

## **Detached Youth Work Regional Consortia: Call for Proposals**

### **Contents**

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>About the funder</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>About Detached Youth Work</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Aims of the fund</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Programme design</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Evaluation design</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Estimated timeline</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Application guidance</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>How we'll assess your application</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>21</b>

## **Purpose**

The Youth Endowment Fund (YEF) is seeking to appoint up to 4 regional consortia for a **Detached Youth Work (DYW)** pilot evaluation. A regional consortium is a multi-agency partnership—led by a public or youth-focused organisation—that collaborates to design and deliver DYW within a randomised control trial. It brings together key local stakeholders to ensure effective implementation, monitoring, and data collection across selected areas. Through this pilot evaluation, regional consortia will receive financial support for delivery of DYW and contribute towards the evidence base for this work. The regional consortia will have the following key responsibilities.

### **Co-design stage (October 2025 – February 2026)**

All YEF-funded projects undergo a co-design phase to finalise their delivery and evaluation plans. This collaborative process is essential to ensure that implementation and evaluation are closely aligned, enabling the trial to be designed robustly and generating meaningful evidence about the intervention. The co-design stage will involve:

- Working with an independent evaluator to develop a robust pilot Randomised Control Trial (RCT) which will primarily investigate DYW's effectiveness in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Identifying 10 suitable 'patches' within their region for randomisation (i.e. where DYW would be suitable to deliver, based on criteria set out by the evaluator.)

### **Pilot RCT stage (April 2026 – April 2028)**

#### *Set up trial (April – September 2026)*

- Recruit and train staff for delivery and supervision of DYW.
- Onboard relevant stakeholders.
- Establish data collection processes.

#### *Delivery (October 2026 – April 2028)*

- Undertake and oversee delivery of DYW within 5 randomised 'intervention' patches:
  - 6 months of reconnaissance and relationship-building with young people.
  - 12 months of delivery and data collection.
- Monitor and report on non-DYW youth activities within 'control' patches.
- Manage relationships with key stakeholders, such as police forces and local communities.
- Support the evaluator with evaluation activities (such as data collection).

Progression to the co-design phase, as well as the setup and delivery stages of the evaluation, is subject to approval by YEF's Grants and Evaluation Committee. These

approvals will be sought in September 2025 and March 2026, respectively. Funding **will not be confirmed** until the trial has successfully passed all governance stages in **March 2026**.

Guidance on [YEF's approach to evaluation can be found here](#), while an overview of YEF's expectations of grantees and project teams [can be found here](#). YEF can arrange for this guidance to be translated into Welsh upon request.

## 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 Detached Youth Work

### Background

Detached youth work aims to engage with young people 'where they are at', providing youth work in non-institutional settings. These settings are usually places that young people have chosen to be, such as on the street, in parks, shopping centres, fast food outlets or other community spaces. Rather than serving children in a youth club, school, or college, detached youth work meets children out in the community.

The **activities** involved are broad-ranging and include:

- Befriending and relationship building.
- Providing information, advice and guidance.
- Signposting to services.
- Sport, cultural and other street-based activities.
- Intervening to defuse conflict or respond to potential or actual violence.
- Engaging with peers.
- Mentoring and being a role model.
- Facilitating youth-led projects.

- Engaging with families.
- Advocating to other community members on behalf of youth people.

The **issues** that DYW is designed to address are similarly broad ranging, but may include:

- Wellbeing, confidence and mental health.
- Anti-social behaviour.
- Staying safe.
- Gang exploitation and involvement in youth violence.
- Substance misuse.
- Social and emotional learning skills.
- Engagement with other support agencies.
- Relationships with peers and families.
- Sexual health.
- Engagement in education, training and work.

Detached youth workers will generally **work with any children and young people** spending time in their 'patch'. However, DYW often involves working with the most marginalised or vulnerable groups of CYP. These groups are likely to change over time, and to be highly mobile.

### **Existing evidence and evaluation**

DYW is widely delivered across all regions of England and Wales, but the impact of the intervention is poorly understood. There is a substantial evidence gap around the effectiveness of the model in reducing youth violence. YEF commissioned the Centre for Evidence and Implementation (CEI), Bryson Purdon Social Research (BPSR) & YMCA George Williams College to deliver [a feasibility study](#) of DYW which reported in 2024 and:

- **Explored the nature of DYW** and developed a shared practice model between providers.
- **Ascertained what methods could** be used to robustly evaluate the impact of DYW, and the risks and mitigations to such an evaluation.

The feasibility study proposed a design for a **Randomised Control Trial (RCT)** which would test the impact of DYW in hyper-local areas, or 'patches'. Once appropriate patches have been identified, a process would be undertaken to randomly assign each patch to an intervention group or a control group. DYW would take place in the intervention patches, while control patches would receive 'usual' services, such as other youth work and policing.

The feasibility study identified several risks and assumptions that must be tested before recommending a full-scale impact evaluation. For this reason, we are proposing to fund only a pilot RCT at this stage. The pilot will assess whether these risks can be addressed, helping to determine the viability of a future full-scale RCT. These findings were reinforced by a separate scoping study conducted by CEI, BPSR & YMCA George Williams College for YEF, which is due to be published in October 2025. The scoping study explored key elements of the proposed RCT design, including matching crime data to historical DYW delivery areas, developing eligibility criteria for selecting regional consortia and patches, and forecasting an expected effect size for the intervention.

#### *Key components/ shared practice model*

There is significant variation in the types of youth work that are delivered across England and Wales and which may be described as ‘detached’, including mobile practice or street projects. As part of the feasibility study of DYW, CEI BPSR & YMCA George Williams College developed a **shared practice model** which identified and harmonised the key principles underpinning the model, between participating organisations and sector stakeholders. The shared practice model sets the parameters of DYW and **regional consortia will be expected to adhere to it for delivery** (though it may be amended during co-design).

The model’s **key requirements are as follows**. DYW is:

- Delivered in public spaces.
- Young-people centred (addressing the needs and experiences of young people)
- Relational (aiming to build trust and respectful relationships with children.)
- Facilitative of community integration (requiring youth workers to have local knowledge, and to connect with local stakeholders.)
- Distinct from purely ‘outreach’ youth work. Outreach work centres on bringing young people into an established service, such as a youth club. DYW can include elements of outreach (if young people request to participate in activities within a youth centre, for example) but is not the primary function.

In addition, the model requires the following **features of delivery and duration**:

- Detached youth workers should have, or be working towards, a Level 2 certificate in youth work.
- Detached youth workers should be provided with the opportunity to reflect on their practice, at least monthly, with supervision.
- DYW is delivered by a ‘team’ (of at least two youth workers plus a supervisor or manager.)

- Services should be led by youth workers with a minimum of two years' experience in the area they are working.

The full shared practice model can be found in [Appendix 2 of the feasibility study](#). Delivery of DYW within the pilot RCT **will need to adhere to the shared practice model**, though the model will be refined during co-design.

For the purpose of developing an application for this call, applicants should forecast to deliver a model requiring the following team. This is based on one DYW team being able to access all 5 patches within their region; if this is not possible due to the geographic breadth of anticipated delivery, applicants could suggest multiple teams or alternative team compositions.

Role	Qualifications/ experience	FTE employment	Responsibilities
<b>Detached Youth Workers (2 per team)</b>	Level 2 certificate in Youth Work  Experience of delivering DYW	0.6 FTE (25 hours per week)	Attend 5 patches for 4 hours a week each: <i>20 hours p/w</i>  Planning and supervision: <i>5 hours p/w</i>  <i>May also need to factor in additional travel time, depending on the breadth of patches.</i>
<b>Team manager/supervisor</b>	Level 6 certificate in Youth Work  At least 2 years' experience working in the area	0.2 FTE (8 hours per week)	Provide management, supervision and planning for DYWs.

## Aims of the fund

Given the evidence gap on the impact of DYW in the UK on youth violence and community cohesion, and its widespread implementation, YEF believes there is significant value in funding a **Pilot Randomised Control Trial (RCT) and Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE) of DYW**.

DYW presents several significant 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. The feasibility and scoping research we've funded to date suggests it's important to explore several key questions using a pilot study rather than a full-scale trial which would involve delivery and evaluation on a much larger scale. These key questions are explained below:

- Can sufficient eligible patches be identified and randomised?
- What is the feasibility and acceptability of delivering the shared practice model?
- How well can service provision within intervention and control areas be monitored during the pilot study? Can Detached Youth Work feasibly be contained to the delivery patches and not spill over to the control patches?<sup>1</sup>
- Can the required data be obtained from police forces at a sufficiently local level to compare intervention and control areas?
- What are the perceived impacts of detached youth work?
- Is the proposed delivery model and study design feasible for a full-scale trial?

The pilot RCT will have the following core aims:

- Investigate the implementation of DYW. This component of the evaluation will report on aspects of delivery such as:
  - The 'reach' of the intervention (how many children and young people youth workers engage with.)
  - The extent to which DYW can be implemented 'as intended', and with adherence to the shared practice model.
  - What 'business as usual' services look like (what's delivered in the absence of DYW.)
  - The average cost of delivering DYW.
- Test whether an RCT evaluation design of DYW can be delivered successfully on a small scale, and could be delivered on a larger scale.
- Monitor whether the work of the Detached Youth Workers can feasibly be contained to the delivery patches and not spill over to the 'control' patches ('contamination' of the control patch in the language of an evaluation.)

This will be a multi-phase project with two key transition decision points, both requiring approval from YEF's Grants and Evaluation Committee. The first decision point will take place in September 2025, following the appointment of the regional consortia and

---

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the key risks to a full-scale evaluation, and regional consortia will be asked to monitor what other, similar activities are being delivered in all patches (both intervention and control) and whether any Detached Youth Work has ended up taking place in control patches

independent evaluator. Subject to the Committee's approval, the project may then move into the co-design phase, where the regional consortia and evaluator will work together to further develop the plan for delivery and evaluation. The second decision point will be in March 2026, when the Committee will decide whether the delivery and evaluation plans are sufficiently well-developed for the project to progress to setup and delivery of the intervention and RCT.

Should decisions be made to proceed at both transition decision points, delivery of the trial is estimated to be as follows:

- Set-up: *April – September 2026*
- Relationship-building and reconnaissance: *October 2026 – March 2027*
- Delivery of DYW: *March 2027 – March 2028*

If the findings of this exercise are conducive to a full-scale evaluation, then it's possible that further research into DYW could follow this project, in the form of a larger trial.

## Programme design

We are now seeking to appoint regional consortia to manage the delivery of DYW within their respective regions. Each consortium will be responsible for identifying 10 suitable 'patches' for randomisation, in collaboration with the YEF-appointed independent evaluator. A 'patch' refers to the typical small areas in which detached youth work organisations operate, which may vary in size and geography. Once the patches have been identified and randomised, each Regional Consortium will oversee DYW delivery in the five patches allocated to the intervention group and maintain oversight/ reporting of the five patches assigned to the control group. Consortia will also be responsible for maintaining the engagement and support of key stakeholders throughout the project.

We plan to appoint **up to four Regional Consortia** to participate in the co-design and delivery of the trial. While our intention is for all consortia involved in co-design to progress to the delivery phase, this will be subject to approval by YEF's Grants and Evaluation Committee. Not all consortia may proceed if they are unable to meet the trial's requirements—for example, if they are unable to identify 10 appropriate patches for randomisation, or if key partners such as the local police force withdraw their support.



### **Finding out what works**

Being a YEF regional consortium 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 the assigned evaluator will work with you to co-design the most effective trial to explore if, how, and why DYW may reduce youth violence and influence other relevant outcomes. However, this evaluation will focus solely on assessing whether the trial design is suitable for a full-scale impact evaluation. It will not be intended to provide conclusive evidence on whether DYW is effective. 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 the project and work closely with the evaluator, including through the set-up and design stage, delivery, data collection and reporting. Final trial requirements will be confirmed during the co-design phase, but will include strict adherence to the randomisation process. All selected patches will be randomly assigned to either the intervention or control group, and this allocation must be followed without exception. Full participation in the evaluation, in line with the criteria set by YEF and the evaluator, is a core condition of involvement in the project.

### **Roles and responsibilities of the regional consortia**

- **Contribute to the co-design process**, working closely with the evaluator to shape a robust Pilot RCT design for DYW. This includes input into any revisions to the shared practice model. As part of this phase, the regional consortia will also develop a detailed delivery plan and proposed budget.
- **Identify 10 hyper-local patches for randomisation**, using criteria defined by the evaluator (see 'Patch selection'.)
- **Oversee and manage delivery of the DYW intervention** in the five patches allocated to the intervention group. We will expect that any regional consortium will include a

youth work provider which can directly deliver the intervention according to the shared practice model.

- **Commit to avoid delivery of DYW in control patches**, by securing a formal commitment from all consortium members not to commission or deliver DYW in these areas for the duration of the trial.
- **Monitor and report on activity in control patches**, maintaining oversight of any youth-focused interventions (such as youth work or patrols by police) – whether commissioned by consortium members or external organisations – and keeping the evaluator informed of any developments during the trial period.
- **Maintain ongoing partnership of organisations within, and external to, the regional consortium**. This is particularly important to ensure the study is run as intended in both the areas with detached youth workers and those without, and to coordinate access and collection of data.
- **Support the evaluation process**, including assisting with data collection, complying with data monitoring requirements, making staff in the regional consortium available for interview and supporting fieldwork research with young people.
- **Promote and uphold YEF's evaluation approach**, ensuring all evaluation milestones and deadlines are met.
- **Report quarterly to YEF** on the scope, risks, and progress of delivery. More frequent updates should be provided if significant challenges arise.
- **Maintain a strong and collaborative partnership** with both YEF and the evaluator throughout the project lifecycle.

### **What organisations need to be represented in a regional consortium?**

Based on consultation with youth agencies, the organisations which are **essential partners** for a regional consortium for a pilot trial are:

- The local authority/ies (LAs), representing management and delivery of youth services (including any detached youth work delivery), youth offending teams and community safety teams.
- The local police force/s.
- Voluntary detached youth work provider, experienced in delivering DYW (if not being directly provided by the LA.)

We would also **recommend** that the following organisations are included in the consortium, where possible:

- Voluntary sector centre-based youth work providers.
- Violence Reduction Units/Partnerships (VRUs).
- Community Safety Partnerships.
- Any umbrella organisations for local youth services.

Many of the organisations comprising the consortium should already have experience of working in partnership.

The consortium's activities may also be informed by wider stakeholders interested in youth work such as housing teams, resident development officers, schools, education leads, Integrated Care Boards, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and other community organisations such as faith groups, however these would not necessarily need to be formal members of a consortium.

#### *Lead organisation*

It's key that consortium 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. YEF will pay the entirety of the grant to the lead organisation, who will be responsible for distributing payments to other members of the consortium. The consortium should be led by the organisation with the strongest relationship to the other partners; this might be local authority youth services, large youth work delivery organisations, youth service infrastructure organisations or Violence Reduction Units/ Partnerships.

#### **Eligibility criteria**

The DYW scoping report has identified that regional consortia should meet the following eligibility criteria:

- A demonstrated capacity to deliver, and prior experience of delivering, high-quality detached youth work that is consistent with the shared practice model (which may be refined at co-design.)
- Deep local knowledge of the area, and an ability to demonstrate how the area could benefit from additional detached youth work funding.
- Prior experience of systematically identifying areas for DYW, and doing reconnaissance.
- Able to identify 10 patches following criteria agreed during co-design.
- Existing strong multiagency partnerships or relationships.

- Sufficient influence to determine where detached youth work does and does not take place.
- Established knowledge of the local area.
- Able to demonstrate credible need in specific locations.
- Delivery organisations are sufficiently large and stable that the project would not destabilise or distort their provision.
- Willing to take part in a randomised control trial (RCT) and committed to ensuring that DYW does not take place in patches allocated to the control group beyond 'usual' services, such as other youth work and policing.

Applications will also be strengthened if applicants can demonstrate experience of delivery as part of an evaluation, that they understand the rationale for an RCT design, and that they're able to communicate the need for rigorous evaluation methodology with partners. We would also expect that the youth work organisations comprising the consortium are already engaging with around 50 CYP per week, or 300-400 CYP within the past year.

### **Patch selection**

The precise criteria for selection of eligible patches will be determined during co-design. However, it is likely that the criteria will include:

- A demonstrable level of need (through patterns of youth crime and anti-social behaviour, for example.)
- A sufficiently *reachable* population of young people who are actively present.
- A clearly defined geographical area that is small enough to facilitate meaningful ongoing contact with young people.
- Youth worker knowledge of the community.
- No anticipated delivery of DYW within the patch for 1 year prior to the delivery start date of October 2026 (therefore no delivery of DYW from October 2025.)

Patch selection is likely to be informed by both data around instances of crime and anti-social behaviour, and local knowledge. Applicants should consider which organisations within the consortium will be able to provide the local knowledge (this could be the Community Safety Partnership, for example.)

The exact size of the patches is likely to vary significantly between consortia and locations – depending on whether the environment is urban or rural, for example, and the anticipated number of children and young people who gather there. However, the anticipated size of patches will be within the **10 to 100 hectares** range, with the median size probably being

around **51 hectares**. The exact requirements for patches, and the acceptable size range, will be determined during co-design. Local context will be crucial in guiding the decisions around identifying patches. Some patches may be geographically consistent year-round while others may need to be large enough to account for the changing behaviour of young people across seasons (between a park in summer and a fast food restaurant in winter, for example.)

Regional consortia will be expected to undertake intensive work to identify suitable patches prior to randomisation.

### **Partnership with local police forces**

Local police forces will be integral stakeholders within any trial of DYW – both for delivery and evaluation. Therefore, it is crucial that any applying regional consortium can evidence the support of any police forces responsible for public safety within their proposed delivery area. Police forces will be required to provide data on incidences of crime and anti-social behaviour within patches, and possibly in surrounding areas. This data would be requested in Spring 2028, covering the period before, during (October 2026 – April 2028) and at the end/after delivery. The data would need to include:

- The specific crime/ incident types.
- Date and time of incidents.
- Location of incidents (i.e. geotagged data), ideally including eastings and northings.
- ‘Flags’ indicating youth involvement as either perpetrator or victim of crime.
- Instances of anti-social behaviour

The exact structure and nature of the required datasets will be determined during co-design, but this could be in the form of a *bespoke police force extract of geocoded data* or in *pre-aggregated police force data*. At this stage, police forces should be prepared to share both formats of dataset with the evaluator within this trial. The evaluator will work with police forces to develop a suitable Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) and to ensure the requirements for participating in the evaluation are clear and proportionate. The police force would need to agree to host the evaluation team in a secure data environment, if required

Please note that, depending on the proposed geography of delivery, applicants may need to secure the buy-in of multiple police forces to ensure that all patches are covered.

### **Race equity, diversity and inclusion (REDI)**

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 DYW, 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.

### **Role of the appointed evaluator**

The independent evaluator appointed by YEF will work with YEF and the regional consortia to co-design the programme delivery and the evaluation, agreeing an approach to key issues such as how delivery patches are identified for randomisation, alongside how data will be collected. The evaluator will lead a series of workshops with the regional consortia and YEF as part of the co-design process, to support the regional consortia to refine the trial processes and shared practice model, 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.

The evaluator will also support the trial by:

- Introducing and explaining the shared practice model.
- Setting out processes for identifying patches.
- Randomising patches between intervention and control groups.
- Developing data collection instruments and doing data collection.
- Regularly liaising with regional consortias and trouble shooting.

### **Evaluation design**

We are planning to conduct a standalone Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) with an Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE). This will enable us to understand whether the full-scale efficacy RCT is feasible and explore aspects of implementation. As outlined above 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

and to abide by YEF's 'red lines' (see the [full description here](#)). The following details are included to give you an indication of the evaluation approach.

### **Indicative research questions – Pilot RCT**

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 Detached Youth Work (DYW), and to test the impact of DYW on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour involving young people within 'patches'?*

The **primary outcome** we intend to investigate within a pilot RCT of DYW is incidences of crime and anti-social behaviour by children and young people. Due to the challenges of collecting data relating to individual young people within an evaluation of DYW (see [feasibility study](#)), the outcome will be measured on an area/patch-level using administrative data, using the location information of crime/ASB incidents in police records. The evaluator will not collect this outcome data directly from young people.

Additionally, a series of **secondary outcomes** will be measured, which will likely include community cohesion and the community's feelings of safety (including young people's). The specific measures and measurement tools that will be used will be determined during co-design, and are likely to include surveys with members of the local community. There will likely be an overlap in the topics investigated through the quantitative measures used for the secondary outcomes, and the qualitative investigation in the Implementation and Process Evaluation outlined below.

### **Indicative research questions – Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE)**

The questions explored within the **Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE)** may include:

- **Perceived impacts:** what are the perceived impacts of detached youth work, including differences by groups and services? How do people expect this change to come about? Do stakeholders anticipate that detached youth work reduces inequity? Is DYW perceived as at least as impactful for those young people experiencing it who face the greatest disadvantage? What perceived impacts do other community members experience?
- **Reach:** how many young people are reached? What are their characteristics? Does detached youth work reach the intended young people (i.e. those who are particularly disadvantaged and marginalised from other local services)?

- **Fidelity to the shared practice model and adaptations:** is DYW delivered in line with the shared practice model (including the frequency of sessions, types of activities, adherence to patches, values and the quality of practice)? What adaptations are made and why?
- **Activities:** what activities are delivered in detached youth work? How are decisions about the activities made? What is taken into account, which parties are involved and are there local triggers that influence activity? How is the wider community engaged and influenced through detached youth work?
- **Acceptability and appropriateness of detached youth work:** how is detached youth work experienced by young people? Does what is delivered respond to the issues of inequity faced by young people? How is detached youth work experienced by other community stakeholders?
- **Acceptability of the RCT design and contamination:** how acceptable was the RCT design? Was any detached youth work delivered in the control patches? If so, what and why? What strategies were used to minimise detached youth work (or ensure none took place) in the control patches? To what extent was this appropriate from a youth worker perspective and from a RCT perspective??
- **Appropriateness and feasibility of the evaluation arrangements:** were the research methods and tools used viewed as acceptable, including by the most marginalised young people?
- **Business as usual:** what activities were delivered as business as usual in the control and intervention areas? What additional or new activities were undertaken in control areas in response to local events which, absent the trial, could have been addressed through detached youth work? How were arising issues resolved?
- **Costs:** what was the cost of delivery of the detached youth work? If it is possible to ascertain, what was the cost of delivery of any additional activities undertaken in the control areas in response to issues that, absent the trial, would have been addressed through detached youth work?

These questions will be answered through the following methods (to be refined during co-design):

- An assessment of monitoring data.
- Liaising with DYW agencies and consortium members.
- Interviews with delivery staff.
- Interviews, focus groups and surveys with local stakeholders and young people.

Regional consortia will be expected to support these data collection requirements by:



- Completing a bespoke monitoring data system set up by the eval team, which will require them reporting across the regional consortia.
- Making the police data available.
- Making staff available for regular liaison with the eval team and with other regional consortia.
- Making staff available for interviews.
- Supporting data collection with YP, which might involve survey work and creative approaches.
- Providing data on costs.

#### **Indicative research questions around race equity, inclusion and diversity (REDI):**

- 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') affect CYP from Black Asian and ethnic minority backgrounds in accessing and receiving support from detached youth workers?
- 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)?

### **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	Monday 7 <sup>th</sup> July 25
Deadline for full proposal submission	Monday 8 <sup>th</sup> August 25
Proposals scored and shortlisted	Monday 11 <sup>th</sup> – Thursday 14 <sup>th</sup> August 25
Interviews with shortlisted applicants	Tuesday 19 <sup>th</sup> August – Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> August 25
(Provisional) Regional Consortia appointment	Thursday 4 <sup>th</sup> September 25
<b>Grants and Evaluation Committee – decision point (approval for co-design)</b>	Tuesday 30 <sup>th</sup> September 25
Co-design	October 25 – February 26

Grants and Evaluation Committee - Decision point (approval for delivery)	March 26
---	----------

## Budget

*Please note – the budget proposal should only cover costs associated with delivery of the trial (October 26- April 28). Each regional consortium will receive a one-off payment for participation in the co-design process (~ £2,200 per consortium) which will take place with all consortia and the evaluators.*

Applicants should include in their budget costs for effectively managing the development and delivery aspect of this trial. We expect this to cover:

- Core day to day management and delivery of DYW within the 5 ‘intervention’ patches (see *shared practice model*) between October 2026 – April 2028
- Monitoring and reporting of activities delivered within 5 ‘control’ patches between October 2026 – April 2028
- Employment and training of staff
- Being the main point of contact for both the evaluator and YEF, quality assuring delivery and reporting quarterly to YEF on the status of the project
- Stakeholder management across the regional consortium and wider community and services
- Monitoring and reporting of activities being delivered in control patches
- Supporting the evaluation as necessary, including with data collection

Budgets can be revisited/finalised through the co-design period. We are not providing an indicative budget for this call, as we would like applicants to propose the budget they believe is required to deliver this project robustly, at the required scale, within the context of a trial.

*Please note, YEF has a standard requirement for all grantees to 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](#). However, if you’re unable to meet this requirement, we would still like to hear from you. In your bid, please explain if this won’t be possible and why.*

## Application guidance

### Application process

Regional consortia 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 all proposals will be **9am Monday 11<sup>th</sup> August 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: **Detached Youth Work Regional Consortium Proposal**

### 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 between Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> August and Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> August.

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 questions, email [ben.moffat@youthendowmentfund.org.uk](mailto:ben.moffat@youthendowmentfund.org.uk), specifying *Detached Youth Work proposal* in the subject line.

## 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: Commissioning an evaluator for the evaluation*

We'll then match the 4 successful regional consortia 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, and subject to approval by our Grants and Evaluation Committee, the regional consortia will be expected to be available for a series of intensive co-design workshops.

These are likely to run from October 2025 to February 2026 and you will need to be available to attend a minimum of six 2–3-hour, co-design workshops. 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 regional consortia 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 the final proposal has been submitted by the regional consortia in partnership with the 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 around 5 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 for delivery of the trial) is likely to be around 9 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 and delivery of Detached Youth Work will entail, with a clear strategy of how your organisation

will successfully coordinate and oversee delivery within the consortium? Do you have experience of delivering DYW in line with the shared practice model?

- How likely is it you'll be able to work with the wider consortia, the evaluator and local stakeholders to deliver in the given timeframe? To do this, we'll look at your previous experience and expertise of overseeing, or collaborating with partners who oversee, youth work interventions. We will also assess your existing regional networks 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 Detached Youth Work, and whether mitigations proposed are adequate.

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

We're trying to assess the extent to which you have:

- Delivered DYW previously.
- The partnerships in place to deliver at the required scale.
- Experience of systematic approaches to identifying areas for DYW (and can deploy local knowledge to support identification.)
- Have a strong understanding of how you'll identify and oversee the 10 DYW patches required for the pilot RCT. It's important for us to be able to assess whether your proposed approach, including management of DYW teams and the selection of patches in which they deliver, will enable the required scale to be met.

## **3. Ability to successfully develop and manage relationships with partner bodies, both inside and outside the regional consortium**

We're trying to assess the depth of alignment and partnership between bodies within the regional consortium, and how relationships will be developed externally. We will need to understand whether you currently have all necessary consortium partners on board, or whether you can present compelling evidence that you can get them on board. We also want to understand any potential risks involved with coordinating stakeholders and relationships within a complex project. For example, gaining senior level buy in from relevant LA services to ensure no DYW will be delivered in control patches, and the local police force.

## **4. Ability to appropriately consider race, equality, diversity and inclusion issues relevant to Detached Youth Work**

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 marginalised backgrounds and how these children and young people are supported.

### **5. Ability to commit to the trial requirements**

We'll look for evidence that you can commit to the trial requirements – particularly:

- Demonstrating that you'll be able to identify 10 appropriate patches for the trial
- Intention not to deliver DYW in control areas
- Conducting or supporting data collection as required

<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