

OPEN CALL FOR QEDS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

This FAQ document compiles questions submitted by prospective applicants since the launch of our open call for quasi-experimental evaluations (QEDs), including those raised during our webinars. We have provided responses to help address common areas of interest and uncertainty. This document will be updated regularly as we continue to receive questions and host further webinars.

Will Foundations be funding intervention delivery?

No, Foundations are not funding intervention delivery for this call. This is primarily because we anticipate this being a **retrospective evaluation** for interventions that have already been completed. Where evaluations are prospective, we would expect to use randomised experimental methods such as an RCT.

If applicants have a strong justification for a prospective evaluation where an RCT would not be possible/ would be inappropriate and a QED would be better, please email us and this could be something we discuss.

Can academic institutions apply?

Yes, and we would encourage them to do so. Academic institutions could also be particularly valuable as part of a consortium, for example, with other who have expertise around conducting rigorous QEDs or knowledge of relevant data sets.

Will University overheads be funded?

No, our call guidance states that Foundations will not pay Full Economic Costings (FEC) for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), which means only direct costs for HEIs will be covered (i.e. expenses that are directly related to the running of the project including staff salaries, equipment and materials specifically used for this project, and travel costs for fieldwork etc).

How many families are you expecting to go through this evaluation?

We do not set a strict minimum sample size for this call. However, we expect applicants to justify that their proposed evaluation will have sufficient statistical power to detect meaningful effects, given the sample size and characteristics of the available data. This should include a brief power calculation or other rationale appropriate to the proposed quasi-experimental method. We recognise that effect sizes and sample sizes vary depending on the intervention and context, so we



assess feasibility and rigour on a case-by-case basis. Applicants whose proposals may concern a smaller sample size may want to consider applying as a Pilot-QED rather than a full-scale QED.

You've put a really big focus on using existing data. Is that the primary focus of this call? Or are you open to interventions that can provide new data?

This call is focused on retrospective quasi-experimental impact evaluations that make use of existing administrative or service delivery data. Our aim is to accelerate learning about what works by leveraging data that already exists - minimising costs, reducing research burden on service providers, and enabling timely insights.

We're working across several different local authorities. We're wondering whether we should bring all of those local authorities together or just use one local authority. Proportionally, there's are probably more ethnically minoritised families in one particular local authority that we're working with than the other local authorities.

To generate a robust evaluation, particularly with a full-scale QED, a larger sample size would be preferable. We are also particularly interested in generating insights for minoritised ethnic children and families and would encourage applicants to consider subgroup analyses and the samples required to do this.

If we have an intervention that is funded across the four UK nations, would that still be eligible?

This would still be eligible. However, we would only be able to conduct an evaluation on the intervention that was delivered in England. Foundations is funded by the Department for Education, which is responsible for education and children's services in England only (given that education is a devolved matter across the four nations of the UK). As such, our focus is to understand how to improve outcomes for children and families in England only. Where an intervention has been delivered across the four nations, it would still be eligible, but we would expect proposals to focus specifically on our target population.

Can you elaborate on the possibility of additional funding to existing evaluations to conduct further analyses?

Yes, if an intervention or programme has already been evaluated through, for example, say an RCT, we like to consider funding re-analyses of evaluation data using different outcomes or looking at the impact for subgroups of children and families. For example, there could be a parenting intervention that we could analyse specifically for minoritised ethnic families.



Prior to the application, does Foundations expect us to do an evaluability assessment of our QED? E.g. doing some initial patient and participant involvement and effect size calculations. Or can this be included as part of the project itself?

We don't expect a full evaluability assessment before applying. However, we do expect applicants to have done enough preliminary work to show that a credible quasi-experimental design is feasible. This might include initial checks on data availability and quality, indicative sample sizes, and a basic sense of whether there's potential for identifying a suitable comparison group. We don't require patient and public involvement (PPI) at this stage, but we welcome it if it strengthens the case for feasibility or relevance.

Do you need evaluators to have access to the required datasets at the point of application?

No, not necessarily at the point of application, but as stated in our criteria, applications that can demonstrate clear access routes to the data and awareness of any risks or known challenges to accessing these datasets will be favoured.

How will you make decisions across your priority areas and populations? For example if you have several very strong applications, but limited funding do you have some 'priority' priority areas?

Our primary assessment criteria are focused on strategic alignment – specifically, how well the proposal addresses our priority areas, outcomes, and populations. Technical quality, including the credibility of the proposed quasi-experimental design and the expertise of the team, is assessed as a secondary criterion.

If we receive several very strong applications, we may also consider the overall balance and complementarity of our portfolio as a tertiary criterion, but this will only come into play after assessing strategic alignment and technical merit. We aim to prioritise proposals that are both well-designed and most likely to generate useful evidence for decision-makers across our priority areas.



We run an intervention that has a broadly White British uptake, however we are very keen to explore barriers to marginalised communities accessing the intervention as part of our own EDIE strategy. Would this be of interest or is it beyond scope of the call?

We are looking to fund QEDs in which the research question focuses on the impact of an intervention. We also welcome QEDs that include subgroup analyses which look at effectiveness for subgroups of children and families. IPEs could explore questions around barriers to accessing interventions.

Would applications that not only focus on family work but includes the whole network around the child (including work with the family, social care, school staff) be eligible for this call? The main focus would be on working with the parents but it also includes work with the network around the child, especially for children in care.

Yes, this would be eligible provided that child outcomes can be measured