**Table 1: Summary of high scoring case studies in ‘Social Work and Social Policy’, REF2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concern | Case study 1 (University College London: Improving police practice) | Case study 2 (University College London: situational crime prevention) | Case study 3 (LSE: Reading the riots) | Case study 4 (LSE: Better measures of fuel poverty) | Case Study 5 (LSE: Child protection – improving practice) | Case Study 6 (LSE: better mental health) | Case Study 7 (LSE: Re-igniting R&D for antibiotics) | Case Study 8 (LSE: Financing long-term care) |
| Is the case study based on a single study, a collection of work by one individual or a collection of work by a group? | Collection of research projects undertaken by a research group | Collection of research projects undertaken by a research group | Collection of research by single academic | Collection of studies by a pair of academics (lead academic and Research Fellow) | Collection of research by a single academic | Collection of studies by a group of researchers | Collection of studies by senior academic and team | Collection of studies by a research group |
| Are any of the research outputs primarily syntheses? If so, is credit being claimed for original research featuring in the synthesis or the synthesis itself? | Yes, one is (credit appears to be claimed for synthesis) | No | No | Yes (credit appears to be claimed for synthesis) | No | No | No | Yes (within modelling - credit appears to be claimed for synthesis) |
| What kind of impact is described? | Changes to local policy and practice in UK and abroad leading to reductions in crime | Changes to local policy and practice and to national and local policy thinking | Extensive media coverage, cited in national policy debates and recommendations for changes to practice | Changes to the measurement of fuel policy by national UK government | National policy changes (with related changes in local practices) in responses to government-requested review in UK, led by this academic. NGO use in advocacy for policy change in Australia. | Use by high profile NGOs in campaigning work, citations in national policy documents and speeches with implications for public service provision | Citation in international and national policy debates and by private sector actors, and justification for provision of new R&D funding | Citation in UK national and EU policy documents and claims that models provided partial basis for at least one policy change |
| Does the use/application described appear commensurate with the findings/conclusions of the original research? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) |
| Is there any discussions of the ethical dimensions of the impact in the case study? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Where does the research feature on the ‘impact ladder’ (figure 1)? | Middle | Middle-low | Middle-high | Low | Middle-low | Middle-Low | Low | Low |
| When was the relevant research conducted / published? | 2007-2011 | 2009-2012 | 2004-2011 | 2002-2012 | 1999-2010 | 1995-2013 | 1994-2013 | 2001-2013 |
| What is the profile of the academics involved? | Largely senior, academics, mixed genders | Largely senior, academics, mixed genders | Senior, male | Senior, male lead with junior, male RF | Senior, female | Senior, male lead with more junior team of mixed genders | Senior, male lead with more junior, female team | Mixed seniority, mixed gender |
| Does the research cited appear to have been critical of, or in line with, the policies it contributed to/ attempted to contribute to? | Calling for a shift in focus/approach | Calling for a shift in focus/approach | Critical | Calling for a shift in measurement | In line with national policies but critical of local policies & practices | In line with national policies | In line with national policies | In line with national policies |
| Was the target audience the public, community group, NGO, practice or policy? | Policy & practice | Policy & practice | Policy & the public | Policy | Policy & practice | Policy & practice | International and national policy and private sector practices | National policy |
| REF2014 institutional ranking for UoA 22 (Social Work and Social Policy) by output | 11/62 | 11/62 | 2/62 | 2/62 | 2/62 | 2/62 | 2/62 | 2/62 |

**Table 1 continued: Summary of high scoring case studies in ‘Social Work and Social Policy’, REF2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concern | Case study 9 (University of Oxford: reducing child anti-social behaviour) | Case study 10 (University of Oxford: EBP for AIDS-affected children) | Case study 11 (University of Oxford: Regulating labour immigration) | Case study 12 (University of Oxford: Targeting resources in UK & South Africa) | Case Study 13 (University of York: Child support research) | Case Study 14 (University of York: Individual budgets evaluation) | Case Study 15 (University of York: Research on child well-being) | Case Study  16 (University of York: Single working age benefit) |
| Is the case study based on a single study, a collection of work by one individual or a collection of work by a group? | Collection of research by senior academic and team | Two studies by lead, senior academic and team | Two studies undertaken by a pair of senior academics and an external collaborator | Programme of research by senior academic and team | Collection of studies by a research group | Single study by one senior academic and team | Collection of research by senior academic and team | Collection of research by senior academic and team/collaborators |
| Are any of the research outputs primarily syntheses? If so, is credit being claimed for original research featuring in the synthesis or the synthesis itself? | Yes, one is (credit appears to be claimed for synthesis) | No | No | No | No | No | Yes, one is (credit appears to be claimed for synthesis) | No |
| What kind of impact is described? | Citation in a wide range of national policy documents in UK and elsewhere and claims of use from key policy actors | Citation in a range of national (South African) and international policy documents, linked to specific recommendations, and use by NGOs in advocacy and training | Citation by leader of opposition in UK, use by US think tank, discussion in policy debates in Netherlands, US & UK and UN, media coverage, claimed use in proposed legislation in US (which had not yet passed at time of writing) | Directly informed approaches to targeting deprivation in UK and South Africa | Direct use in national level policy changes in UK | Commissioned evaluation of trial of new policy approach in UK, used to refine the approach. Also influenced policies in other countries. | Drawing policy attention to an issue and contributing to policy debates about, and responses to, that issue in UK and internationally (through EU and NGOs) | Citation in public consultation and other policy documents, references in Parliamentary debates, and use by Parliamentary Select Committees (informing overall approach and coining new terminology). |
| Does the use/application described appear commensurate with the findings/conclusions of the original research? | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | N/A (not yet applied) | Yes | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) |
| Is there any discussions of the ethical dimensions of the impact in the case study? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Where does the research feature on the ‘impact ladder’ (figure 1)? | Low | Middle | Middle | Middle | Middle | Low | Middle-high | Middle-high |
| When was the relevant research conducted / published? | 2006-2013 | 2009-2013 | 2008-2013 | 2008-2013 | 1999-2011 (though highlight research and policy engagement from 1994+) | 2008-2011 | 2003-2011 (though highlight work from 1993+) | 2005-2010 |
| What is the profile of the academics involved? | Senior, female lead and team of mixed gender, mixed seniority | Senior, female lead and team of mixed gender, mixed seniority | Senior, female academic and mid-career male academic, working with external senior, male colleague | Senior, male academic and mixed gender, mixed seniority team | Senior, male academic and female team of mixed seniority | Senior female academic and team of mixed, genders, ethnicities and seniority | Senior, male academic and team of mixed, genders, ethnicities and seniority | Senior, male academic and earlier career, female academic |
| Does the research cited appear to have been critical of, or in line with, the policies it contributed to/ attempted to contribute to? | In line | N/A (identified new areas of concern) | N/A (identified tension between different perspectives) | In line | Critical | In line | Critical | Critical |
| Was the target audience the public, community group, NGO, practice or policy? | National policy | Policy & practice | Policy | Policy | Policy | Policy | Policy | Policy |
| REF2014 institutional ranking for UoA 22 (Social Work and Social Policy) by output | 1/62 | 1/62 | 1/62 | 1/62 | 7/62 | 7/62 | 7/62 | 7/62 |

**Table 2: Summary of low scoring case studies in ‘Social Work and Social Policy’, REF2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concern | Case study 1 (Angela Ruskin University: supporting recovery from mental ill health) | Case Case study 2 (Angela Ruskin University: involving self-help & citizen research groups) | Case study 3 (Liverpool Hope University: quality assurance & regulation in higher education) | Case study 4  (Liverpool Hope University: Radical social work practice) | Case study 5  (University of Bolton: Drink driving) | Case Study 6 (University of Bolton: Centre for Worktown studies) | Case Study 7  (University of Chester: Relational & reflective supervision and practice) | Case Study 8  (University of Sunderland: Domestic violence and abuse in same sex relationships) | Case Study 9  (University of Sunderland: multiple forms of social exclusion) |
| Is the case study based on a single study, a collection of work by one individual or a collection of work by a group? | Collection of research by a senior academic and team | A group of researchers involved in two studies | Programme of work by a single academic | Programme of work by a single academic | Collection of work by a single academic | Programme of research by a research group | Single study by a single academic | Two, linked studies by two academics | Four projects by a small group of researchers |
| Are any of the research outputs primarily syntheses? If so, is credit being claimed for original research featuring in the synthesis or the synthesis itself? | No | Yes (though not systematic) – credit appears to be being claimed for synthesis | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| What kind of impact is described? | Citation in national policy documents and debates, media coverage and some examples of changes in local practices | Influenced national guidelines for practitioners, provided training for front-line staff and third sector organisations, contributed to changes in local planning and practice. | Media coverage and involvement in House of Commons Inquiry | Work disseminated to and commented on by practitioners, service users and trade union figures in UK and elsewhere and contributed to development of a network.   |  | | --- | |  | | Work disseminated to practitioners, local policymakers and campaigners | Public engagement activities | Dissemination to practitioners | Citation in national policy documents and use by campaigning / NGO groups and local policymakers and practitioners. Raising public awareness by media coverage and theatre. | Media coverage, contribution to local and national policy debates (including via policy citations), informed an EU survey, changes to practices of some local third sector organisations. |
| Does the use/application described appear commensurate with the findings/conclusions of the original research? | Yes (though only aspects have been applied) | Yes | No clear evidence of research use | No clear evidence of research use | No clear evidence of research use | No clear evidence of research use | No clear evidence of research use | Yes | Yes (though impact, in terms of changes made, seems limited to date) |
| Is there any discussions of the ethical dimensions of the impact in the case study? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Where does the research feature on the ‘impact ladder’ (figure 1)? | Low | Low | Middle | High | High | Unclear (not policy focused) | Middle-low | Middle | Middle-high |
| When was the relevant research conducted / published? | 2006-2012 | 2006-2012 | 2004-2013 | 2002-2011 | 2009-2012 | 1995-2013 | 2011-2013 | 2006-2011 | 2009-2013 |
| What is the profile of the academics involved? | Female, mixed in terms of seniority but lead academic was senior | Female, mixed in terms of seniority | Senior, male | Senior, male | Senior, male | All male, mixed in terms of seniority | Senior, female | Senior, female | Mixed seniority and gender |
| Does the research cited appear to have been critical of, or in line with, the policies it contributed to/ attempted to contribute to? | In line with government policies (some of the research was commissioned) | N/A (focus was on changing approach to engagement, rather than changing policy) | Critical | Critical | Critical | N/A (no obvious policy focus) | Unclear | Critical (identifies gaps in current policy provision) | Policy focus is limited but identifies gaps and concerns with current approaches |
| Was the target audience the public, community group, NGO, practice or policy? | National policy and local practice/service | National policy guidelines, local policy and practice | National policy | Practice | Local policy, practitioner and campaign audiences | Public | Policy & practice | All | All |
| REF2014 institutional ranking for UoA 22 (Social Work and Social Policy) by output | 59/62 | 59/62 | 30/62 | 30/62 | 62/62 | 62/62 | 61/62 | 54/62 | 54/62 |