



social care  
institute for excellence

# Rapid evidence reviews: knowledge-based social work

Outline proposal to UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work)



The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) was established by Government in 2001 to improve social care services for adults and children in the United Kingdom.

We achieve this by identifying good practice and helping to embed it in everyday social care provision.

SCIE works to:

- disseminate knowledge-based good practice guidance
- involve people who use services, carers, practitioners, providers and policy makers in advancing and promoting good practice in social care
- enhance the skills and professionalism of social care workers through our tailored, targeted and user-friendly resources.

# 1. Introduction

This proposal has been prepared in response to a request from UC Metropol for SCIE to undertake a series of four related rapid evidence reviews, on:

1. The use of feedback tools (including digital tools and apps) for children and young people receiving social work support
2. How social work professionals use video and digital tools to support supervision and reflective practice.
3. The knowledge and skills required for care planning
4. The impact of social workers' post-qualifying education on social work practice

Please see Annex 1 for a brief summary of these four reviews. We would like to thank you for the opportunity we had to meet with you to discuss your requirements in detail. We would be delighted to work with you on this valuable work and have provided a high-level summary of our approach, and indicative costs for your consideration.

## 2. Proposed approach & required outputs

### a. Project initiation

We propose holding a Project Initiation videoconference with you as soon as possible after the award of the contract. This would be to: establish relationships and day-to-day working arrangements; confirm the overall project plan, milestones and timescale; and, define the key elements of the search strategy.

### b. Rapid evidence reviews

*Searching.* We will draw on knowledge from organisations, practitioners, the policy community, research, service users and carers and government bodies, as appropriate. We will undertake rapid evidence reviews rather than exhaustive systematic searches and we will work with you to identify and agree the most appropriate bibliographic databases and sources of grey literature, and search parameters. We also assume that we will only include English-language evidence in our searches. We have, however, factored in time to liaise with Danish colleagues to support their evidence searches and analysis and, if it is possible for them to provide us with summary analysis in English, we will be able to include that in our work.

*Screening.* The Project Manager/Analyst and Information Specialist will work together to pilot the inclusion/exclusion criteria on a random 10 per cent of the references. They will use the focus of the research topic and the underlying theoretical framework to guide decisions affecting the number of records which form the basis of the review. As a guide, given the parameters of this work, we would anticipate including approximately 25-30 records for analysis and synthesis per review. As screening proceeds, the criteria are likely to be more closely defined by the project team. If the restriction of topic, publication date or other criteria is not sufficient to reduce the number of records to a manageable level, the SCIE project team will consider other appropriate restrictions, propose these and agree a way forward.

*Retrieval of full text records.* After screening on titles and abstract, the articles assessed as relevant for inclusion and any outstanding queries will be retrieved in full text hard copy to allow further screening and to aid the writing process. We will use bibliographic software to manage the retrieval source and hard copy status of records, and to manage loans.

*Data extraction.* We will develop a bespoke template to standardise data extraction from the final set of records. This will ensure we capture evidence relating to the key areas of focus in a systematic and comprehensive way.

### **c. Analysis, reporting and quality assurance**

*Analysis.* We will conduct thematic analysis of data extracted from the documents included in the review. We have access to Atlast qualitative analysis software to support this should we think it useful.

*Reporting.* The lead analyst will be responsible for writing the review reports, advised and supported by the Senior Research Analyst. The Project Director will provide final sign-off. We will provide UC Metropol colleagues with indicative findings at a suitable opportunity in order that you can contribute to shaping the review reports in a meaningful way. We will also commission external peer review.

*Quality appraisal.* The nature and time of this work does not permit use of full quality appraisal tools. Because this report will describe a range of relevant data, multiple tools would be required and there is the risk of excluding relevant material because of methodological flaws. We propose, therefore, that the peer reviewers and those undertaking quality assurance within our team adopt a critical perspective, and that the final output of this work should pay attention to whether the evidence base also addresses the views of people who use services and of their carers, and to equality and diversity.

*Presenting findings.* As requested, we have factored into the budget costs of key team members presenting to critical stakeholders/advisors in Denmark. We have assumed two people will visit for a day.

### 3. Indicative costs and milestone dates

Our quote for this project, as per the table below, is **£47,970**.

Thank you for supplying your Danish VAT number. UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work) is liable to account for VAT under reverse charge rules.

Tasks	To be completed by	Project Director		Quality assurance/ Senior Res.		Project Mgr/ Lead research analyst		Snr Information Specialist		Totals	
		Beth Anderson £720		Deborah Rutter £540		Jen Francis £405		Paul Ross £360		Days	£
		Days	£	Days	£	Days	£	Days	£		
<b>Project start-up</b>											
Project initiation meeting (PIM)	27.01.14	0.25	180.00	0.25	135.00	0.25	101.25	0.25	90.00	1.00	506.25
Finalising research questions	at PIM 27.01.14		-		-	0.25	101.25	0.25	90.00	0.50	191.25
<b>Reviews 1 &amp; 2: Use of social care tools &amp; Peer support/tools for reflective practice</b>											
Agree/refine search strategy	31.01.14 after PIM	0.25	180.00		-	0.50	202.50	0.50	180.00	1.25	562.50
Searching	14.02.14		-		-		-	10.00	3,600.00	10.00	3,600.00
Title & abstract screening	26.02.14		-		-	3.00	1,215.00	7.00	2,520.00	10.00	3,735.00
Liaison with Danish subject matter experts	27.02.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Full text retrieval	05.03.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Coding/data extraction	19.03.14		-	0.25	135.00	8.00	3,240.00		-	8.25	3,375.00
Analysis, reporting & QA	28.03.14	0.50	360.00	1.50	810.00	6.00	2,430.00		-	8.00	3,600.00
3-day learning programme for librarian	Early March		-		-	1.00	405.00	2.00	720.00	3.00	1,125.00
<b>Review 3: Education and training in evidence-based care planning</b>											
Agreeing search strategy	31.01.14 after PIM	0.25	180.00		-	0.50	202.50	0.50	180.00	1.25	562.50
Searching & title screening	21.03.14		-		-		-	10.00	3,600.00	10.00	3,600.00
Title & abstract screening	07.04.14		-		-	2.00	810.00	4.00	1,440.00	6.00	2,250.00
Liaison with Danish subject matter experts	08.04.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Full text retrieval	14.04.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Coding/data extraction	22.04.13		-	0.50	270.00	5.00	2,025.00		-	5.50	2,295.00
Analysis, reporting & QA	02.05.14	0.50	360.00	1.00	540.00	3.00	1,215.00		-	4.50	2,115.00
<b>Review 4: Impact of post-education social work training</b>											
Agreeing search strategy	31.01.14 after PIM	0.25	180.00		-	0.50	202.50	0.50	180.00	1.25	562.50
Searching & title screening	30.04.14		-		-		-	10.00	3,600.00	10.00	3,600.00
Title & abstract screening	09.05.14		-		-	2.00	810.00	4.00	1,440.00	6.00	2,250.00
Liaison with Danish subject matter experts	12.05.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Full text retrieval	16.05.14		-		-		-	1.00	360.00	1.00	360.00
Coding/data extraction	23.05.14		-	0.50	270.00	5.00	2,025.00		-	5.50	2,295.00
Analysis, reporting & QA	30.05.14	0.50	360.00	1.00	540.00	3.00	1,215.00		-	4.50	2,115.00
<b>Presenting findings</b>			-	2.00	1,080.00	2.00	810.00		-	4.00	1,890.00
		2.5	1,800.00	7.0	3,780.00	42.0	17,010.00	55.0	19,800.00	106.5	42,390.00

Expenses	£
Full text & copyright costs	1,980.00
Peer review (2x£250 per paper)	2,000.00
Travel & subsistence (2trips x 2ppl x £400 each)	1,600.00
	<b>5,580.00</b>

Summary	£
	<b>47,970.00</b>

# Annex 1

## **Review 1: The use of feedback tools (including digital tools and apps) for children and young people receiving social work support**

**Aim:** To undertake a rapid evidence review of available literature on feedback tools aimed at enabling children and young people to engage with social work caseworkers. Specifically, the review should look for evidence about:

- relevant tools in use in social services
- comparable tools in use in adult social care and other sectors
- tool content (i.e. measures used, core components etc.)
- barriers to, and facilitators of, development and implementation
- costs associated with implementation or use
- impact and outcomes.

We will adopt an iterative approach to searching for this review, liaising with you as appropriate. It may be useful to note the following proposed parameters at this stage:

- **Location:** The following countries may be of particular interest: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands.
- **Language:** We will be including only English publications, however, you have indicated that a member of your team will undertake a review of Danish literature and will provide us with a summary report in English, which we can also include.
- **Study/research types:** All study types will be considered initially, although peer-reviewed articles and research reports will be prioritised for inclusion. It will be particularly important to look for studies reporting the views and experiences of children and young people.

**Output:** The results of this will be summarised in a rapid evidence review report, which UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work) will use to inform the technical design and development of an app. The aim of the app is to facilitate two-way communication and engagement between children and young people<sup>1</sup>, and the social care professionals supporting them.

---

<sup>1</sup> The target audience for the app is children and young people aged 15 to 18 years old.

## **Review 2: How social work professionals use video and digital tools to support supervision and reflective practice**

**Aim:** To undertake a rapid evidence review of available literature on how social work professionals use video and digital tools to support their professional development and practice. Specifically, the review should look for evidence about:

- relevant tools in use in social services
- comparable tools in use in other sectors (e.g. 'My Teaching Partner')
- tool content (i.e. measures used, core components etc.)
- barriers to, and facilitators of, development and implementation
- costs associated with implementation or use
- impact and outcomes.

We will adopt an iterative approach to searching for this review, liaising with you as appropriate. It may be useful to note the following proposed parameters at this stage.

- **Location:** The following countries may be of particular interest: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands.
- **Language:** We will be including only English publications, however, you have indicated that a member of your team will undertake a review of Danish literature and will provide us with a summary report in English, which we can also include.
- **Study/research types:** All study types will be considered initially, although peer-reviewed articles and research reports will be prioritised for inclusion. It will be particularly important to look for studies reporting the views and experiences of social work practitioners and their supervisors.

**Output:** The results of this will be summarised in a rapid evidence review report, which UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work) will use to inform the technical design and development of video supervision tool for social work practice<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> The target audience is social workers and their supervisors.



### **Review 3: Knowledge and skills in care planning**

**Aim:** To undertake a rapid evidence review of available literature on how social workers can use evidence-based approaches to build knowledge and skills required for care planning, in relation to services for children and young people. Specifically, the review should look for evidence about:

- the skills and knowledge required to create care packages
- the skills and knowledge social workers need to plan and commission care in an outcomes-focused way
- how social workers can embed evidence-based practice in care planning.

We will adopt an iterative approach to searching for this review, liaising with you as appropriate. It may be useful to note the following proposed parameters at this stage.

- **Location:** The following countries may be of particular interest: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands.
- **Language:** We will be including only English publications, however, you have indicated that a member of your team will undertake a review of Danish literature and will provide us with a summary report in English, which we can also include.
- **Study/research types:** All study types will be considered initially, although peer-reviewed articles and research reports will be prioritised for inclusion. It will be particularly important to look for studies reporting the views and experiences of social work practitioners and their supervisors.

**Output:** The results of this will be summarised in a rapid evidence review report, which UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work) will use to inform education and training to be provided to post-qualification social workers supporting children and young people<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> The target audience is social workers and their supervisors.

## **Review 4: The impact of social workers' post-qualifying education on social work practice**

**Aim:** To undertake a rapid evidence review of available literature on post-qualifying social workers' education, training and support in relation to services for children and young people. Counselling, decision-making and communication are of particular interest. Specifically, the review should look for evidence about:

- the effects of different elements of post-qualifying education on students' knowledge and skills
- whether learning translates into practice and, if so, the effects of this
- whether learning is embedded within organisations and, if so, the effects of this
- the effects of post-qualification education on outcomes for service users and carers
- the effectiveness of different elements of post-qualifying education.

We will adopt an iterative approach to searching for this review, liaising with you as appropriate. It may be useful to note the following proposed parameters at this stage.

- **Location:** The following countries may be of particular interest: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands.
- **Language:** We will be including only English publications, however, you have indicated that a member of your team will undertake a review of Danish literature and will provide us with a summary report in English, which we can also include.
- **Study/research types:** All study types will be considered initially, although peer-reviewed articles and research reports will be prioritised for inclusion. It will be particularly important to look for studies reporting the views and experiences of social work practitioners and their supervisors.

**Output:** The results of this will be summarised in a rapid evidence review report, which UC Metropol (Institute of Social Work) will use to inform education and training to be provided to post-qualification social workers supporting children and young people<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> The target audience is those responsible for designing and delivering social work training.