

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Theme: An Ageing Society

Programme: Risk, trust and relationships

Title: Risk, trust and relationships in an ageing society: a review of the evidence

REF: RTR001

This call is for proposals for a review of the evidence on the risk, trust and confidence aspects of decision making in informal and semi-formal supportive relationships.

General guidelines

Project Timescale	4 months, starting February 2012 (as negotiated)
Project Budget	Up to £28K (including VAT and expenses) one project only
Contact for administrative and budget queries	Phillipa Fairburn, Research Administrator phillipa.fairburn@jrf.org.uk 01904 615967 Please note that, in the interests of fairness, we are not able to give feedback on draft proposals. However, we are willing to discuss JRF thinking on the programme and the evidence we are interested in learning about. Please contact Phillipa Fairburn in the first instance.
Deadline for submission	Wednesday 1 February 2012 – 23.59 pm
Notification of decision	Tuesday 7 February 2012 (or as soon as possible thereafter)
Start of project (or as negotiated)	February 2012 (as negotiated)
Project completion date	15 June 2012
Please submit applications via our website	http://www.jrf.org.uk/funding/calls-for-proposal/risk-trust-and-relationships It would be helpful if you could let phillipa.fairburn@jrf.org.uk know by Monday 23 January 2012 whether you are planning to submit a proposal.

Required documents

The submission must contain two attachments; templates are available via the links below:

1 The Proposal Registration and Budget Form (.xls) -

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/ProposalRegistrationAndBudgetForm.xls>

2 The Proposal, including appendices of summary CVs (. doc)-

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF-application-for-funding.doc>

Please note

All text should be Arial – size 14

The maximum length of the proposal is 3,000 words, excluding CVs and references.

CVs should be a maximum of two sides A4 per person and should include relevant publications and project work.

No appendices, bar the CVs and references are permitted.

In line with our procurement policy, we may ask for further information at a later date e.g. accounts from your organisation. We may also request that you provide names and contact details of referees (e.g. past funders or sponsors) or further CV information.

Background

The JRF's 'Risk, trust and relationships in an ageing society' programme

In January 2012 the Joseph Rowntree Foundation begins a new programme spanning over 3.5 years. The programme aims to:

- build understanding of the little explored territory of risk, trust and relationships in our ageing society
- find ways to help people become more *confident* in making decisions that contribute to achieving a good life for all, and kinder communities.

The programme focuses on *informal* relationships, for example those existing between family members, friends or neighbours, and *semi-formal* ones governed by outside rules to a greater degree, for example between a volunteer and a person he/she supports.

The programme wishes to take a wider view and explore decisions involving weighing up risks and gains in a *web of relationships*, including multiple perspectives. As the context of the programme is our ageing society, it is anticipated that the 'web' will involve an *older person* who does, or over time will, require some degree of *support and (potentially) care*.

Our initial 'working theory' is that people are better able to weigh up and deal with issues that they perceive as containing an element of risk if they are less fearful (for example of the unknown) and less anxious, therefore more confident. Greater confidence increases willingness to be supportive and kind. Greater kindness, in turn, results in stronger, better relationships and a better life for all involved in them, and helps foster mutually supportive communities.

The programme therefore intends to seek answers to key questions such as:

- what would help make people more confident to make better decisions about caring for and supporting each other?
- what helps or sustains people in local communities who 'dare to be kind'?
- how can society's capacity to support an ageing society, and deal with related risks, be strengthened – including why things go wrong and what helps make them go right?
- how do formal social care structures interact with informal and semi-formal spheres? What works and what needs to be changed?

- what can *formal* social care practice and regulation learn from how risk and trust operate in *informal* and *semi-formal* spheres?

In the course of developing the new programme, we commissioned a collection of five papers in 2010-11, available on the JRF website

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/work/workarea/rights-responsibilities-risk-regulation>, with two more papers near completion.

Please note: this call is for proposals to review the existing evidence across a range of disciplines and not for projects to undertake new research on the subject. The review plays a key role in the first stage of the programme and will feed into decisions about commissioning a small number of research projects. For this reason the 15 June 2012 completion date is not negotiable.

Aims of the project

The aim of this project is to conduct a review of the existing evidence on the risk, trust and confidence aspects of decision making in informal and semi-formal supportive relationships in an ageing society.

In fulfilling this aim, the review should:

- Identify the breadth of research topics relevant to the broad subject area and review the available evidence.

Based on our current thinking, *examples* of topics are included below, but these should not limit the work of the research team:

- The dynamics of decision making (key issues e.g. power and the decision making process as roles in relationships and/or support and care needs change); the main factors influencing this (for example, when do issues become a matter of risk and why?); what helps making decisions that increase the quality of life of those affected? How does thinking about risk affect trust?
- How do questions of risk, trust and confidence play out in semi-formal relationships, for example in those between volunteers and people they support? What role do organisations involved in the relationship (e.g. the organisations that fund and organise the volunteering activity) play in mediating these?
- How does the entry of the 'formal sphere' into people's lives affect the framing of risk and trust? For example, do professionals tend to

re-evaluate matters of what is risky, who is to be trusted, how decisions should be made - and what is the impact of this on people involved in the existing 'web' of relationships?

- How far and in what ways has regulation penetrated the informal and semi-formal spheres? What is the (real or perceived) impact of regulatory frameworks on people's willingness to be kind and supportive?
- How are decisions made when people do not have 'webs' of informal relationships?
- Consider relevant evidence on the identified topics from a range of *disciplines* (for example social care, psychology, sociology, social anthropology, but potentially also disciplines further afield such as educational studies, criminology and others), *cross-disciplinary collaborations* and distinct *bodies of research* (e.g. on volunteering or on how communities 'work'). The review should provide an overview of the contribution of evidence from various disciplines to the identified topics, and wherever possible, an indication of where the main gaps are.
- We are interested in
 - evidence resulting from diverse methodologies, approaches, perspectives
 - evidence from the UK (including the devolved administrations), as well as key pieces of relevant research from other countries
 - the equality and diversity aspects of the identified topics
 - existing (practical) examples that we can learn from
 - research led by or involving people with direct experience

Proposers should set out the time period that they believe the review should cover and give their reasons for this.

Design, methods and analysis

Proposers should clearly set out the design, methods and the analysis they intend to use to accomplish the review, and demonstrate how these will enable the project to meet its aims.

The proposal should be explicit about the way in which the team intends to identify, access and assess evidence for the review. This should include a concise discussion of the disciplines and inter-disciplinary approaches the research team

intends to investigate (although this may evolve during the course of the work) and the way evidence from various methodologies will be assessed. It should be clearly spelt out how the *quality* of the reviewed research will be assessed and how this will affect the ways in which the evidence from these is used. In addition to fully published research, it will be important for the review to consider other sources of evidence too, for example grey literature or primarily non-text-based evidence.

We encourage proposers to be bold and explorative in their approach and look at a range of disciplines, approaches and sources. Research teams may also wish to consult experts in fields they are less familiar with, but from which they anticipate potentially relevant contribution. If you plan to do this, please include the required resources in your proposed budget.

Outputs

A short (approx 15,000 words) accessible report and a summary are normally the minimum outputs required. We may publish these via the JRF website.

Ethical issues

We expect all projects that we fund to adhere to the SRA ethical guidelines. If your proposal raises particular ethical issues you *must* indicate what these are and what your strategy for addressing them is. If your proposal requires consideration by an ethics committee please specify this in the proposal. For some proposals with particular ethical issues, funding may be conditional on ethics committee approval.

If you do not foresee any specific research ethics issues you must also state this in your proposal, together with a brief indication of why you think this is the case.

Staffing

Give brief information about the role of each staff member on this project, their particular area of expertise (where relevant), the work they will undertake and how much time they will devote to the project. Where a proposal is submitted by partnerships it must be clear what the contribution of each partner will be and how their costs are being met. Proposals involving organisations from different sectors should demonstrate a respectful and capacity building approach, which clearly values the expertise and contributions of all partners.

Please clearly describe the management arrangements of the project. This is particularly important for projects which include relatively junior members of staff or where work is being carried out by staff from more than one organisation.

You should also briefly indicate how proposed members of staff would fit in the proposed work with their already existing commitments.

Please note: this information is required as part of the proposal and is not a section for CVs – summary CVs are required as separate documents (2 sides A4 maximum per person, including any relevant publications).

Advisory arrangements

A collaborative approach to working with JRF is essential. It is expected that there will be regular one-to-one discussions, either face-to-face or over the telephone, with the Programme Manager regarding project progress and milestones. Your proposal should reflect these requirements.

We will discuss advisory arrangements with the successful team.

Assessing risks

We ask proposers to be open and robust about the key risks associated with their project, and the steps they propose to mitigate these.

Timetable

You must provide a schedule clearly setting out the proposed work: what activities will be carried out, when they will occur, how long they will take and how they relate to other activities. It is common for draft reports to undergo a number of iterations and this should be accounted for within the proposed timetable.

Please timetable the *draft report* for mid-May 2012. Please also remember that the completion date of 15 June 2012 is non-negotiable.

It is anticipated that one member of the research team will be required to attend a programme advisory group to present emerging findings in May. In addition, team participation may be requested at a programme workshop in March/April. Please allow for these two days in your timetable and budget.

We *may* interview shortlisted research teams on **6 February 2012** (likely venue: JRF's York office). Please indicate your availability on this day. However, if you cannot be available, this will not exclude consideration of your proposal. Please

also indicate the contact details of the person available on 3 February to arrange interview details with.

Budget

The budget available for this research is up to £28,000. The budget submitted must include all research and other costs including VAT if applicable.

Funding criteria

The key criteria against which proposals will be judged will be:

- Demonstration of a robust, good quality design appropriate to the project's aims and the credibility of proposed strategies for identifying, accessing, assessing and reporting on relevant research
- Understanding of the role of risk, trust and confidence in decision making in supportive relationships
- Understanding of the potential contribution of different disciplines and methodologies to the subject and flexibility to make full use of the insights from these in developing findings
- A bold, explorative approach to the subject
- Understanding of the policy, practice and research context associated with the ageing society in the UK
- Knowledge of the relevant sources of evidence
- Knowledge of, and access to, relevant networks and contacts to enable the work to be comprehensive, up-to-date and well-grounded
- Capacity to deliver a high quality output
- The proposed team's experience and credentials in relation to the area of work
- Adequate identification of the key risks and ways to mitigate these
- Value for money.