

HPC COMMUNITY FUND YOUTH PATHWAYS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR EXPRESSION OF INTERESTS

CRITERIA 1 – PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

Range and mix of partners	1. The partnership is a single organisation, or partners with very similar roles, skills or reach. 2. The partnership includes some different partners, but there are clear gaps in skills, size or geographical reach. 3. The partnership brings together a good mix of organisations of different sizes and skills, mostly covering the priority areas. 4. The partnership brings together a strong mix of organisations of different sizes and skills, with clear coverage across Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and the surrounding rural areas.
----------------------------------	---

Shared outcomes and roles	1. The partners have not agreed shared outcomes or roles. 2. The partners describe some shared aims, but individual roles are unclear. 3. The partners set out shared outcomes and a general sense of who will do what. 4. The partners set out clear, shared outcomes with well-defined roles for each partner.
----------------------------------	---

CRITERIA 2 – FIT WITH YOUTH PATHWAYS PRIORITIES

Coverage of the three priority areas (belonging, soft skills, creative)	1. The proposal covers none, or only one, of the three priority areas. 2. The proposal covers some of the three priority areas, but as separate, disconnected activities.
--	--

engagement, mental health support)	3. The proposal covers most of the three priority areas and shows some links between them. 4. The proposal covers all three priority areas as a single, joined-up offer, showing clearly how they connect for young people.
---	---

Reach across priority communities	1. The proposal does not identify where activity will take place. 2. The proposal identifies some priority areas but coverage is patchy or unclear. 3. The proposal covers most of Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and the surrounding rural areas. 4. The proposal clearly covers Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and the surrounding rural areas closest to the HPC site, including under served communities.
--	---

Ability to work with young people to develop the partnership	1. No evidence of how young people will shape the partnership. 2. Some intention stated, but vague — unclear how or which young people will be involved. 3. Clear method for involving young people (e.g. advisory group, co-design), though reach may be limited. 4. Young people are embedded in shaping the partnership on an ongoing basis, including under-served groups.
---	--

CRITERIA 3 – DELIVERABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Track record	1. The partners have little or no track record of delivering support to young people locally. 2. Some partners have a track record of delivering support to young locally, but experience is limited. 3. Most partners have a good track record of delivering support to young people locally
---------------------	--

	4. Partners have a strong, evidenced track record of delivering support to young people across the priority areas.
--	--

These criteria will be expanded and used at the full application stage. Shortlisted partnerships will receive the updated criteria as part of the development stage.