

What works for children?

Annual Report 2003



1 What Works for Children? Annual Report 2003

Executive summary

This report summarises the progress made by the ESRC *What Works for Children?* (WWfC) group over the past year. Key activities over the last twelve months have included:

- Consolidation of working relationships with pilot projects.
- Two workshops for practitioners; one on youth offending and one on searching for publications on on-line databases. Another workshop is planned this autumn, looking at the needs of disabled children and their families. The development officer has also co-facilitated four evaluation workshops for Children's Funds projects in Yorkshire.
- Formalisation and evaluation of our evidence request service.
- The development of a project planning and review tool, a self-assessment tool for using research and a guide to finding, assessing and using research in practice. These resources are currently being evaluated.
- The development of a comprehensive access database to assist in the evaluation of the work of the project and describe the fit between service planning and research.
- Work to include service users in the evidence-based practice agenda. Collaboration with a school is in progress, a pilot has been carried out with children and young people and work has been done on how to disseminate research messages to children and families.
- Development and maintenance of the project website
- The group has presented at four international, four national and two regional conferences. There was also considerable dissemination work in the spring in Canada, New Zealand and Australia.
- Three articles have been published in peer-reviewed journals, two book chapters commissioned, and further publications are under review or in preparation. A series of Highlights will be published in autumn 2003 and spring 2004 in collaboration with the National Children's Bureau.

1. Introduction and context

The aim of What Works for Children is to improve outcomes for children and young people by promoting the use of research in practice. An objective for our project has been to work directly with practitioners and service planners to look at what facilitates the use of research and what the obstacles might be. A development officer is working with six Children's Funds programmes (CF) in the Yorkshire area and over the last year the relationship with practice has been consolidated and grown alongside the development of the project website - www.whatworksforchildren.org.uk - and other tools for understanding, finding and using research in practice.

1.1 Aims and objectives

At the outset the following objectives were established to guide our project:

- Developing an interactive network of research, policy and practice organisations and individuals with an interest in effective services for children and young people.
- Identifying the best available evidence from research and, working with practice and policy colleagues, identifying gaps in knowledge.
- Promoting the sharing of policy and practice interventions based on this evidence.
- Understanding and developing ways to overcome obstacles to integrating research evidence into practice and policy.
- Working with practitioners and policy makers to develop replicable models of implementing evidence-based based interventions.
- Providing consultancy and training.
- Looking at the role for children and young people in policy and practice developments.

We are working with service planners from six Children's Fund (CF) programmes and practitioners from projects funded by these. The CF has seven sub-objectives for their work, which have influenced the focus of our work. In short, these are:

- To promote school attendance.
- To improve educational performance.
- To reduce the number of young people committing crime and the number of children and young people who are victims of crime.
- To reduce child health inequalities.
- To ensure accessibility of services.
- To develop services which are experienced as effective by children, young people and families.
- To involve families in building the community's capacity to sustain the programme.

1.2 Structure of the project

What Works for Children is a collaboration between Barnardo's, City University and The University of York. Overall responsibility for the project lies with Helen Roberts (City), Di McNeish (Barnardo's) and Trevor Sheldon (York).

Our development officer, Sarah Frost, is employed full time by Barnardo's and based at Leeds Children's Fund programme's offices. Over the last year Sarah has met regularly with Children's Fund service planners and practitioners, running workshops, seminars and developing tools for implementing research in practice.

Tony Newman remains a Barnardo's lead on research evidence, and supervises both of the CASE studentships linked to the award, one at the University of Bristol (academic supervisor Geraldine Macdonald) and one at University of Wales (academic supervisor Mick Bloor).

The research team at City University is co-ordinated by Kristin Liabo, a full time research officer, supported by Madeleine Stevens who works 60% as a research assistant and full time research support intern, Alison Moore. Over the past year the research team has supported the development officer's work by running an evidence request service for practitioners, improving and refining the Evidence Nuggets, where possible on the basis of international peer review, developing the Evidence Guide and evaluating the overall project work. Greg Khine, a research support intern with the Child Health Research and Policy Unit, has set up and maintained the project website. Carol Joughin joined the Child Health Research and Policy Unit in October last year. Using her experience of research dissemination from the FOCUS project at the Royal College of Psychiatrists, she has helped guide our work between October 2002 and August 2003.

Alison Moore left the project in August to move to Cambridge, and from September 15th Madeleine Stevens will be on maternity leave. During her leave, we expect to increase our level of support from Greg Khine. The relatively generous staffing levels for this phase of the work have been made possible through City's generous overheads policy for newly appointed research professors.

1.3 The EvidenceNetwork

We have benefited from links across the network, and in particular from the library and information services provided by the centre. Our closest links have been with RURU (St Andrews), Public Health (Glasgow), and Social Policy (York). We have also been fortunate in our link with Ian Walker (Warwick) and Frank Windmeijer (IFS) for advice, support and assistance with an appointments panel for our income study (see 1.4 below).

Staff from the WWfC node have liaised closely with Dr Sandra Nutley's team, have presented at meetings organised by them, and are playing a part in a commission RURU has with SCIE.

Roberts and Petticrew (Public Health node) have been commissioned by Blackwells to write a book on systematic reviews, are co-editing a special issue of *Child: Care, Health and Development* on evidence and have published a joint paper on evidence triage in the *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*.

The Public Health node, Social Policy node and WWfC are co-investigators in an ESRC methods programme project on evidence synthesis (see 1.4 below)

Our links across the network were helpful in work we completed in the summer of 2003 for the London Health Commission, on evidence on means of reducing inequalities in child health for the Mayor's Strategy for London.

Our closest links with the centre have been with Professor Deborah Ashby and Annette Boaz, with whom we have discussed methodological issues, and who has taken a particular interest in our work on mentoring. We have also enjoyed support from Lesley Grayson and Alan Gomersall on searching.

1.4 Funding related to the ESRC WWC funding

Over the lifetime of the project, the following grants have been linked to, or have built on our ESRC funded What Works for Children work:

- £25,000 from the Health Development Agency for work on Evidence Briefings. (Staffing, Patricia Lucas, Angela Underdown, Julia Gibbs)
- £20,000 (with Professor Jennie Popay, University of Lancaster, PI) to explore methodological issues in systematic reviews. (Staffing, Lisa Arai)
- £5000 from the London Health Commission to look at the evidence basis in relation to child health inequalities for the Mayor Strategy for London. (Staffing, Katherine Curtis)
- £132,000 in all (of which £37,000 to City University) with Professor Jennie Popay PI (Lancaster), Professor Sally Baldwin (York), Dr Mark Petticrew (Glasgow), Dr Amanda Sowden (York) from the ESRC methods Programme on Developing Methods for the Narrative Synthesis of Quantitative and Qualitative Data in Systematic Reviews of Effectiveness. (Staffing, Lisa Arai)
- £3000 from the Health Development Agency for a scoping study for a systematic review of evidence on child poverty and health with Professor Nick Spencer (Warwick), Professor Stuart Logan (Peninsula Medical School, Dr Gabrielle Laing (Consultant Community Paediatrician, Hackney. (Staffing, Carol Joughin, Lisa Arai and Greg Khine)
- £16000 from Barnardo's for a systematic review of income studies. (Staffing, Sandra Dowling)

- £96000 (of which £52000 to City) from the Department of Health Policy Research Programme for a systematic review of infant growth with Dr Catherine Law PI (MRC Environmental Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton) and Professor Jos Kleijnen (CRD University of York). (Staffing, Patricia Lucas)
- \$40,000AUD from the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth with Dr Elizabeth Waters PI and Dr Faline Howes (University of Melbourne) for a feasibility study on the establishment of a national clearinghouse of effective interventions and research evidence on children and young people in Australia.
- £85,000 (of which £29,000 to Barnardo's) from the Social Care Institute of Excellence for a study on research utilisation in the social care workforce with Dr Sandra Nutley and Dr Isabel Walters (Research Unit for Research Utilisation at the University of St Andrews). (Staffing, Sarah Frost and Di McNeish)

A further substantial international bid has recently been funded by the Canadian Institute for Health Services Research from a consortium including Professor Penny Hawe, University of Calgary (PI) and within the UK, Dr Mark Petticrew, also in the evidence network, to refine new methods in complex intervention studies with young people. This work will be undertaken in Canada, the USA, Australia and the UK, with matched funding from VicHealth in Melbourne.

2 Research outputs as related to project objectives

2.1 Developing an interactive network

As is reflected throughout this report, a range of activities undertaken by What Works for Children, have contributed to the informal, interactive network of policy and academic institutions, both nationally and internationally. We are currently using the project website as a further means of creating a virtual network.

As detailed under 1.3 and 1.4, the node has collaborated extensively across the EvidenceNetwork, which has resulted in successful research bids and joint publications.

Our seminars have been directed towards the Children's Fund practitioners with whom we work, but have been open to and attended by a range of people from outside the Children's Fund and the EvidenceNetwork.

"What Works for Children" received two ESRC CASE awards, which run from 2002/3 to 2004/5. Barnardo's is meeting 50% of the cost of each award.

At Bristol University, Lorna Henry is studying "Assessment of risk in cases of child neglect". Fieldwork for this study will be carried out in Wiltshire, with the co-operation of Wiltshire Social Services Department. Her academic supervisor is Professor Geraldine Macdonald. At Cardiff University, Nick

Jenkins is studying "Children's and parental accounts of children's risk behaviour and incurring non-domestic, non-road traffic injuries". Data collection will be via the A&E department at the University of Wales Hospital. LREC approval has been obtained. Academic supervisor is Professor Mick Bloor.

The students have completed first year research training modules, preliminary literature searches, fieldwork access arrangements and interview schedule/data collection instrument pilot. Both studentships are co-supervised by Dr Tony Newman on behalf of Barnardo's.

2.2 Understanding and overcoming obstacles to integrating evidence into policy and practice

Our understanding of obstacles to integrating research evidence into policy and practice has benefited from our direct work with, and subsequent feedback from, practitioners and service planners.

Our website provides an introduction for practitioners wanting to use research and features resources for overcoming obstacles they might encounter. A summary of this web section is given in Appendix 1.

Research Use Self-Assessment Tool (Appendix 2)

We have adapted an assessment tool used by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. The tool allows organisations to evaluate their capacity to acquire, assess, adapt and apply research evidence in the design and delivery of services and can help organisations to identify specific areas of improvement related to their use of research. By using the tool with selected programmes at various stages we hope to track progress and identify changes in the use of evidence amongst participating organisations.

So far we have facilitated the completion of this tool in three Children's Fund partnership programmes, and work with the remaining three will be undertaken in next few months. The Research Use Self-Assessment Tool has also been sent to individual Children's Fund projects for their use and feedback is being collated. The work has further informed our understanding of the obstacles to research use in practice. Encouragingly, feedback suggests that practitioners attribute their ability to access and acquire relevant research to input from WWfC, though we are aware of potential response bias here.

Initial findings from this process indicate that the internet is a popular source of research, but few practitioners had used (or heard of) online resources such as Pubmed and ERIC which could enable them to access sound studies. Service planners' understanding of the term 'research' was broad, and a range of activities were referred to in this category, including small scale local evaluations and consultation exercises. A need for continued support in the

areas of acquiring, assessing, adapting and applying research has been highlighted.

Links and Joint Working

Our understanding of possible levers in the research use process has further developed through links and joint working with organisations with a scope similar to ours including Making Research Count (MRC), Research in Practice (RiP), the Centre for Evidence Based Social Services (CEBBS), and the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE).

An action planning approach used by Making Research Count was adapted for our event in December 2002. This encouraged practitioners to consider how they could take the research evidence forward to effect change within their organisations. An action plan was designed which prompted practitioners to ask relevant questions about the application of research.

We are in discussions with CEBSS regarding the development of a training package on using research in practice for social care practitioners.

Our consultation with practitioners on behalf of SCIE, as part of the Research Utilisation and the Social Care Workforce project, has given us further understanding of obstacles to research use and highlighted examples of activities designed to increase the use of research in practice.

2.3 Identifying the best evidence from research

The Evidence Nuggets

The trawl for sound evidence-based interventions carried out in the project's first year has continued. This, in combination with practitioners' requests for evidence resulted in the Evidence Nuggets, which have been developed and put through a peer review process. Five nuggets have been available on our website since January 2003 and one more is in the pipeline.

The aim of the Evidence Nuggets is to provide robust research which can help with decision-making. Layout and readability were important features along with academic quality. Feedback was sought during distribution. This was positive about the concept and respondents found the nuggets useful and easy to read. Whilst this is encouraging for the project's work, it is likely that those who did not find the nuggets helpful refrained from commenting.

In collaboration with a City University colleague, Dr Neil Brocklehurst, the Evidence Nuggets were piloted in two workshops for health visitors last spring. The feedback from these groups suggests that the practitioners particularly liked having information about the costs of interventions, and having all the relevant information on an intervention in one place. Some of the feedback indicated that they wanted the Evidence Nuggets to be more

detailed, whilst others wanted them shorter. Overall, the usefulness of nuggets was not questioned and future topics were suggested.

The Evidence Request Log

As the development officer formed working relationships with service planners, requests for research evidence and information started to come through to the research team. This was initially dealt with as and when questions were passed on, but when the number of requests grew it was decided that the service would be formalised and monitored. A log of questions and answers was developed along with a format for responses.

The work on the nuggets and the evidence request service has highlighted the considerable gap between published research and the needs of the practice community. Making the evidence nuggets based on systematic reviews relevant to service planning involved a focus on implementation processes, an area of practice where little evidence has been systematically gathered. This has implications for both primary studies and future systematic review methods.

2.4 Promoting the sharing of policy and practice solutions based on the best available evidence

Seminars

On the 5th December 2002 we held a seminar for Children's Fund practitioners and associated professionals on 'Reducing Offending in Children and Young People: *What Works?*' The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Provide an overview of the research evidence on interventions aimed at reducing offending amongst children and young people.
- Discuss and evaluate the research evidence on particular interventions and how effective they appear to be.
- Explore how this evidence can be implemented and used in practice through an action planning session in workshop groups.

Over 40 people attended from a range of organisations including Children's Fund programmes and projects, Youth Offending Teams, Crime Concern, the Probation Service and On Track. Speakers at the event included Deirdre Quill from the regional Children and Young People's Unit (CYPU), Edwina Harrison, manager of Leeds Youth Offending Team (YOT) and Dr Sara Scott, Principal Research Officer at Barnardo's. The City team provided input on the Evidence Nuggets and Mark Anslow, Manager at Calderdale Children's Fund programme, spoke about how they had used one of the nuggets to inform service development in their area. A programme for the day can be found in Appendix 3. Appendix 4 is a copy of the WWfC newsletter reporting on the event.

Feedback on the seminar was very positive. The most useful parts of the day were considered to be opportunities for networking and sharing practice and listening to the research. The least useful part of the day was the action planning session - some found it unhelpful because mixed groups made it difficult for participants to make plans specific to their organisations. The Action Plan and our workshop facilitation are being reviewed to inform future events.

Our next event will be held on November 5th this year and will look at services for disabled children and their families: what works and what's promising? This will be a full day seminar aimed at staff from Children's Fund programmes and projects, and those involved in developing services for disabled children and their families. Speakers include Professor Tricia Sloper from the University of York, Issy Cole-Hamilton from the Children's Play Council and Jan Morrison, Policy Officer for Disability at Barnardo's.

Children's Fund project evaluation workshops

Our Development Officer has co-facilitated four one-day evaluation workshops for Children's Fund projects in conjunction with the Children's Fund local evaluation team (the Policy Research Institute at Leeds Metropolitan University). The workshops focused on issues such as:

- The purpose of evaluation and importance of stakeholders
- Building evaluation into project planning
- What information to collect and how to collect it
- Analysing and making use of evaluative information

Project planning and review tool (Appendix 5)

In conjunction with one of the Children's Fund programmes, we have developed a project planning and review tool (PPRT), designed to help identify key information and actions in planning and developing projects. More specifically the tool assists in identifying:

- The need for the project and how this has been identified.
- What outcomes the project hopes to achieve.
- How outcomes will be achieved and how methods and activities have been chosen.
- How projects will know that outcomes have been achieved.
- How Children's Fund sub-objectives will be met.

When analysing the use of the PPRT we have been particularly interested in how projects have responded to the question 'How do you know the chosen activities / methods will be successful? What information or evidence do you have to support this?' An analysis of a sample of projects using the tool found that most responses cited previous experience and 'good practice'. Some projects referred to research (mostly unspecified) and OFSTED reports. A small number of projects cited What Works for Children's Evidence Nuggets,

which suggests that even if Children's Fund programme workers are aware of research, this information is not necessarily communicated to people at project level. We will seek to undertake more training and support with individual projects around the sources of responses to this question and improve our communication mechanisms.

Two Children's Fund programmes are now using the PPRT in the commissioning and reviewing of their projects and the tool has been adapted for use within the remaining programmes. We have also used it in the evaluation workshops to aid the identification of outcomes, outputs and inputs and the planning of evaluation activities.

A recent Children's Fund review by the regional Children and Young People's Unit (CYPY), which formed part of a quality assurance process, made the following observation:

"I was impressed with the project planning tool which will have a large impact on setting milestones and targets which [name] Children's Fund can monitor against. I am aware that other Children's Funds in the region are equally impressed with this tool and are planning on using it in work with their services."

Regional CYPY Team

The Evidence Guide

A guide to finding, assessing and using research evidence has been produced, which links to the Research Use Self-Assessment Tool and the Project Planning and Review Tool. The guide has been distributed to all Children's Fund programmes and projects and is available on our website. Feedback on the guide has been sought from practitioners and service planners.

2.5 Developing the role of children and young people as active stakeholders in policy and practice developments

Involving children and young people in developing systematic reviews

In collaboration with the Public Health node, What Works for Children wanted to include the views of children and young people in the development of a systematic review on bullying. A pilot group was set up with 15 young people in Leeds, who spoke about the aspects of bullying which they found most important. From planning and running this group it became clear that it might be necessary to work with a smaller number of young people, and over a period of time, to provide a quality introduction into the concept of a systematic review and a basic understanding of research.

It was clear from our pilot group that bullying is an issue that engages children and young people. Involving stakeholders in conveying the messages from a systematic review might have considerable dissemination value. There is

need for further work into how children and young people might gain ownership of research findings and use these to their benefit. This will depend on the local policy context and opportunities for children and young people to contribute to changes in areas that affect their lives. One example of the way in which we are approaching this is described below.

Work with children and parents about traffic calming

Links have been established with a London school experiencing problems with the local roads. Accidents have happened frequently and the children themselves have initiated action to calm the traffic.

WWfC was invited to attend a Parent Teachers Association (PTA) meeting in early September to speak with parents about how research messages on traffic calming might help, and two groups of children will produce posters with messages from research. These posters will be distributed to local councillors and other local bodies, including the Primary Care Trust, for whom the messages will be relevant.

The school has already managed to gain some support in the local authority for calming the traffic, and opportunities will be explored for working with the children in producing an evidence nugget advising other schools on how they might go about achieving changes in their road environment.

2.6 Providing consultancy and training in order to promote approaches which have been developed

Internet Searching Workshop

A one day workshop on finding information to help decision making ('And what evidence do you have to support that view?') was held in Leeds on 11th April 2003. This was attended by a small but enthusiastic group of Children's Fund programme staff. The aim of the workshop was to help practitioners find relevant research information on childcare practice using on-line databases and websites. The workshop sought to provide participants with:

- Basic search techniques needed for using on-line databases.
- Knowledge of the main sources of research information about evidence based childcare practice.

The workshop placed an emphasis on hands-on work, allowing participants to try out searches for themselves. The Evidence Guide was used as a basis for some demonstration searches and all participants were given a copy at the end of the day. Feedback from the event suggested that participants found it a useful and informative day.

Project planning and review tool (PPRT)

Meetings with individual Children's Fund programmes have been held to introduce and explain the purpose of the PPRT.

The PPRT was also presented at a meeting of the Children's Fund monitoring forum, a meeting for all those with responsibility for monitoring and evaluation within 10 Children's Fund programmes in Yorkshire.

2.7 Ensuring that the work of the network is evaluated and sustainable

During spring and summer 2003 a mapping exercise has gathered data from across the six Children's Fund programmes to look at the type of services funded and how the themes of these fit with our work. All the information has been put into an Access database containing information on our activities.

The aim of this exercise is twofold. First, we wanted to get a greater sense of the type of services funded by the six Children's Fund programmes and compare this with the information they had been asking for in our evidence request service and seminars. It is hoped that this will inform knowledge about how our service has ultimately impacted the work of the Children's Fund programmes with which have been working.

Second, the exercise has provided more detail on the funded projects in terms of overall focus, target group and budget. It has been clear from this information that researchers and service planning practitioners differ significantly in focus. The 'what works' agenda is largely concerned with the way that a particular intervention responds to needs and what the outcomes are. The projects' aims and objectives are generally more comprehensive, initiated by identified needs, but with less focus on why the intervention will respond to the needs and what the ultimate outcomes might be.

This work will both contribute to the evaluation of the project, and inform our analysis of obstacles and facilitators to using research in practice. There will be a fuller discussion of sustainability in our final report.

3 Other Research outputs

3.1 Presentations (including poster presentations)

County Durham and Tees Valley Strategic Health Authority Conference, "Getting Evidence into Practice", University of Middlesbrough, Sarah Frost presented paper on WWfC, 19th September 2003.

British Association for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (BASPCAN) Conference, York. Sarah Frost facilitated workshop based on WWfC implementation work, 22nd July 2003.

Social Policy Association Conference, Middlesbrough. Sarah Frost and Kristin Liabo presented papers on WWfC, 15th – 17th July 2003.

Evidence based policies and Indicator Systems Conference. Sarah Frost and Patricia Lucas presented a paper on Mentoring: A suitable case for evidence based treatment, 11th July 2003.

Research for Health in Primary Care: Reality, Impact and Future, International conference at the University of Hertfordshire. Madeleine Stevens and Kristin Liabo presented on the evidence request log, 21st – 23rd May 2003.

Developing systematic reviews across countries, 3rd Annual Campbell Collaboration Colloquium, Stockholm. WWfC presented a poster on the mentoring nugget. The poster was produced in collaboration with a service planner who used the nugget to inform practice, 26th – 28th February 2003.

Reducing social inequalities in health among children and young People, European Conference in Copenhagen. Patricia Lucas and Kristin Liabo presented on WWfC, 9-10th December 2002.

Professional Associations Research Network (PARN) Conference, Queen Mary's University. Joint event with the ESRC EvidenceNetwork. Sarah Frost and Patricia Lucas presented on WWfC and continuing professional development, November 2002.

Research Unit for Research Utilisation (RURU) Seminar in St Andrews. Sarah Frost presented on WWfC, November 2002.

Leeds Education and Research Network (LEARN) Annual Conference, Leeds. Sarah Frost facilitated workshop on WWfC, 8th April 2002.

In addition to these presentations, Helen Roberts spoke about our work in February and March 2003 at the Universities of Ottawa, Alberta, Melbourne, Otago, Auckland and Wellington. She participated in two one day meetings for policy makers in NGOs and government on the What Works agenda in Auckland and Wellington.

3.2 Peer reviewed publications

Petticrew, M. and Roberts, H. (2003) Evidence, hierarchies and typologies: horses for courses, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, Vol. 57, pp 527-529

Liabo, K, Lucas, P and Roberts, H (2003) 'Can traffic calming measures achieve the Children's Fund objective of reducing inequalities in child health', *Archimedes, Archives of Disease in Childhood*, Vol.88, No. 3, pp 235-236

Lucas, P, Liabo, K and Roberts, H (2002) 'Do Behavioural Treatments for Sleep Disorders in Children with Down Syndrome work?', *Archimedes, Archives of Disease in Childhood*, Vol. 87, No. 5, pp 413-414

A series of highlights have been agreed by the National Children's Bureau, based on the Evidence Nuggets. These will be submitted and published over the next five months.

Two book chapters have been commissioned. One on mentoring, as a contribution to a handbook on youth mentoring, edited by David DuBois and Michael Karcher, published by Sage. The second on the What Works for Children project to be in a book edited by the Health Development Agency, to be published by Oxford University Press.

3.3 Policy and practice publications and journalism related to ESRC funding

Interview with Sarah Frost about her development work in Voluntary Action Leeds Newsletter, Issue no 151, March 2003

A poster has been produced based on an overview by Helen Roberts on what works in reducing child health inequalities. This highlights key messages from research and is designed for practice settings. Around 500 copies of the poster has been distributed to all Children's Fund Programmes, Primary Care Trusts in England, Welsh Health Authorities and health organisations in Scotland and Northern Ireland, in addition to dissemination by team members at conferences and meetings.

A further poster on the needs of looked after children will be developed over the next few months to coincide with the re-launch of the Barnardo's 'What Works' series.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Obstacles and enablers to research use: What Works for Children?

<i>Practitioners say...</i>	Obstacles to research use	Possible enablers offered by What Works for Children?
<i>We don't know / can't see how research can help</i>	Lack of awareness of research evidence and its role, potential usefulness and applicability	Awareness raising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations, training and support on the role of research in practice for service planners / practitioners • Research Use: Self-Assessment Tool to identify gaps / barriers in an organisation ability to acquire, assess, adapt and apply evidence in practice • Project Planning Tool to encourage practitioners to identify evidence for their choice of intervention / chosen way of working
<i>We don't know where to find research evidence / never get to hear about research / don't have the time or resources</i>	Difficulties acquiring research / knowing where to look Having skills to search effectively Lack of resources / time	Acquiring research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence Guide - provides guidance for practitioners on locating research findings. • Prioritising practitioner needs, specific queries & CF priorities • Internet databases searching skills training • Signposting of relevant research, websites and databases • Generating and helping practitioners to formulate research questions • Request Log - Logging of practitioners questions on our Evidence Request Database • Providing evidence based answers to practitioner's questions - summaries • Providing training seminars to share research evidence on relevant subjects e.g. reducing offending event, disabled children • Production and dissemination of EvidenceNuggets

<p><i>We don't have the skills to assess whether research evidence is good or not</i></p>	<p>Lack skills in assessing / critically appraising research evidence</p>	<p>Assessing Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence Guide contains a section on appraising evidence • Provide training and support in basic critical appraisal skills • Discussing examples of 'good' v 'weak' evidence • Exercise on, 'which evidence would you use?'
<p><i>Research doesn't seem relevant to us / We don't see how it can help us</i></p>	<p>Adapting research to meet local needs / circumstances</p>	<p>Adapting Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify key recommendations / messages from research • Encourage and support local adaptation of research evidence • Explore local examples to complement research findings
<p><i>Research evidence is presented in a way which makes it difficult to interpret / not seen as practice orientated</i></p>	<p>Evidence presented in a way which is opaque to practitioners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using different methods of presentation – experimenting with Q&A nuggets • Presenting evidence using different formats and methods of presentation • Providing summaries of relevant evidence, as well as information and analysis from other sources, in response to practitioners questions in a user-friendly way • Presenting research results concisely and in accessible language
<p><i>We're not sure how to use research / apply it to our service</i></p>	<p>Knowing what to do with evidence once found, how to apply it in practice</p>	<p>Applying Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify similarities between current practice and research evidence • Focusing on practitioner and local needs around implementation of evidence into practice using the Action Plan - identifying key people and decisions • Acknowledging the limitations of evidence <p>Encourage managers / practitioners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link the research results to key issues facing decision makers and provide recommended actions • Identify the relevant similarities and differences between practice context and the research context (<i>including organisational, political, social, technological, and structural factors, and skills required</i>) • Decide whether the research intervention could still be successfully implemented in our context (<i>What may be different in the implementation or outcomes for us, our partners or stakeholders?</i>)

<p><i>Our organisation / management isn't interested / doesn't support the use of evidence in practice</i></p>	<p>Lack of organisational preparedness to take on evidence informed practice. Resistance to change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and support in the use and role of research for managers / service planners • Research Use: Self-Assessment Tool to identify gaps / barriers in an organisation's ability to acquire, assess, adapt and apply evidence in practice
<p><i>There's pressure on us to direct funding towards particular services / to use other sources of information in planning services (e.g. policy guidance, wants of service users)</i></p>	<p>Pressure on practitioners to direct funding/services towards services with a weak evidence base</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions with agenda setters, policy makers and practitioners about alternative evidence based solutions • Sharing our Evidence Nuggets and details of our work with relevant professionals, organisations and at relevant events and conferences • Article submitted to BMJ on policy pressures to adopt particular interventions



WHAT WORKS
FOR CHILDREN?

Is research working for you? A self-assessment tool

Developed as part of the **What Works for Children?** Project.

Adapted, with permission, from an original 'Self-Assessment Tool'

developed by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, Ontario



Is research working for you? A self-assessment tool

The purpose of this self-assessment tool is to help projects evaluate their capacity to use research evidence in the design and delivery of services.

There are no right or wrong answers in the self-assessment. The tool can help practitioners and service planners identify specific areas of improvement which will enhance a project's overall capacity to use research in the design and delivery of services. Ideally, projects need to be able to:

Acquire research	Can the organisation find the research results it needs?
Assess research	Can the organisation assess if the research is reliable and high-quality, and if it is relevant and applicable?
Adapt its format	Can the organisation present the evidence to appropriate decision-makers in a useful format, which combines recommendations, conclusions and key issues?
Apply it in decisions	Does the organisation have the skills, structures, processes and culture to promote and use research evidence in decision-making?

This tool can be used to evaluate where you feel your organisation is and where it should be. Your ratings should reflect your organisation's views on how far apart these two are.

What do we mean by 'Research Evidence'?

When we refer to 'Research Evidence', this includes evidence from published research articles / papers. Academic research is only one sort of evidence, but has the advantages of greater rigour, relevance and independence. Other sources might include: Practice experience and knowledge of professionals or evidence from experience of and views of users / carers.

Why would we want to use research?

By making research work better for you, your organisation can:

- Enhance **accountability** to stakeholders
- Increase **objectivity** and **fairness** in decision-making
- Increase **confidence** in and **quality of decisions**
- Enhance **outcomes for children and families**

Service planners and providers are trying to make difficult financial, structural, service and resource decisions in a rapidly changing and highly complex environment. They are bombarded with vast quantities of information – frequently contradictory – by a multitude of stakeholders and interest groups. At the same time, demands for ever-higher levels of accountability come from service providers, users, and funders alike.

Research evidence complements – not replaces – the many other forms of data and knowledge which go into making decisions. The growing body of research in areas such as child care and education can help managers and policy makers evaluate the feasibility and potential impact of their options. Good use of the available research can also make it easier to explain where decisions came from, and sometimes help evaluate interest groups' competing arguments. By improving the organisation's abilities to find, create or use research in decision-making, both decision makers and stakeholders can become increasingly confident that they are making the best investments possible to improve the lives of children and young people.

Where does this tool fit in?

Many organisations would like to make better use of research, but aren't sure where to start. Others feel they're doing well, but would also like to know if they are making the best use of their resources, or if there are areas they could improve.

The self-assessment tool provides a menu of the many forms of expertise, structures and practices which make it easier to use research in decision making. Through self-assessment, an organisation can discover its strengths, identify gaps, and make plans for addressing priority areas in the future. We hope the tool will not only help in self-evaluation, but also provide ideas for where and how to enhance research use.

This is not a test! It's a tool to help your organisation identify, **for its own use**, what it's doing well, and where it may want to invest in improvements.

How do you use this self-assessment tool?

We suggest you build a cross-organisational group to undertake the assessment; an ideal group would include representatives from projects, management and the executive/ partnership board. It may be helpful for each person to fill in the assessment on their own, before coming together as a group to discuss the different views and come to consensus on the ratings. A neutral facilitator may also help ensure everybody contributes to the discussion.

1. For each assessment area, evaluate *where you are* and *where you ought to be*; your ratings will reflect your group's judgement on how far apart these two are. If the group believes the organisation is doing as well as it ought to be in that area, rate it 4 out of 4.
2. To agree on a final rating in each assessment area, the group must balance a number of strengths and weaknesses. By tracking the specific issues raised by members, the group will be better able to inform follow-up. For example, if the group believes the organisation needs to improve its capacity to appraise research results, is that because the necessary skills are lacking, or because there is no time to use those skills?
3. As the group identifies strengths, they may wish to discuss whether these are being fully used across the organisation.
4. Once the assessment is complete, the tool can be used as a guide to identify priority gaps and develop plans to address them; reviewing the issues raised during the self-assessment discussion should help inform this planning
5. Revisit the self-assessment as a group, as often as helpful to check progress against the original benchmark.

- Who defines what is "enough" effort or adequate resources? You do
- Skills and resources don't need to be on your staff or in your building, as long as you can get at them when you need them
- Decisions, like organisations, vary in size, complexity, and purpose. Effort should be proportionate to the importance of the decisions and the resources of the organisation
- The discussion of where you are vs. where you ought to be will likely be much more useful than the final score!

The Questions!

Use the following rating system to record your answers to the following questions

1	2	3	4
Don't do	Do poorly	Do quite well	Do very well
<i>Don't do it at all.</i>	<i>Do it - but not very well.</i>	<i>Do it quite well but with room for improvement.</i>	<i>Confident in your ability to do it well.</i>

For each assessment area, evaluate *where you are* and *where you ought to be*; your ratings will reflect your group's judgement on how far apart these two are. If the group believes the organisation is doing as well as it ought to be in that area, rate it 4 out of 4.

1. Can we acquire research evidence?

	Some hints	Rating
1.1 Do we know how to find research?	Our organisation has <u>either</u> enough skilled staff with adequate time, incentives and resources, <u>or</u> arrangements with external experts, who search for, monitor and/ or undertake research relevant to our major management and policy decisions	1 2 3 4
1.2 Are we looking in the right places?	Our organisation is acquiring enough relevant research through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Journals, by subscription, Internet or library access, including major child care / social care services research journals such as British Medical Journal, Archives of Disease in Childhood, Child Health and Development, Children and Society, British Journal of Criminology, British Journal of Social Work. b) Non-journal reports (grey literature), by library or Internet access and direct mailing from research/ disseminating organisations such as the Department of Health, Education and Skills Council, REAL, the National Children's Bureau, Children's Play Council, Barnardos, Home Office Research Development Statistics. c) Databases, by subscription or Internet access, including resources such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, ERIC, the Cochrane Collaboration, the DARE (Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness), CAREDATA, Psychinfo, Pubmed, ChildData. d) Websites, including major evidence-based policy and decision-making sites which collate and/ or evaluate sources of research such as The NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination at the University of York, Research in Practice, Bandolier, The National Electronic Library for Health, the Campbell Collaboration (C2), the Cochrane Collaboration, Clinical Evidence, the Social Care Institute for Excellence (including CAREDATA), the Centre for Evidence Based Social Services at the University of Exeter, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, and the publications section of the Health Development Agency (including Our Healthier Nation Database). e) Working with researchers, by formal and informal networking; plus by providing places where researchers (on staff and/ or external) can discuss their work with our staff and management; plus by getting involved in research as a host, decision-maker partner or sponsor f) Learning from peers, by formal and informal networks, to exchange ideas, experiences and best practices 	1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

2. Can we assess the validity, quality and applicability of research evidence?

	<i>Some hints</i>	Rating
2.1 Can we tell if the research is reliable and high quality?	<p>Our organisation has <u>either</u> enough skilled staff with adequate time, incentives and resources, <u>or</u> arrangements with external experts, who use critical appraisal skills and tools to:</p> <p>a) Evaluate the quality of the methodology used</p> <p>b) Evaluate the reliability of specific research by identifying related evidence and comparing methods and results</p>	<p>1 2 3 4</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
2.2 Can we tell if the research is relevant and applicable?	<p>Our organisation has <u>either</u> enough skilled staff with adequate time, incentives and resources, <u>or</u> arrangements with external experts, who really know our organisation and have the skills to:</p> <p>a) Identify the relevant similarities and differences between our context and the research context (<i>including organisational, political, social, technological, and structural factors, and skills required</i>)</p> <p>b) Evaluate which of these differences are relevant, and whether the research intervention could still be successfully implemented in our context (<i>What may be different in the implementation or outcomes for us, our partners or stakeholders?</i>)</p>	<p>1 2 3 4</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>

3. Can we adapt the format of the research results to provide information useful to our decision-makers?

	<i>Some hints</i>	Rating
3.1 Can we summarise results in a user-friendly way?	<p>Our organisation has <u>either</u> enough skilled staff with adequate time, incentives and resources, <u>or</u> arrangements with external experts, who use research communication skills to:</p> <p>a) Present research results concisely and in accessible language</p> <p>b) Synthesise in one document all relevant research as well as information and analysis from other sources</p> <p>c) Link the research results to key issues facing our decision makers and provide recommended actions</p>	<p>1 2 3 4</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
3.2 Do we provide results to decision-makers?	<p>Summarised and easy-to-use research evidence is routinely brought to the attention of relevant decision makers (<i>such as through regular meetings or reports; or participation by researchers/ analysts in management meetings to present/ discuss evidence</i>)</p>	<p>1 2 3 4</p>

4. Can we apply the evidence in decision making?

	<i>Some hints</i>	<i>Rating</i>			
4.1 Do we lead by example and show we value research use?	a) Using research is a priority: our organisation has committed sufficient people, time, training and budgets to access, appraise, adapt and apply research in making decisions	1	2	3	4
	b) Our organisation's job descriptions and performance incentives include enough focus on activities which encourage using research	1	2	3	4
	c) Both management and front-line staff support and participate in frequent forum where staff and invitees present and discuss research evidence related to the organisation's main goals	1	2	3	4
	d) Management has clearly communicated corporate strategy and priority areas for improvement, so that people creating or monitoring research evidence know what is needed	1	2	3	4
	e) Our organisation has effective communication channels so that priorities, evidence and ideas are exchanged across divisions, as well as between management and front lines	1	2	3	4
	f) Our corporate culture is to value and reward flexibility, change, and continuous quality improvement, and we provide adequate resources at all levels to support change	1	2	3	4
4.2 Do our decision-making processes have a place for research?	a) When we make major decisions, we usually allow enough time to identify researchable questions and create/ obtain, analyse and consider research results and other evidence	1	2	3	4
	b) Our management team has enough expertise to evaluate the feasibility of each option, including potential impact across the organisation as well as on its clients, partners and other stakeholders	1	2	3	4
	c) When staff develop or identify high quality and relevant research, decision makers will usually give formal consideration to any resulting recommendations	1	2	3	4
	d) Staff and appropriate stakeholders know when and how major decisions will be made, how and when they can contribute evidence and how that information will be used	1	2	3	4
	e) The staff who have provided evidence and analysis usually participate in the discussion before a decision is made and, when possible, so do relevant non-staff researchers	1	2	3	4
	f) When a decision is made, feedback to staff and appropriate stakeholders includes a rationale for the decision, and review of how the available evidence influenced the choices made	1	2	3	4

1.1.1 What's next?

WWFC is creating a range of resources to make it easier for managers and policy makers to find and use research. We are developing a series of 'Evidence Nuggets', summaries of research evidence on particular subjects and interventions. We also hold workshops for managers and practitioners to make research more accessible and usable.

Contact: Sarah Frost, Development Officer, What Works For Children
 c/o Leeds Children's Fund, 191-3 Chapeltown Road, Leeds, LS7 3DU
 Tel: 0113 2626362 Fax: 0113 2622602 Email: sarah.frost@barnardos.org.uk



WHAT WORKS FOR
CHILDREN?

'Reducing offending amongst children and young people: What works?'

9.30am – 4.00pm, Thursday 5th December 2002, Dean Clough Galleries, Halifax

9.30 – 10.00	Arrival and Coffee	<i>Speakers</i>
10.00 – 10.10	Welcome and Introductions	<i>Chair: Edwina Harrison, Manager, Leeds Youth Offending Team</i>
10.10– 10.30	Policy Context – CYPU Guidance, IRT, etc.	<i>Deirdre Quill - Regional Manager, CYPU</i>
10.30 – 11.00	Overview - “What Works in Reducing Offending?” The evidence from research.	<i>Dr Sara Scott – Barnardo’s</i>
11.00 – 11.45	Nuggets – CBT, Parent Training, Mentoring Presentation on research findings.	<i>Patricia Lucas & Kristin Liabo – City University</i>
11.45 – 12.00	A Case Study Example - ‘Mentoring - The Calderdale Experience’. Lessons learned.	<i>Mark Anslow, Manager, Calderdale Children’s Fund.</i>
12.00 – 12.15	Questions	
12.15 - 1.15	LUNCH	
1.15 – 2.15	Session 1 : Finding and using research evidence - current practice	
	Aims:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To establish what information /evidence is being used already in the planning and delivery of services aimed at reducing offending ◆ To identify any gaps in knowledge or access to information 	
2.15 – 2.30	COFFEE BREAK	
2.30 – 3.45	Session 2: Implementing Evidence in Practice -specific interventions	
<i>As above.</i>	Aims:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To explore the practical implications for applying research evidence in practice (on one of the interventions discussed earlier) including identification of barriers and incentives. ◆ To develop an Action Plan for the implementation of evidence in practice locally 	
3.45 – 4.00	Questions and closing comments	<i>Edwina Harrison</i>

ESRC What Works for Children?



'Reducing offending amongst children and young people: What works?'

On the 5th December 2002 the What Works for Children? initiative arranged a one-day conference in Halifax for Practitioners. Researchers

from 'What Works for Children?' and Barnardo's gave presentations on research findings on effective and less effective interventions for reducing offending amongst young people. Deirdre Quill, Regional Manager for the CYPUC, provided an overview of new policy directions in the field.

The afternoon workshops provided practitioners with an opportunity to identify their current use of research evidence and to begin to identify those factors needed to successfully implement research evidence into practice within their organisations. The course was well received, with 70% of practitioners who gave feedback saying that they would attend a similar event in the future:



"Thanks for a nice day."

"Thanks Sarah + Patricia for facilitating our action plan! You were marvellous!"

Evidence log

In response to practitioners' requests for evidence to inform their service planning and delivery 'What Works for Children?' provides quick searches and briefings on available evidence alongside our evidence nuggets. The practitioners' requests and researchers' responses are stored in our 'evidence log'.

NEW STAFF ADDITIONS

Madeleine Stevens

joined the research team in September 2002 having previously worked at the Family & Child Psychology Research Centre at City University. Madeleine has particularly worked on the development of the Evidence Guide and the Evidence Log.

Carol Joughin

joined us in October 2002 as a senior research fellow. Carol has extensive experience in the evidence-based research and practice field having managed the FOCUS project at the Royal College of Psychiatrists for a number of years.

At the end of November

Greg Khine and Alison Moore

joined us as Research Support Interns working on a range of the project's initiatives. Greg is currently finishing his Masters course at the LSE and Alison just completed an MA in Social Research.



Research use: Self-Assessment tool

Our direct work with service deliverers has highlighted that many practitioners would like to make better use of research evidence in the design and delivery of projects and services, but some of them may not be sure where to start. In an attempt to address this we have developed a Self-assessment Tool for practitioners.

The tool, adapted from an original pilot version produced by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, aims to help Children's Fund Programmes evaluate their capacity to use research evidence in the design and delivery of services. More specifically, the tool will enable Children's Fund Programmes to assess their ability to: **acquire** research - find and access useful research evidence; **assess** research – establish its quality; **adapt** its format - to meet local needs and requirements; **apply** it in decisions - in service planning and development

It is hoped that the tool will help Children's Fund Programmes identify specific areas of improvement, which will enhance their overall capacity to use research in practice. The tool is currently being piloted with Children's Fund Programmes in Yorkshire.

Coming up...

In 2003 the node will continue to respond to practitioners' requests for research, provide seminars and other resources, closely follow up the use of the audit tool and focus on including children and young people in our work.

Recent publications

Petticrew M. and Roberts H. (in press) Evidence, hierarchies and typologies: Horses for Courses, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*

Lucas, P., Liabo, K. and Roberts, H. (2002) Do Behavioural Treatments for Sleep Disorders in Children with Down Syndrome work?, *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, Vol.87 No 5, 413-4

Liabo K. and Roberts H. (in press) Does traffic calming work? *Archives of Disease in Childhood*

Contact

Kristin Liabo, What Works for Children? Child Health Research and Policy Unit, Institute of Health Sciences, City University, Bartholomew Close, London EC1A 7QN 020 7040 5970
k.liabo@city.ac.uk

Events

Three of our new staff attended a useful one-day course at the British Library provided by Alan Gomersall and colleagues in November. Following on from that, in December, they undertook a comprehensive course at the Institute of Child Health on evidence-based care for children. Topics included critical appraisal of systematic reviews and randomised controlled trials.

Helen Roberts spoke at several events, among these; the Campbell Collaboration Methods Group in Baltimore in September. In November Sarah Frost and Patricia Lucas presented at a Network seminar on continuing professional development. Also in November Sarah spoke about her work both at RRU's seminar in St Andrew's on increasing research impact and at a Research in Practice seminar. Sarah presented to a Leeds Children's Fund workshop in December and attended a SCIE conference on EBP in the same month. Carol Joughin was a rapporteur at the international conference on 'Reducing Social Inequalities in Health Among Children and Young People' in Copenhagen, Denmark, where Patricia Lucas and Kristin Liabo also presented on the work of the Children's node.

PROJECT PLANNING & REVIEW TOOL

Name of project:

Lead partners' contact name:

Lead partners' address:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

Location of project if different from above:

Other partners in the project (contact name and agency):

Once all sections of the assessment tool have been completed, both the project leader and development officer should sign below:

Signed and agreed by:

PROJECT LEADER.....

Print name:..... Date:.....

DEVELOPMENT OFFICER.....

Print name:..... Date:.....

Date for review meeting:.....

PROJECT PLANNING & REVIEW TOOL

This **Project planning and review tool** is designed to help projects and development officers in identifying key information about the development and progress of projects and identify necessary action to ensure the project success.

This **Project planning and review tool** is designed to help with the process of identifying:

- ◆ The *need* for the project and how this has been identified
- ◆ What the project hopes to *achieve*.
- ◆ *How* this will be achieved and how methods and activities have been chosen
- ◆ How projects will *know* it has been achieved
- ◆ How project *objectives* will be met

About the children using this project

1) What are the needs or problems of the children / young people your project works with?

	Needs and / or problems of the children / young people targeted by the project <i>(see Guidance Note 1)</i>	How have these needs or problems been identified? <i>(See Guidance Note 1a)</i>
1		
2		
3		
4		

2) What is the total number of children who will benefit from the project during the life of the project? (see note 2)

1			
2			
3			

Level of intensity Estimate Review Actual

2a) How have these numbers been calculated?

3) What is the age range of target children? (see Note 3)
(please tick all that apply):

5 – 7 years 8 – 10 years 11 – 13 years other. (please state)

4) Are the children targeted by the project from (Please use codes as in Guidance Notes 4a & 4b):

a) A particular place in your area? Please state

which:.....

b) A particular ethnic group(s)? Please state

which:.....

c) A marginalised group? Please state which:.....

Participation of children and young people

5) Please tell us which 'degree of participation' best reflects your work with children and families in both the design and delivery of this project. (see Guidance Note 5 for definitions):

Degree of participation':.....

How have (or will) the children and families targeted by the project been involved in the design of the project?

What information do you have / will you collect to support this? e.g. results of consultation

5a) How have (or will) the children and families targeted by the project been involved in the delivery of the project?

What information do you have / will you collect to support this? e.g. results of consultation

Costs and resources (see Guidance Note 6)

6) Please calculate the unit cost of the project for direct beneficiaries (i.e. cost per child):

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Annual / Total Cost of Project} \rightarrow \boxed{} \\ \text{Divided by} \\ \text{Number of children} = \rightarrow \boxed{} \end{array} = \boxed{} \begin{array}{l} \text{Cost per} \\ \text{child} \end{array}$$

4 TABLE 1: INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR PROJECT

What does your project aim to achieve (what are the <u>specific outcome objectives</u>)? Please use one box per objective. (see <i>Guidance Note 7</i>)	Project objective? See <i>Note 8</i> .	Time scale for achievement of objective ?	What methods / activities will be used to achieve the aims and objectives? (See <i>Guidance Note 9</i>)	How do you know the chosen activities / methods will be successful? What information or evidence do you have to support this? (See <i>Guidance Note 10</i>)	How do you know that the <u>specific aims and objectives of the project</u> have been achieved? (See <i>Guidance Note 11</i>)		
					What information do you need?	Where and how will you get it?	When will it be collected?
1)							
2)							
3)							
4)							

TABLE 2: Project mile stones (see Guidance Note 12)

Please identify the timescales for completion of the key tasks (Project Milestones) required for the development of your project. For each of the objectives identified in table 1, please list the key milestones which need to be reached each quarter in order to progress the project development.

OBJECTIVE?	<i>Quarter</i>	Project mile stones - tasks & responsibilities	<i>Date for review</i>	<i>Date completed</i>
OBJECTIVE 1	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 2	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 3	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 4	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			

OBJECTIVE 5	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			

Table 3: ACTION POINTS

Please identify any action points required for the achievement of the project milestones identified in Table 2.

Please ensure any action points listed are linked to the objectives set out in Table 1 and to the project milestones identified in Table 2.

OBJECTIVE?	<i>Quarter</i>	ACTION POINTS	<i>By whom</i>	<i>Date completed</i>
OBJECTIVE 1	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 2	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 3	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 4	1 st Qtr			

	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			
OBJECTIVE 5	1 st Qtr			
	2 nd Qtr			
	3 rd Qtr			
	4 th Qtr			

Financial payment schedule

See Guidance note 14.

	Staffing	Running costs	Project costs	Total	Leverage
<i>2001/02</i>					
Fourth Quarter					
<i>Total 2001/02</i>					
<i>2002/03</i>					
First Quarter					
Second Quarter					
Third Quarter					
Fourth Quarter					
<i>Total 2002/03</i>					
<i>2003/04</i>					
First Quarter					
Second Quarter					

Third Quarter					
Fourth Quarter					
<i>Total 2003/04</i>					
Total Grant					

Once this form is completed, the project leader and development officer should sign and date the front sheet and agree a date for review.