

Trustee Shortlisting Comments – YWG 1 June 2024

Applicant & Trustee Score	Trustee score 1	Trustee score 2	Trustee score 3
<b>Shortlisted</b>			
<p>Anawim – Birmingham Women’s Centre Score = 12</p>	<p><b>(AH)</b></p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> Clear target numbers, new piece of work and specialist case worker to be funded. All about prevention which should help numbers over time. Birmingham base.</p>	<p><b>(CC)</b> Good insight and knowledge on the issues. Understand that many CJS service are based on ‘male models.’ Trialling new risk assessment tool. Working very specifically with the right cohort with good referral mechanisms (P3.) 1-1 work and group work sessions and train the trainer.</p>
<p>Abianda (London) Score = 10</p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> Really like the critical thinking and re-setting of women’s expectations, especially as young women and girls may well talk to others. I think the causal link they give here might be optimistic, but I like the idea of piloting with one local authority to test it.</p>	<p><b>(HB)</b> The organisation has been working with young women and girls for ten years and has grown significantly since start-up. The application is full of detail that demonstrates a short but strong track record. Strong understanding of sexual and criminal exploitation, and various elements of modern slavery and the changing ways that young women and girls are being exploited and put at risk. No rigorous evaluation of outcomes, but the principles of the work are very sound and clearly based on existing evidence, e.g. of the value of healthy relationships. The fact that they are planning to ‘refine, review and relaunch’ their model of practice raises questions about what issues they have identified with it to date.</p>	<p><b>(JM)</b> Detailed plan. 10 years experience. Solid organisation - £850k income. Clear on outcomes.</p>

		<p>They say they intend to use the grant partly to track impact and develop evidence of effectiveness, so this should be coming down the line. But there is little sense of how they have done this before. Their website has a section on impact, but they are little mentioned in the reports they refer to and nothing much on their effectiveness, though they are clearly able to engage with stakeholders.</p> <p>Excellent evidence of existing expertise in gender- and trauma-informed approach, the application is peppered with detail to show this. Costs reasonable. Target groups prioritised.</p> <p>This organisation has an existing strong track record of providing services to our target groups and the proposed development of their approach, including a stronger element of evaluation, seems both credible and hard-earned. The application demonstrates a very high level of knowledge and experience, and the theory of change principles are undoubtedly sound. There are a few questions to explore, noted above, but overall seems an ideal application.</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>SAY Women (Glasgow) Score = 10</p>	<p><b>(JM)</b> Growing organisation, doubled in 3 years. Specific and new project. Clear outcomes. Detailed plan</p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> Their focus is childhood sexual abuse and homelessness/risk of homelessness and the move into women on the edge of the CJS is new. It's good they recognise their need for additional expertise, and I think we'll need to be clear where they're putting their efforts when the person is recruited – speaking of which, I'm a bit concerned about the qualifications required – it looks a lot, as does the job description!</p>	<p><b>(DF)</b></p>
<p><b>To be discussed</b></p>			
<p>Brighton Women's Centre Score = 9</p>	<p><b>(DF)</b></p>	<p><b>(AH)</b></p>	<p><b>(HB)</b> Good level of existing work with young women and girls in contact with the CJS or at risk of involvement, over a period of 15 years. Summary of research findings hits key points and particularly like the recognition of difficulties in transitioning to adult services and how this project may help to address this problem. Theory of change looks solid and some data provided to show positive previous outcomes with older age group following evaluation of Inspire project. Track record of monitoring and evaluation, and underpinned by a commitment to coproduction which will push them towards continuous user perspective evaluation. Existing expertise</p>

			<p>in gender- and trauma-informed approach. Costs reasonable. Target groups prioritised.</p> <p>A strong application, evidencing experience and a plan for developing current services that does not overpromise. Clearly sets out what is planned and when. Positive evaluations of previous work and good evidence of an existing network of relationships to support future growth. Very good, but if there is competition for funding, I would place this at a slightly lower priority than Abianda, which seems to have greater need of TT support.</p>
<p>Stepping Stones Luton Score = 9</p>	<p><b>(AH)</b></p>	<p><b>(CC)</b> Funded through MoJ shows ability to work well with women impacted by CJS. Offer ETE support to get women back into employment or education. Access to theory/ and counselling. Also works to address systemic barriers within the CJS.</p>	<p><b>(HB)</b> Well-established organisation, with strong contacts in the justice sector and a history of achievement. The detail, e.g. on referral routes (relatively weak in other applications) and the numbers of women they might be able to help with the funding, indicates an organisation that knows what it is doing. Clearly a strong understanding of needs.</p> <p>Target both those at risk and those in the CJ system already. Some evidence of qualitative evaluation, which is fine though not particularly strong, but principles of the work/theory of change are sound.</p>

			<p>States that outcomes will be tracked and evaluated, but not a lot of detail. Strong links with stakeholders and experience of consulting beneficiaries. Existing expertise in gender- and trauma-informed approach. Costs reasonable. Target groups prioritised.</p> <p>An excellent all-round application, which clearly sets out what they will do, how and for how many women. They have good existing experience and are likely to deliver well on their plans, making a significant difference to the lives of young women.</p>
<p>Working Chance (London) Score = 9</p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> Target numbers 165 young women 18-30. Contacts with all 12 women's prisons so good national coverage. Loss making.</p>	<p><b>(DF)</b></p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> Very good, strong focus on women's employability. From their description, it looks an efficient system. It appears we're contributing to a general pot of money, but 165 beneficiaries seems a lot for the number of staff (41 participants per keyworker). Maybe I need to know more about it, but I've got concerns about their capacity.</p>
<p>Clean Break Theatre Company (London) Score = 8</p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> Different and creative. Good structure and target numbers. Year 1 funds specialist support worker to target young girls.</p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> I was rather disappointed in this; feels very woolly to me. I imagine the geographic reach is London/near London, given the participation of the Drama Schools. Not keen</p>	<p><b>(CC)</b> Unique model/activities and different to other applications. Coproduced with young women. Specifically address the needs of black and minority groups. Silver Trauma informed work.</p>

			<p>Do they have evidence that the below outcomes reducing participants to reoffend?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 100% improved confidence and wellbeing</li> <li>- 100% report new skills in theatre</li> <li>- 90% report new positive networks</li> <li>- 70% achieve auditions at drama school</li> <li>- 60% continue to engage with Clean Break through our core Members Programme.</li> </ul>
<p>Daddyless Daughters Project (London) Score = 8</p>	<p><b>(DF)</b></p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> South London, sister squad, ages 11-25 Good project structure, not new and have worked with 150 girls with 100 on their waiting list. Modest Grant (£40k).</p>	<p><b>(AH)</b></p>
<p>One Small Thing (Southampton) Score = 8</p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> I see-sawed a bit on this, a new model for dealing with the issue of homelessness which will be evaluated by the University of Southampton. On one hand, I imagine people will be queuing up to give them money for 'an alternative to prison', on the other it is a new approach and given their collaborations with other organisations, would be a smart use of our money.</p>	<p><b>(JM)</b> Score as a 2 but could be 4. Well established charity. Innovative - Hope St. Specific project with specific outcomes, but income £4m average over last couple of years. With £1m p.a from Chair - Lady Edwina Grosvenor (but good for networking??) Very interesting project, but do they really need us. Should we support smaller</p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> To fund Community partner. Although London based this is to support girls in the Southampton area. Income and expenditure figures need to be explained, is there a decimal point missing? No target numbers, although there's capacity at Hope Street for 24 girls.</p>

Rejected			
<p>Belifted Now CIC (London) Score = 7</p>	<p><b>(JM)</b> Detailed plan and support team. Mentoring programme, but very small charity - £66k income. Would they be able to scale up with £40k p.a grant? Transformational? Less clear on outcomes</p>	<p><b>(HB)</b> They clearly have experience of working with women and girls and those at risk of CJ involvement, but less convinced about their knowledge of criminal justice. There don't seem to be any similar existing work streams.</p> <p>Not much doubt that they have general understanding of CJS. The application asserts that it will make a difference without providing convincing reasons for why. The work will include a pupil referral unit and they have some previous experience there; it will also include an unnamed local women's prison - there is no women's prison local to their current catchment area of NW London, so not clear where they mean, and it seems they have no existing links. It is not straightforward to set up a project in prison and unclear how far they have thought this through. In principle good, but the vagueness gives the impression that this might at least in part be something of a 'punt'.</p> <p>Say they will evaluate, little detail on how – unclear on what baseline their (high) percentages are based. But the fact that they have an evaluation and</p>	<p><b>(DL)</b> Light on target numbers, although target market is sound. Seems an extension to work in pupil referral units. Grant spend, whilst it states where it will be used, vague on analysis.</p>

		<p>impact officer is noteworthy. Existing expertise in gender- and trauma-informed approach, experience of CBT and trauma-informed counselling, and work on supporting survivors of domestic violence. Costs reasonable. Target groups prioritised.</p> <p>In general, an underwhelming application. It doesn't fully convince about existing expertise related to criminal justice or in its outline of how the money will be used. There are too many bland soundbites, and not enough clear linking of buzz terms to what they will actually do. I wouldn't want to dismiss completely without further exploration with them, but does not seem a priority.</p>	
<p>Imago Dei (E. Grinstead) Score = 7</p>	<p><b>(HB)</b> Established organisation working with women in prisons and with staff who have prison experience. Strong evidence of relating to people already in contact with the CJS. I'm a little unsure about the religious basis to their work and whether this will in effect discourage some women and/or affect the organisation's approach more than comes across in the</p>	<p><b>(KD)</b> Despite reservations about the Christian mission, I do think that working with the Chaplaincy is a good route in as I believe it's a statutory requirement and reports in to the MoJ. I also liked the very practical support offered to prison leavers 3-6 months before they leave and through the gate. Risk of it not being fully funded, but I think it would be good to speak with them. They might certainly benefit from Spark.</p>	<p><b>(AH)</b></p>



	<p>application. Their website has a stronger emphasis on spiritual nature of their work, although again they are at pains to stress they work with everyone and don't proselytise. Not a deal breaker but just something to be aware of when making a decision. Theory of change is sound and there is a need for more of the 'through the gate' work they describe. If they can work well with their target 35+ women from 3-6 months before release I imagine that will have a significant impact on community reintegration.</p> <p>Good evidence of how it will be monitored and addresses this directly with a survey and the idea of an advisory board is a good one if they implement it. Strong evidence of trauma-informed work over a lengthy period. Costs reasonable. Target groups prioritised</p> <p>Have existing experience, good contacts and work in several women's prisons. Notwithstanding my reservations about inclusion, most other</p>		
--	---	--	--

	aspects of this application look strong.		
Getaway Girls (Leeds) Score = 6	<b>(CC)</b> Great track record. Good level of lived experience with staff. Application doesn't detail well the key activities that will take place.	<b>(DF)</b>	<b>(JM)</b> Long-standing charity - 35 years Plan less detailed - felt a bit generic. Listing of outcomes also felt a bit generic.
Trevi Women (Plymouth) Score = 5	<b>(CC)</b> Good experience and work on various projects. Do they work specifically with young women age 18.	<b>(AH)</b> Project not focused enough on YW&G involved in CJS.	<b>(JM)</b> Not clear what we would be funding No specific project? Funding general costs? No plans for when funding ends. Reasonable sized charity £3.4m income. Could our funds be better used elsewhere?