details about RCTs in the 'Evaluation design' section.
5. **Our approach to archiving data:** We're passionate about understanding what works to change things for children in the long-term. We want to avoid promoting work that looks great but doesn't make a long-term difference. To avoid this, it's a requirement for YEF funded projects to agree to our approach to collecting and storing data to enable long-term follow-up through our data archive. The data archive means we'll be able to learn more about what does and doesn't work to reduce violence over the long-term. We require projects to use Strength and Difficulties questionnaires (SDQs) and the Self Report Delinquency scale (SRDS) as

evaluation tools. You will not be able to progress with our funding unless you, your organisation(s) and where appropriate project partners have read, understood and agreed to our data archive and use of SDQs and SRDS. Please read the information on our [website](#) and watch our video explainer.

6. **Our approach to randomisation in RCTs:** We are committed to young people getting the best possible support at the right time. This means we strive to conduct the most robust types of research; in evaluations, RCTs are widely considered the goal standard. Usually, this involves randomly assigning young people to either a treatment group (who receive the intervention) or a control group (who do not). However, this RJ fund is unique in that it is not feasible to control who receives the RJ (as per the victim's code) and we will therefore need to randomly assign pairs of young people and victims to treatment and control groups among those who agree to participate in the evaluation. More detail can be found under the 'young person eligibility' section. Randomisation must be something you and recruited YJSs agree to and facilitate, as a condition of receiving this funding.
7. **Scale:** to support a robust and meaningful evaluation we require projects to be able to reach a certain number of children and young people during the project lifetime. For this fund, the number that would need to be recruited to the evaluation is between 100-120 children and young people. The direct RJ activity would be delivered to around half of these.

### *What are we looking for from a delivery partner*

At a minimum, applicants should meet the following criteria (either as a single organisation or as part of a consortium):

- Be able to demonstrate the ability to recruit and onboard ~5-10 Youth Justice Service teams through existing networks and relationships – identifying YJS teams who would be able to recruit between 100-120 CYP (inclusive of delivery + control group, and the pairs of young people) into the evaluation within a 6-month period
- Have experience of working with YJS teams
- Have strong experience and/or excellent understanding of existing RJ practice delivery and government legislation that surrounds this
- Have strong project management experience
- Can demonstrate the ability to coordinate and manage multiple partners effectively
- Be willing and able to work with an independent evaluator who will lead on the evaluation design and delivery
- Be supportive of the idea of randomisation in evaluation, and be willing and able to explain the value of this approach to others

### *Role of the appointed evaluator*

The independent evaluator appointed by YEF will work with YEF and the delivery partner to co-design the programme delivery and the evaluation, agreeing an approach to key issues such as how young people are recruited, randomised and consented into the evaluation, alongside how data will be collected. The evaluator will lead a series of workshops with the delivery partner, YJS teams and YEF as part of the co-design process, to support the delivery partner to produce a high-quality delivery plan which is in line with the best available evidence. The evaluator will also lead on producing a comprehensive evaluation plan and producing a full evaluation report at the end of delivery.

### *Design overview*

As noted above, delivery of RJ varies and the availability of information around what and how it's delivered is limited, as is the evidence on its impact for children and young people in the UK. That is why we're proposing a pilot RCT and implementation and process evaluation of direct RJ (which the evidence suggests can be the most impactful model), centred on a shared practice model. Developing a shared practice model involves identifying and defining the core components of delivery (i.e., the minimum common elements of delivery) that each YJS will implement within their practice. These include:

- **Focused:** we're interested in direct RJ practice only for this evaluation (i.e. face-to-face meetings/conferences).
- **Manualised:** to be able to determine whether this approach can be evaluated, there must be a clear outline of each stage of direct RJ delivery, from initial assessments, gaining consent, facilitation of the intervention through to any follow up post-delivery.
- **Compliant:** adhering to legislation that governs RJ delivery by YJS teams - see eligibility criteria below.
- **Timely:** whilst every case is unique, as part of this evaluation, recruitment and delivery of direct RJ will have to be consistent across YJSs
- **Monitored:** to successfully evaluate the implementation of the shared practice model there must be a consistent approach to data collection across YJSs.

The shared practice model necessarily aims to ensure consistency of delivery for the purposes of evaluation. However, we note that there will be some areas within the shared practice model that will need to be flexible, catering to the needs of the local area and service. Therefore, there is scope for creativity in thinking about aspects of the delivery that could and should be varied; we will expect to see this creativity in proposals, and for this to be further developed in the co-design process with YJS teams and the evaluator.



### Young person eligibility

There are statutory and legal obligations that raise challenges to undertaking randomisation in the space of RJ. As per the [Code of Practice for Victims of Crime in England and Wales](#) (the Victim's Code), the victim has the right to receive information about RJ and how to access it. More specifically, if the offender is under the age of 18, the victim has the right to receive information about RJ from the YJS team. This means that it is not feasible to control who receives the offer of RJ and randomising who receives the intervention is only possible among pairs of young people who agree to participate in the evaluation. Please see further information related to randomisation and the evaluation design further on.

Young people that would be eligible include:

1. The young person (offender) is between 10-17 years old.
2. The young person accepts responsibility and has made a guilty plea.
3. There is an identifiable victim. As per current practice in the sector, we propose using a broad definition of "victim" including a direct victim of the crime, a family member or representative of the community.
4. A young person with any type of sentence (i.e. community resolution, youth conditional caution, referral order, youth rehabilitation order, etc.).
5. The young person has committed a crime typically considered for RJ.
6. The victim, young person and any other participants consent to take part in Restorative Justice.
7. The victim, young person and any other participants consent to take part in a formal direct Restorative Justice activity

### Area/YJS selection

The following criteria should be met when recruiting YJSs:

- YJSs need to already be delivering direct RJ with regular referrals coming through
- Ideally YJSs will operate under 1-2 police forces
- YJSs must be willing to engage in adjusting elements of their practice in line with the Shared Practice Model
- YJSs must be open to randomisation as described below

Applicants should also think about practicalities surrounding overseeing delivery of multiple teams spread across various regions, bearing in mind the needs of the local areas they operate within and what this means for delivery.



We need applicants to demonstrate they have the right connections and relationships in place with YJSs and be able to suggest where/who they would recruit. An indication of commitment to engage would be desirable but not essential at this stage.

### **Race equity, diversity and inclusion**

Children and young people from marginalised backgrounds (including children and young people from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic backgrounds, as well as young people and children who've been in care) are significantly overrepresented in the youth justice system. Through the evaluation of direct RJ, we therefore want to make sure that we are reaching a diverse range of young people. It is essential for race equity, diversity and inclusion considerations to be embedded into the design and delivery of the programme. The delivery partner and evaluation team may work with one of YEF's Race Equity Associates in the co-design period who can advise on specific elements of programme design, but we would expect applicants to demonstrate initial thinking around this in their application.

## **Evaluation design for this fund**

### **Indicative research questions**

We are planning to conduct a standalone Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial with Implementation and Process Evaluation. This will enable us to understand whether the full-scale efficacy RCT is feasible and explore dimensions of implementation of direct RJ, including barriers and facilitators to delivery and cost data analysis.

The overarching research question we will explore through the pilot trial is the following:

Is it feasible to conduct an efficacy RCT of a tightly defined model of direct Restorative Justice delivered by the Youth Justice Services and to test the impact of direct RJ on re-offending among children and young people who committed violent and/or non-violent offences?

A series of additional questions will also be explored, including:

- Randomisation: Is randomisation feasible? What are the best methods for randomising participants? Is randomisation acceptable to participants and key stakeholders?

- Contamination: Do participants (young people and victims) adhere to the group allocation<sup>2</sup>?
- Control: What is the most appropriate control group? Is Business as usual an appropriate control?
- Outcome and measurement: What measure and data source provide the most accurate, reliable, and feasible assessment of the primary outcome?
- Promise: Does the intervention show evidence of promise?
- Logic model: Is there initial evidence to support the logic model?
- Impact feasibility: Is an efficacy study (RCT) feasible?
- Recruitment: What are the appropriate recruitment strategies into the evaluation? Does this differ for different subgroups (e.g., those from racialised communities, with disabilities, girls and young women, children in care/or who are care-experienced?)
- Retention: what are the appropriate methods for improving retention in the evaluation? Does this differ for different subgroups?

Indicative sub-questions for implementation and process evaluation (internal pilot and efficacy stage):

- Fidelity: Is it feasible to develop and deliver a shared model of direct RJ, which is described and applied with sufficient consistency for a trial?
- Fidelity: Is the programme being delivered with sufficient consistency across the YJSs?
- Dosage: How much of the intended intervention has been delivered?
- Quality: How well are the different components of the intervention being delivered?
- Reach: What is the rate of participation by intended recipients?
- Responsiveness: To what extent do the participants engage with the intervention?
- Adaptation: Are changes needed to accommodate context and population need?

Indicative sub-questions for race equity, inclusion and diversity:

- How do structural factors (e.g., institutional racism, lack of diversity in the workforce, failures to acknowledge different experiences and treating CYP as a homogenous group, mistrust of support services or 'system', referral biases, and the lack of coordination between services and agencies) affect CYP from Black Asian and ethnic minority backgrounds in accessing and receiving the programme?

---

<sup>2</sup> We recognise that RJ will remain voluntary and will be open to participants throughout the evaluation regardless of the group allocation – we do not intend to influence participants' rights to access RJ. We expect that some participants will change their minds in the course of the evaluation, and so one of the objectives of the pilot RCT is to test the extent to which participants adhere to their group allocation.

- Do different subgroups have different recruitment rates, retention rates, or outcomes?
- What is the experience of different groups of CYP (e.g., those from racialised communities, girls and young women, LGBTQ+ CYP, CYP with SEND, or CYP in care/or who are care-experienced)?

### **Outcomes of interest**

The primary outcome RJ is intended to impact is re-offending. Therefore, we aim to test the feasibility of measuring the impact of RJ and collecting data on re-offending as part of the pilot RCT. Our priority is that re-offending is measured using administrative data.

Additionally, a series of secondary outcomes will be measured, which will likely include self-reported measures, such as Self-reported Delinquency Scale (SRDS) and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ).

### **Estimated timeline**

If there are any updates to the timeline this will be provided when we invite shortlisted candidate to interview.

<b>Evaluation timeline (pre-delivery)</b>	<b>By when?</b>
Call for proposals published	25 <sup>th</sup> February 2025
Deadline for full proposal submission	28 <sup>th</sup> March 2025
Proposals scored and shortlisted	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2025
Interviews with shortlisted applications	18 <sup>th</sup> April 2025
Delivery partner appointment	25 <sup>th</sup> April 2025
Delivery partner begins soft recruitment of YJSs (formal letters of commitment)	25 <sup>th</sup> April – 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2025
Evaluator commissioning	20 <sup>th</sup> June 2025

<b>Grants and Evaluation Committee – decision point</b>	<b>29<sup>th</sup> July 2025</b>
Pre-meets with delivery partner and evaluator	w/c 4 <sup>th</sup> August
Co-design	August 2025 – January 2026
<b>Grants and Evaluation Committee – Decision point</b>	<b>End of Feb 2026</b>

*The below timeline is subject to our Grants and Evaluation Committee approval – we would also encourage applicants to tell us whether this seems reasonable/achievable.*

<b>Estimated timeline</b>	<b>By when?</b>
Set-up and mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment</li> <li>• DSA/MOU signing</li> <li>• Evaluation ethics approval</li> <li>• Developing data monitoring tools and processes</li> <li>• Training</li> <li>• Any other preparatory activities</li> </ul>	March – October 2026
Recruitment, delivery and data collection	October 2026 – October 2028
Evaluation analysis and reporting	Mid 2029

## Budget

Applicants should include in their budget costs for the delivery partner to effectively manage the development and delivery aspect of this trial. We expect this to cover core day to day management, being a point of contact for all YJSs recruited and the independent evaluator, quality assuring delivery and reporting to YEF as required.

We expect the budget to cover delivery management from March 2026 through to supporting data collection up until October 2028. These are estimated timelines and budgets can be revisited/finalised through the co-design period.

**Budgets should not include the cost of actually delivering the direct RJ activities as we would be expecting this to be part of the YJSs’ existing practice.** However, we do recognise that taking part in an evaluation requires additional resource particularly related to administrative tasks such as data collection, and any additional staff time for



engagement in training and adjusting to the shared practice model<sup>3</sup>. Applicants should, therefore, include such costs in their proposed budgets.

*Please note, applicants must provide at least 20% of the budget from supplementary and/or in-kind support. These sources of funding can include other grants, contributions you make through your own unrestricted funding, or in-kind and pro-bono support your organisation receives for the activities. More details can be found [here](#).*

---

<sup>3</sup> Should an expansion of existing delivery in selected YJSs be required based on co-design work, we will review budgets accordingly

## APPLICATION GUIDANCE

### Application process

A delivery partner will be appointed by competitive tendering process. This will involve submission of a full proposal, followed by interviews for shortlisted applicants only.

Proposal forms should be downloaded [here](#) and completed in Word Format. It is critical that you adhere to the word limits provided. Alongside the proposal form, you should also submit a risk register, timeline and budget (links to YEF templates included in the proposal form and [here](#)).

### Deadline & submission

The deadline for submitting proposals will be **5pm 28<sup>th</sup> March 2025**.

### Submissions should include:

- Completed proposal form (including eligibility check)
- Completed project timeline
- Completed project budget
- Completed risk register

Full proposals should be sent to [grants@youthendowmentfund.org.uk](mailto:grants@youthendowmentfund.org.uk). Please ensure the title in the subject line of your email is: **Restorative Justice\_Delivery Partner Proposal**

### *Partnership applications*

To ensure we deliver the best evidence about what works for children and young people, we require projects to reach a high number of children and young people. The YEF is interested in proposals from single organisations and from consortia with complementary expertise, and where the consortium can demonstrate that they will work well together to ensure the delivery is well-integrated. It's key that consortia applications have a lead organisation and work as one entity. The lead organisation will act as the YEF point of



contact (and overall project manager who takes ultimate responsibility for adhering to the terms of the grant if successful).

### *Our commitment to equality*

Children and young people from marginalised backgrounds – including Black and Asian children and young people, as well as young people and children who've been in care – are significantly overrepresented in the youth justice system. If we truly are going to make a difference, we need to make sure that our funding is used in a way that reaches and represents the children we are here to serve.

We're particularly interested in receiving proposals from organisations that are either led by leaders from Black, Asian or other minority backgrounds, and/or whose work has a particular focus on ultimately benefitting young people from Black, Asian and other minority backgrounds through their own work or through their partnerships with other relevant organisations and agencies (e.g., consortium members, employers).

### **How we'll assess your application**

We'll have a team of assessors who'll review your proposal and score it based on the criteria in Appendix 1. We'll use these scores to shortlist applicants and invite only shortlisted applicants to interview w/c 14<sup>th</sup> April.

It will help us to assess your application if you provide explanation and rationale for the suggestions you've made in your proposed approach.

### **Data and privacy**

If you want to know how we store and use the data in your form, you can read our [data privacy policy](#). If you want to learn more about data sharing between grantees and evaluators, you can read the [guidance on our secure data archive](#).

### **Get in touch**

If you have any further questions, please get in touch. Email [yasmin.jeddaoui@youthendowmentfund.org.uk](mailto:yasmin.jeddaoui@youthendowmentfund.org.uk), specifying 'Restorative Justice\_query' in the subject line of your email.



## **What happens next**

### ***Step one: Assessment & interview***

We'll begin assessing applications as soon as they are received. We therefore encourage you to submit your application as soon as you're ready, rather than waiting until the deadline. Our assessment team will be tasked with developing a shortlist of applications, and shortlisted applicants will be invited to interview. We may come back to you outside of this schedule to request more information to support our decision if necessary. After all interviews, an internal decision meeting will be held to decide on the successful applicant.

### ***Step two: Matching you with an evaluator***

We'll then match the successful delivery partner with an evaluator from our evaluator panel. This panel is made up of approximately 35 research organisations and universities that have the knowledge, skills and expertise to conduct rigorous evaluations of the implementation and impact of the projects we fund. Each organisation will competitively bid to be partnered with you. Evaluators will be matched based on a range of considerations, including the strength and quality of their bid, their skills and experience in the evaluation methods that are appropriate for your project, their subject specific knowledge and experience of conducting research with the children and young people your project supports.

### ***Step three (subject to our Grants and Evaluation Committee approval): Co-design***

Once you're paired with an evaluator, the delivery team and YJS representatives will be expected to be available for a series of intensive [co-design workshops](#).

These are likely to run from August 2025 to January 2026 and you will need to be available to attend a minimum of six 2–3-hour, co-design workshops before the end of January 2026. These will mostly be virtual meetings with in-person meetings scheduled where needed. Additional work will be required outside of these meetings to complete tasks/relevant outputs (e.g. Theory of Change, detailed delivery plan, budget, timeline, risk register, Shared Practice Model). Further information on the required outputs will be provided prior to co-design commencing.

The purpose of co-design is for the delivery team, representatives from the YJSs and the appointed evaluator to work together to further refine and develop a clear, joint project and evaluation proposal to take to YEF's Grants and Evaluation Committee for final approval.

There will be budget provided to support some of the costs of engagement in the co-design period and produce the relevant outputs listed below. This shouldn't be included in the budget you submit as part of this application.

#### ***Step four. Final proposals***

Once you submit your final proposal, which has been co-designed with your evaluator, we will present it to our Grant and Evaluation Committee who will make the final decision on whether or not to award the grant and the evaluation. The length of time this 'co-design' phase will last is 6-months.

#### ***Time***

It's important to be aware that from the time you submit the first part of your application to the point you hear the final outcome (i.e. whether or not YEF will be award the grant and the evaluation) is likely to be from around 10 to 12 months. We believe that this amount of time working with our team and your paired evaluator is critical. Together, it will help you develop a strong foundation to find out what works to prevent children and young people becoming involved in violence.

## **Appendix 1: Assessment Criteria**

### **1. Ability to deliver as planned**

We're asking ourselves three main things:

- Have you demonstrated an excellent understanding for what the set up (including the development of a shared practice model) and delivery of direct Restorative Justice will entail, with a clear strategy of how your organisation will successfully coordinate and oversee delivery within YJS teams.
- How likely it is you'll be able to work with YJSs to deliver in the given timeframe. To do this, we'll look at your previous experience, expertise, and existing networks with YJS teams and how you plan to use these to successfully promote and set up delivery.
- Whether sufficient consideration has been given to the possible risks to set up and delivery of direct Restorative Justice, and whether mitigations proposed are adequate.

## **2. Ability to deliver at the required scale**

We're trying to assess whether you have a strong understanding of current referral and completion rates of direct Restorative Justice and how the required sample size for the pilot will be met within the 6-month recruitment period.

It's important for us to be able to assess whether your proposed approach, including selection of YJS teams and areas in which they deliver, will enable the sample size to be met.

## **3. Ability to successfully recruit and onboard YJS teams**

We're trying to assess whether you have prior experience of working with YJS teams, have good insight into teams which have a consistent and well embedded approach to Restorative Justice delivery and your strategy for recruiting and onboarding them into the trial.

We also want to understand any potential risks involved with recruiting and onboarding YJS teams into the evaluation and what approach you will take to mitigating these risks. For example, gaining senior level buy in from selected YJS teams.

## **4. Ability to appropriately consider race, equality, diversity and inclusion issues relevant to Restorative Justice**

Children and young people from marginalised backgrounds (including children and young people from Black, Asian and other minority backgrounds, as well as young people and children who've been in care) are significantly overrepresented in the youth justice system.

We are trying to assess whether you have given adequate consideration to how race equity, diversity and inclusion considerations will be embedded into the design and delivery of the programme.

To do this we will want to see that you have considered how you will ensure reaching children and young people from marginalized backgrounds and how these children and young people will continue to be supported during and after the programme.

<b>Scoring</b>	
0	Totally fails to meet the requirement - information not available
1	Meets some of the requirements with limited supporting information
2	Meets some of the requirements with reasonable explanation
3	Fully meets the requirements with detailed explanation and evidence
4	Exceeds the requirements with extensive explanation and evidence