



**TECHNIUM**  
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

[www.techniumscience.com](http://www.techniumscience.com)



**Vol. 76/2025**  
**A New Decade for Social Changes**

**PLUS**  
**COMMUNICATION P**



**International**  
Communication & PR

## Quality in Social Work Services: Global Standards, Key Indicators, and Policy Implications

**Hafize Nurgul Durmus Senyapar**

Department of Social Work, Faculty of Health Science, Gazi University

[nurguld@gazi.edu.tr](mailto:nurguld@gazi.edu.tr)

**Abstract.** Importance and Aims: Quality assurance in social work has become an increasingly critical concern for both scholars and practitioners, as services face growing demands for accountability, effectiveness, and equity. Despite the proliferation of quality frameworks worldwide, there is no universally accepted system for measuring quality in social work, creating inconsistencies in evaluation and practice. This study aims to conceptualize social work quality more comprehensively and to examine how international frameworks, accreditation standards, and methodological tools can be synthesized into a structured model for assessing and improving service excellence. Methods: The study employs a literature-based, exploratory qualitative design, drawing on academic sources, institutional guidelines, and international standards from organizations such as the IFSW, CSWE, EQUASS, and WHO. The analysis covers literature from 2000 to 2025, using thematic synthesis to identify recurring dimensions, indicators, and best practices. Inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed, English-language studies addressing social work quality frameworks, accreditation, or performance evaluation. Key Findings: The findings confirm that effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism remain the core dimensions of quality in social work. However, the study highlights persistent challenges, including the absence of universally agreed benchmarks and the tension between global standards and local adaptation. While international models such as ISO, EQUASS, COA/NASW, and WHO guidelines provide valuable baselines, they often require contextual flexibility to reflect diverse cultural, socio-economic, and institutional settings. Proposed methodologies—including client satisfaction surveys, case resolution rates, Social Return on Investment (SROI), and AI-driven assessment tools—offer valuable insights but must be integrated in hybrid ways to capture both measurable outputs and nuanced client experiences. Practical Implications: This study demonstrates that quality measurement in social work is not only a technical process but also a critical mechanism for advancing social justice, ethical integrity, and inclusive development. The proposed framework supports policymakers in designing evidence-based quality assurance systems, assists practitioners in embedding continuous improvement strategies, and guides organizations in aligning with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 10, 16, and 17. By emphasizing hybrid methodologies and interdisciplinary collaboration, the study underscores that advancing quality in social work requires moving beyond compliance toward a dynamic process of service excellence, equity, and accountability across diverse contexts.

**Keywords.** Quality in Social Work, Accreditation Standards in Social Work, International Social Work Standards, Professionalism in Social Work Practice, Social Services Evaluation Methods

## 1. Introduction

Quality in social work represents a multidimensional and evolving construct that encompasses effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism in the provision of services to individuals, families, and communities. It is not only a technical measure but also a normative and ethical pursuit that reflects how well services align with social justice, cultural competence, and the rights of vulnerable populations. Assessing quality in social work requires consideration of both measurable outputs—such as case resolution rates, service accessibility, and compliance with professional standards—and less tangible but equally critical dimensions, including empowerment, trust, and long-term well-being [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. High-quality practice is therefore characterized by client-centered approaches, interdisciplinary collaboration, reflective supervision, and continuous professional development that keeps practitioners attuned to new policies, technologies, and evidence-based practices.

### 1.1 Background

Globally, various institutions have developed quality assurance and accreditation frameworks that attempt to define, standardize, and promote service excellence in social work. Models such as ISO 9001 for quality management, EQUASS in Europe, CSWE accreditation standards in the United States, and WHO guidelines for integrated health and social care have provided structured approaches for ensuring accountability and consistency in service delivery [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11]. These frameworks emphasize the integration of quantitative measures, such as client satisfaction surveys and efficiency benchmarks, with qualitative approaches, including participatory evaluations and narrative assessments [12], [13]. Technological innovations—such as AI-driven dashboards, predictive analytics, and digital feedback mechanisms—have expanded the tools available for monitoring and improving service quality in real-time [14]. However, because social work operates in diverse institutional settings, from healthcare and education to correctional facilities and community organizations, quality measurement frameworks must remain adaptable to cultural, structural, and contextual differences [15].

### 1.2 Problem statement and literature gap

Despite decades of research and institutional effort, there remains no universally accepted measurement system for quality in social work. This lack of standardization results in fragmented approaches, inconsistencies across organizations, and challenges in benchmarking performance internationally. On one hand, standardized frameworks risk overlooking the subjective and relational dimensions of practice, such as empowerment and trust-building. On the other hand, individualized assessments often limit comparability and accountability [16], [17]. This gap in the literature reveals a pressing need for frameworks that are both rigorous and flexible, capable of balancing objective service metrics with the complexity of human and social dynamics. Without such a framework, organizations struggle to demonstrate impact, policymakers face difficulties in aligning services with broader welfare goals, and clients risk experiencing inequitable and fragmented care.

### 1.3 Scope of the study

This study examines the conceptualization and measurement of quality in social work through a global lens. It reviews international quality assurance frameworks, accreditation standards, and evaluation methodologies as applied in diverse service contexts, including healthcare, child welfare, criminal justice, education, and community development. By incorporating regional perspectives from developed welfare systems, emerging economies, and culturally specific approaches such as Indigenous social work practices, the study aims to

provide a comparative and holistic understanding of how quality is defined and operationalized across different institutional and cultural environments. The scope deliberately spans both macro-level policy frameworks and micro-level service delivery processes, recognizing that meaningful quality assurance must bridge structural, organizational, and interpersonal dimensions of practice.

#### *1.4 Purpose and significance of the study*

The primary purpose of this study is to propose a structured framework for defining, measuring, and enhancing quality in social work services. Its significance is twofold. First, it contributes to academic discourse by clarifying conceptual dimensions of quality, synthesizing global frameworks, and identifying key gaps in existing measurement approaches. Second, it offers practical guidance for policymakers and practitioners. For policymakers, the framework highlights evidence-based strategies for strengthening accountability, improving funding allocation, and aligning services with SDGs. For practitioners, it provides adaptable tools and benchmarks that support continuous quality improvement, ensuring interventions remain both effective and responsive to the evolving needs of diverse populations. The study thus positions quality not as a static measure but as a dynamic process of service excellence that integrates ethical standards, stakeholder perspectives, and data-driven insights.

#### *1.5. Research questions*

To address these challenges and opportunities, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How is quality conceptualized in social work services, and what are its key dimensions?
2. What international frameworks and accreditation standards exist for quality measurement in social work?
3. What key indicators and methodologies can be used to assess and improve service quality in social work organizations?

#### *1.6. Research outcomes and practical implications*

The expected outcomes of this research include the development of a comprehensive framework that integrates international best practices with locally adaptable indicators. The framework is designed to be inclusive of diverse stakeholder perspectives, striking a balance between standardized accountability and cultural and contextual sensitivity. In practical terms, this study aims to strengthen service delivery in social work institutions, provide policymakers with an evidence-informed basis for regulatory frameworks, and equip practitioners with robust tools for evaluation and improvement. The broader implications extend to enhancing public trust in social services, advancing equity in access and outcomes, and supporting the global pursuit of sustainable, client-centered welfare systems.

## **2. Methodology**

This study employs a literature-based exploratory qualitative design, focusing on how quality is conceptualized and measured in social work services. The design is grounded in qualitative synthesis, enabling an in-depth examination of both theoretical perspectives and empirical findings while identifying recurring themes, gaps, and best practices in quality assurance [18]. This approach is particularly suited for fields such as social work, where definitions of quality are multidimensional and context-dependent, requiring interpretive rather than purely statistical analysis.

Data sources for this research are diverse and include peer-reviewed academic literature on quality assurance, performance evaluation, and accreditation in social work. In addition,

internationally recognized standards and guidelines from professional institutions, such as the International Federation of Social Workers [19], the Council on Social Work Education [6], and the European Quality in Social Services [7], provide benchmarks for evaluating global practices. Case studies and applied frameworks documented in health, education, and community-based social work contexts are also considered, offering practical insights into how different systems operationalize quality in diverse settings.

The time frame of the literature reviewed spans roughly from 2000 to 2025, reflecting developments over the past two and a half decades when international quality assurance and accreditation standards in social services have become increasingly formalized. This temporal scope allows the study to capture both early conceptual debates and more recent advancements, including the integration of digital tools and interdisciplinary frameworks in quality measurement.

Sources were included if they were peer-reviewed, published in English, and explicitly addressed quality frameworks, accreditation systems, or performance evaluation models in social work and related service fields. Excluded materials included opinion pieces without empirical or conceptual grounding, non-English sources, and grey literature lacking methodological rigor.

The analysis employs thematic synthesis to identify patterns across the literature. Following Braun and Clarke's [20] framework, the process involved coding and clustering themes related to dimensions of quality (effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, professionalism), key indicators used in evaluation, and practical strategies for implementation. This method allowed for a structured synthesis of knowledge, highlighting both convergences and divergences in how quality is defined and measured. By integrating evidence from multiple data sources and institutional guidelines, the study develops a comprehensive framework for assessing and improving the quality of social work services.

### **3. Findings**

#### *3.1 Conceptualizing quality in social work*

Ensuring service excellence in social work requires a multidimensional approach that balances effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism. These five dimensions are central indicators of quality, guiding organizations in delivering impactful, client-centered, and ethically grounded services. Examining each dimension enables the development of a structured framework for assessing and enhancing the quality of social work interventions across diverse contexts.

Effectiveness in social work is primarily measured by the extent to which interventions achieve their intended outcomes and improve client well-being. Effective services address social, psychological, and economic challenges, leading to positive transformations at the individual, family, and community levels [21]. This dimension emphasizes evidence-based practice, where research findings and best practices guide interventions to maximize impact. Effectiveness is evaluated through standardized tools, including outcome measurement frameworks, client satisfaction surveys, and longitudinal assessments of well-being [22]. However, effectiveness is complex to capture due to the long-term and multidimensional nature of client progress, requiring a hybrid of quantitative and qualitative methods [23].

Efficiency in social work refers to the optimal use of resources, ensuring cost-effective service delivery without compromising quality. Efficient practice requires balancing limited budgets with the need to provide timely, comprehensive, and sustainable interventions [24]. Indicators include staff productivity, service accessibility, coordination between agencies, and

effective allocation of resources [25], [26], [27]. Challenges arise from funding shortages, workforce limitations, and the complexity of social issues. Innovative models such as integrated services, cross-sector collaborations, and digital case management systems are increasingly applied to improve efficiency while maintaining high standards.

Equity is a foundational principle of social work, ensuring that services are accessible, fair, and responsive to marginalized and vulnerable populations [28]. Unlike equality, which treats everyone the same, equity recognizes that different individuals and groups require different levels of support. Addressing systemic barriers—such as socioeconomic disparities, cultural differences, and geographic constraints—is crucial [29]. Indicators of equity include utilization rates across demographic groups, culturally competent practices, and institutional policies that promote inclusion and anti-discrimination. Advocacy for structural reforms and targeted interventions is integral to equity-focused practice, enabling the delivery of tailored services that promote fair and just outcomes [30].

Responsiveness in social work refers to the adaptability of services to clients' changing needs and contexts. It is characterized by flexible, timely, and personalized interventions, as well as client participation in decision-making [31]. Responsiveness entails not only meeting immediate needs but also adjusting services during crises such as pandemics, economic disruptions, or demographic transitions. Mechanisms such as client feedback, trauma-informed practice, and strengths-based models enhance responsiveness [32], [33]. A culture of continuous improvement, supported by research and client input, ensures that interventions remain dynamic and aligned with emerging social realities [34].

Professionalism encompasses adherence to ethical standards, commitment to lifelong learning, and the competence of practitioners in managing complex social issues. Ethical principles outlined by organizations such as the IFSW [19] set the foundation for dignity, respect, and justice in practice [35]. Professional development through training, supervision, and mentorship sustains competence [36]. Accountability mechanisms—such as licensing, peer reviews, and ethical oversight—safeguard public trust and service integrity [37]. Indicators of professionalism include compliance with ethical guidelines, rates of continuing education, and client satisfaction with practitioner conduct. Building a skilled and ethically committed workforce is crucial for the credibility and resilience of the profession.

Defining and assessing quality in social work is challenging due to the field's inherently complex and relational nature. Outcomes are shaped by clients' lived experiences, cultural contexts, and external factors beyond the control of social workers. Subjectivity in client evaluations and the tension between standardized metrics and individualized services create persistent dilemmas [16], [38]. While audits, case resolution rates, and client surveys offer valuable benchmarks, they often fail to capture the nuanced impact of interventions, such as empowerment, trust-building, or emotional recovery [39], [40]. This necessitates the development of hybrid evaluation models that integrate standardized measures with client narratives, practitioner reflections, and participatory methods.

Comparative perspectives highlight how quality frameworks differ across national contexts while sharing certain commonalities. In the United Kingdom, the Professional Capabilities Framework emphasizes values, ethics, diversity, critical reflection, and professional leadership, with continuous professional development as a cornerstone of quality [41]. In the United States, quality standards are established by the CSWE and NASW [42], [43], with a focus on competency-based education, ethical practice, and cultural competence [6]. Australia highlights cultural safety and Indigenous perspectives, embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledge systems into its professional standards [44]. Nordic countries

such as Sweden and Norway emphasize universal access, preventive work, and democratic participation as indicators of quality [45]. Globally, the IFSW promotes human rights, social justice, and professional integrity, recognizing both universal principles and the need for local adaptations [46]. In developing nations, such as South Africa, quality frameworks blend international standards with local realities, prioritizing poverty alleviation, social justice, and community empowerment [47].

Taken together, these findings illustrate that while effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism form the foundation of quality in social work, their operationalization varies across different contexts. A globally informed yet locally adaptable framework is essential to ensure accountability, cultural sensitivity, and measurable outcomes, while avoiding rigid standardization that risks neglecting the complex realities of client experiences and diverse service environments.

### *3.2 International quality assurance frameworks and accreditation standards*

Ensuring high-quality service delivery in social work requires robust quality assurance (QA) frameworks and accreditation systems that define standards, establish evaluation mechanisms, and provide pathways for continuous improvement. Internationally, several influential models have emerged, including ISO standards, the European Quality in Social Services (EQUASS), the U.S. Council on Accreditation (COA), NASW standards, and guidelines from the World Health Organization (WHO). Each framework contributes to shaping global practices by offering structured benchmarks for accountability, transparency, and service excellence, while also facing challenges in adapting to diverse cultural and institutional contexts.

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has extended its widely recognized quality assurance systems into the realm of social services. ISO 9001, initially designed for the industrial and corporate sectors, has been adapted for use in social services to ensure consistency, efficiency, and effectiveness in service delivery [8], [48], [49]. ISO standards emphasize continuous improvement, client satisfaction, and evidence-based decision-making. They focus on areas such as client-centered service design, systematic risk management, and performance monitoring. Organizations that achieve ISO certification gain external validation of service quality, enhanced credibility, and improved opportunities for funding [48]. However, applying ISO standards in social work is not without challenges. Unlike manufacturing, social work relies heavily on relational and contextual factors. Thus, rigid adherence to standardized processes can sometimes conflict with the need for flexible and adaptive interventions tailored to individual client needs.

The EQUASS framework, widely recognized across Europe, provides a comprehensive certification system designed to guarantee high standards of care, inclusivity, and accountability in social service organizations [7]. EQUASS is distinguished by its emphasis on human rights, participatory evaluation, and client empowerment [50]. Certification involves rigorous self-assessment, external auditing, and the development of continuous improvement plans, aligning service delivery with EU policies on social inclusion and cohesion [51]. While EQUASS has been instrumental in promoting accountability and best practices, it can be resource-intensive. Smaller organizations may find compliance burdensome, as documentation, auditing, and reporting requirements consume a significant amount of resources. Nevertheless, EQUASS provides a valuable framework for ensuring the delivery of ethical and practical social services across diverse European contexts.

In the United States, quality assurance is anchored by accreditation through the Council on Accreditation (COA) and the professional standards set by the National Association of Social

Workers (NASW). COA accreditation certifies that agencies meet benchmarks for governance, ethical practice, and service effectiveness. Such accreditation is often required for organizations seeking government funding or partnerships [43], [52]. Meanwhile, the NASW establishes a code of ethics and practice standards that emphasize dignity, cultural competence, evidence-based interventions, and professional integrity. These standards ensure that practitioners are adequately trained and supervised across diverse practice areas, including child welfare and social work in healthcare. While these standards foster accountability and adaptability, the decentralized U.S. social service landscape creates challenges in achieving consistent compliance, particularly for smaller agencies facing resource constraints.

The World Health Organization (WHO) plays a pivotal role in linking social work with global health initiatives. WHO guidelines advocate for holistic, person-centered care that integrates social determinants of health, such as housing, poverty, and education, with traditional health systems [11], [53]. By promoting interdisciplinary collaboration between social workers, healthcare professionals, and community organizations, WHO seeks to reduce inequities and enhance service coordination. WHO frameworks emphasize accessibility, sustainability, and equity, encouraging nations to develop integrated models that align with the Sustainable Development Goals [11], [54]. Implementation, however, often depends on national policies, resource availability, and institutional capacity. Low-resource countries face particular barriers in adopting WHO standards due to workforce shortages and infrastructural constraints. Still, WHO guidelines remain a vital reference point for advancing integration of social work within public health systems.

Accreditation and licensing systems further strengthen professional accountability and service quality. These mechanisms regulate both individual practitioners and organizations, ensuring they meet ethical, educational, and competency standards before and during practice [55]. Credentialing typically involves academic qualifications, supervised practice, and licensure examinations, while organizational accreditation evaluates governance, staff qualifications, and service outcomes [42], [56]. In the U.S., for example, social workers must pass the Association of Social Work Boards exam and fulfill supervised practice requirements to obtain state licensure [57]. In the UK, practitioners are registered with Social Work England, which upholds ethical and professional standards. Across Europe, organizations such as the European Association of Schools of Social Work [58] and IFSW provide guidance, although national regulations vary. Importantly, accreditation is not static: periodic reviews, continuing education, and external audits ensure ongoing compliance and continuous improvement [59], [60], [61].

Structured QA systems bring several advantages to social work. They establish clear and measurable benchmarks for service quality, enhance accountability through audits and reviews, promote evidence-based practice by linking quality assurance with performance data, and encourage cross-national collaboration and knowledge sharing [62], [63]. International frameworks such as WHO guidelines and IFSW ethical standards provide a common language that facilitates cooperation across borders [19]. They also promote ongoing professional development by embedding requirements for continuing education and competency renewal, ensuring that practitioners stay up-to-date with evolving challenges.

Despite their benefits, QA frameworks also face significant limitations. Standardized models often struggle to accommodate the complexity of local realities. Rigid metrics can undervalue the qualitative aspects of social work, such as empowerment, advocacy, and relationship-building, which are difficult to quantify [64]. Smaller organizations may be disproportionately burdened by the costs of compliance, leading to inequities where only large,

well-funded agencies can achieve accreditation. Additionally, the reliance on quantifiable outcomes risks privileging efficiency and case completion over long-term, holistic social change [65], [66]. These challenges underscore the need for developing adaptable frameworks that maintain rigorous accountability while allowing for flexibility and contextual sensitivity.

In conclusion, international QA frameworks and accreditation standards provide essential mechanisms for safeguarding service quality, enhancing accountability, and promoting continuous improvement in the social work sector. Yet, their application must account for contextual differences, ensuring that universal standards are balanced with local adaptations. By doing so, QA systems can fulfill their potential to strengthen professional integrity, improve client outcomes, and advance the global recognition of social work as a discipline committed to equity, justice, and evidence-informed practice.

### *3.3 Key indicators and methodologies*

Measuring the quality of social work services is inherently multifaceted, requiring the integration of both quantitative and qualitative indicators that reflect the complexity of human experiences and systemic dynamics. A comprehensive evaluation framework must balance measurable outcomes, such as efficiency and case resolution rates, with less tangible yet equally critical dimensions, including empowerment, trust, and cultural responsiveness. This multidimensional approach ensures that services are not only effective in achieving technical goals but also aligned with the lived realities of clients and communities. Key indicators used in quality measurement include client satisfaction surveys, service impact assessments, case resolution rates, efficiency benchmarks, and advanced methodologies such as Social Return on Investment (SROI). Recent innovations, particularly in digital tools and artificial intelligence, have further expanded the methodologies available, enabling real-time, data-driven evaluations that enhance accountability and service delivery.

Client satisfaction surveys remain one of the most widely applied and direct tools for assessing quality in social work. These surveys offer clients a structured opportunity to share their perspectives on the accessibility, responsiveness, and effectiveness of our services. Questions typically focus on professionalism, empathy, communication, and the extent to which interventions have improved quality of life [67], [68], [69]. While satisfaction surveys offer critical feedback, their true value lies in their ability to inform organizational learning by identifying areas for refinement in service delivery. However, satisfaction alone does not fully capture long-term effectiveness, prompting the need for complementary tools such as service impact assessments. These evaluations track tangible improvements in well-being, such as enhanced mental health, housing stability, employment, and social integration, while also accounting for unintended positive or negative consequences [70]. Impact assessments are particularly valuable for ensuring that services contribute not only to immediate needs but also to sustainable social change.

Another sophisticated methodology is the application of SROI, which seeks to quantify the broader social, environmental, and economic value generated by social work interventions relative to the resources invested [71]. Unlike conventional financial accounting, SROI captures intangible outcomes such as improved social inclusion, enhanced community cohesion, and reduced long-term healthcare costs. By translating these benefits into monetary terms, SROI allows organizations to make compelling arguments to funders and policymakers, demonstrating the return on investment generated by social programs. The methodology requires identifying key outcomes, assigning financial values to them, and comparing these values to program investments. In doing so, SROI makes the societal benefits of social work

visible in ways that resonate with decision-makers, thereby strengthening advocacy for program funding and expansion.

Case resolution rates represent a more specific indicator of effectiveness, providing measurable data on the proportion of cases that reach successful closure or desired client outcomes. In child welfare, this may involve reunifying families or securing stable placements, while in mental health, resolution might mean improved management of conditions or enhanced quality of life [72]. Although these rates provide a useful measure of accountability, they must be contextualized within the complex realities of client progress, which is often non-linear and influenced by external social and economic factors.

Efficiency benchmarks complement effectiveness metrics by assessing how well organizations allocate resources to achieve outcomes. These benchmarks evaluate dimensions such as average case resolution time, cost per client, and the avoidance of service duplication [73]. Efficiency metrics are crucial in contexts where resources are limited, enabling social work organizations to maximize their impact without compromising service quality. At the same time, efficiency measures must be balanced with client-centered considerations to avoid prioritizing speed or cost savings at the expense of meaningful engagement and empowerment.

In recent years, technological innovation has transformed quality measurement methodologies in social work. Artificial intelligence-driven assessment tools are increasingly applied to analyze large datasets, predict outcomes, and provide real-time feedback on service effectiveness [74], [75]. These tools can track client interactions, identify patterns in service utilization, and anticipate risks, such as clients who may require urgent intervention. For example, AI systems can analyze survey data, case notes, and social media feedback to generate predictive insights about client satisfaction and program effectiveness [76]. Similarly, AI-driven risk assessments enable practitioners to allocate resources to clients most at risk of adverse outcomes, thereby enhancing preventive efforts. While these tools enhance accuracy and responsiveness, they must be implemented with safeguards to ensure ethical use of data and to avoid reinforcing systemic biases.

Digital dashboards complement AI tools by providing visual, real-time summaries of key organizational metrics. These platforms consolidate data from multiple sources—including case management software, client databases, and financial systems—into integrated, accessible displays [77], [78]. Dashboards enable managers and frontline practitioners to monitor service delivery timelines, case progress, and demographic trends, facilitating the rapid identification of inefficiencies or service gaps [79], [80]. Significantly, dashboards also enhance transparency and accountability by making performance data available to funders, policymakers, and community stakeholders [81]. Their adaptability enables organizations to tailor indicators to local needs and priorities, ensuring that measurement systems remain relevant and contextually appropriate.

Developing a comprehensive framework for quality measurement requires integrating international best practices with local adaptations. Standards established by global bodies, such as the IFSW and WHO, provide essential guidance; however, their application must reflect diverse cultural, socio-economic, and political contexts [11], [54]. For instance, in high-income countries, metrics may emphasize specialized outcomes, such as mental health recovery, while in low-resource settings, indicators might focus on access to basic services or community resilience. Tailoring frameworks to local realities ensures that measurement is not only standardized but also inclusive of regional variations.

A crucial element of such frameworks is stakeholder involvement. Effective evaluation systems must incorporate the perspectives of social workers, clients, community leaders, and

policymakers to ensure inclusivity and sustainability. Practitioners contribute insights into operational challenges and feasible indicators, while clients provide firsthand accounts of service relevance and impact. Community leaders offer contextual expertise, and policymakers establish supportive regulatory and funding environments. Together, these stakeholders help ensure that indicators reflect the complexity of social work practice and address the priorities of all actors involved.

Ultimately, the development of robust key indicators and methodologies in social work is both a technical and participatory process. By integrating standardized benchmarks, innovative technologies, and locally adaptable indicators, social work organizations can develop comprehensive frameworks that strike a balance between accountability and client-centered responsiveness. Such systems not only measure service effectiveness but also contribute to continuous improvement, enabling organizations to adapt to emerging challenges and sustain meaningful impact across diverse contexts.

#### **4. Discussion**

The findings of this study reaffirm that quality in social work is a contested yet essential construct, shaped by both universal principles and local realities. Effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism consistently emerge as central dimensions [1], [28]. However, the persistent absence of a universally accepted definition means that evaluation practices are fragmented, with outcomes depending heavily on the perspectives of different stakeholders—whether clients, practitioners, or policymakers [33]. This reinforces the need for a unifying framework that not only consolidates existing definitions but also offers practical adaptability across contexts.

When compared with existing literature, the findings align with previous critiques that international frameworks, such as ISO, EQUASS, and COA, establish important global benchmarks while potentially risking rigidity when applied without contextual sensitivity [49], [51], [52]. Echoing earlier studies [16], this tension highlights that while global standards ensure accountability and comparability, their effectiveness hinges on localization. In low-resource settings, for example, equity and basic access often take precedence over efficiency or autonomy [28], whereas in higher-income contexts, psychosocial empowerment and recovery outcomes may dominate evaluation criteria. These divergences underscore the importance of frameworks being adaptable rather than prescriptive.

Indicators and methodologies, such as client satisfaction surveys, case resolution rates, and SROI, provide valuable insights; however, their limitations remain evident [69], [71]. Satisfaction surveys capture client perspectives but cannot reflect long-term change. SROI translates outcomes into economic terms but struggles to quantify emotional or relational gains. Similarly, case resolution rates offer accountability, yet they risk oversimplifying the complex trajectories of client progress [72]. The literature confirms these trade-offs, suggesting that hybrid models integrating quantitative and qualitative dimensions—such as participatory evaluations—are most promising [38], [40]. The findings support this conclusion by showing that meaningful evaluation requires balancing measurable indicators with the nuanced realities of client experiences.

A key interpretive contribution lies in clarifying why these findings matter. Without adaptable frameworks, social work organizations risk privileging efficiency over equity or overlooking marginalized populations in the pursuit of compliance. Conversely, when frameworks embrace flexibility and stakeholder participation, they not only improve accountability but also strengthen legitimacy and trust in social services. This is particularly

critical in addressing systemic inequities, as emphasized by Woo et al. [28], and in sustaining long-term well-being beyond immediate outputs.

The global versus local tension also aligns with the SDGs. Goal 16 emphasizes accountable institutions, Goal 10 underscores equity and inclusion, and Goal 17 highlights partnerships as central to sustainable development [11], [54]. The findings demonstrate that quality assurance frameworks contribute directly to these objectives by fostering transparency, reducing inequalities, and promoting collaborative approaches across sectors. However, the literature cautions that such alignment necessitates a more systematic integration into policy frameworks, rather than treating the SDGs as aspirational add-ons [66]. Thus, explicitly linking social work quality measurement to the SDGs ensures that evaluation systems support not only professional accountability but also broader global welfare agendas.

The interdisciplinary implications of this study are equally significant. Social work cannot be isolated from related fields—healthcare, education, and public administration all shape and are shaped by its practices. Previous research has highlighted the importance of incorporating healthcare metrics in enabling more robust assessments of well-being [30], while educational indicators capture outcomes related to empowerment and skill development [3]. Similarly, public administration contributes governance expertise for aligning social work with welfare policies [15]. The findings suggest that interdisciplinary collaboration strengthens the comprehensiveness of evaluation systems, ensuring that measurement tools reflect the interconnected nature of social welfare systems.

At the same time, limitations must be acknowledged. This study, based on a literature-driven synthesis, relies on secondary data and may underrepresent emerging localized practices that are not yet published in global databases. The findings also reveal gaps in operationalizing AI-driven and digital quality measurement tools, which are frequently discussed [74] but remain underexplored in applied practice. Furthermore, cultural and political variations mean that universal comparability is unlikely to be achieved fully, and future work must address how frameworks can balance contextual sensitivity with global accountability.

The findings of this study highlight both convergences and divergences with the existing literature on conceptualizing and measuring quality in social work. They confirm that dimensions such as effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and professionalism lie at the core of social work quality, while also underscoring the absence of universally accepted standards and the pressing need for local adaptation. Moreover, the results demonstrate that international quality frameworks (ISO, EQUASS, COA/NASW, WHO), while valuable, are insufficient in isolation and must be flexibly integrated with local conditions. This study reveals that measuring quality in social work is not merely a technical requirement but an essential component of social justice, ethical integrity, and inclusive development. In sum, this discussion situates the study's findings within the broader literature, clarifies their implications for both theory and practice, and emphasizes that advancing quality in social work requires embracing hybrid methodologies, systematic alignment with SDGs, and sustained interdisciplinary collaboration. Such an approach ensures that quality is not reduced to compliance but becomes a dynamic process of service excellence, equity, and accountability across diverse social contexts.

## **5. Conclusion and Implications**

### *5.1 Key findings*

The findings of this study demonstrate that quality in social work is inherently multidimensional, encompassing effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and

professionalism as core elements. While these dimensions are widely acknowledged in the literature, the study reveals persistent challenges arising from the lack of universally accepted measurement systems. International quality frameworks, such as ISO, EQUASS, COA/NASW, and WHO, provide valuable structures for ensuring accountability and service excellence; however, they remain insufficient when applied rigidly without sensitivity to local contexts. The results emphasize the need to balance global standards with local adaptability, ensuring that quality measurement is both standardized for comparability and flexible enough to capture the diverse needs of clients and community realities. Furthermore, this study affirms that quality assessment in social work is not merely a technical exercise but a process deeply connected to ethical integrity, social justice, and inclusive development.

### *5.2 Practical contributions*

This research contributes to social work theory and practice by offering a comprehensive framework for conceptualizing and measuring quality that integrates both international best practices and context-sensitive indicators. For practitioners, the framework emphasizes the importance of integrating quantitative measures, such as client satisfaction surveys, case resolution rates, and efficiency benchmarks, with qualitative insights gleaned from client narratives, participatory evaluations, and long-term impact assessments. Policymakers and administrators can draw upon these findings to design flexible quality assurance systems that respect cultural, socio-economic, and institutional variations while maintaining accountability and transparency. For educators, the study highlights the importance of incorporating quality measurement training into social work curricula, ensuring that future professionals are equipped with the skills to evaluate and enhance service delivery critically. The practical implication is clear: advancing service quality requires hybrid methodologies that address both measurable outputs and complex human experiences.

### *5.3 Limitations & future work*

Despite its contributions, this study faces several limitations that must be acknowledged. First, while it synthesizes existing literature and international frameworks, it does not include primary empirical data from specific social work organizations or field-based evaluations, which could provide more nuanced insights into the lived realities of quality measurement. Second, the reliance on secondary sources may limit the applicability of findings in rapidly changing contexts, where service delivery models and policy frameworks evolve quickly. Third, the comparative analysis of international frameworks highlights structural gaps but does not fully capture the diversity of practices in low- and middle-income countries, where resource constraints and informal support systems often play a central role. Future research should address these limitations by conducting cross-national empirical studies, incorporating case-based evidence, and exploring innovative methodologies, including AI-driven analytics, participatory evaluation models, and mixed-methods approaches. Further work should also deepen the integration of quality measurement with the Sustainable Development Goals (particularly Goals 10, 16, and 17), ensuring that social work contributes meaningfully to global agendas on equity, strong institutions, and collaborative partnerships. By addressing these areas, future studies can strengthen the theoretical foundation of quality in social work while enhancing its practical relevance across diverse social, cultural, and political contexts.

## **References**

- [1] S. LEVIN, A. FULGINITI, AND B. MOORE: The Perceived Effectiveness of Online Social Work Education: Insights from A National Survey of Social Work Educators.

- Social Work Education*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 775–789, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1080/02615479.2018.1482864.
- [2] L. LISEVICIUTE AND L. ZALIMIENE: Innovations in Non-Governmental Organisations Providing Social Services. *Soc. Teor. Emp. Polit. Prakt.*, no. 13, pp. 77–89, 2016.
- [3] J. MILNER, S. MYERS, AND P. O’BYRNE: Assessment in Social Work. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.
- [4] H. SPECHT AND A. VICKERY: Integrating Social Work Methods. Routledge, 2021.
- [5] N. E. WINSTONE AND D. BOUD: The Need to Disentangle Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 656–667, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2020.1779687.
- [6] CSWE: Council on Social Work Education. CSWE. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cswe.org/>
- [7] EQUASS: European Quality Framework for Social Services. [Online]. Available: <https://equass.be/>
- [8] ISO: ISO 9001:2015, ISO. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iso.org/standard/62085.html>
- [9] F. NADEEM, A. HUSSAIN, AND M. U. AWAN: Investigating the Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation and Total Quality Management in Enhancing Pharmaceutical Quality Performance. *Int. J. Pharm. Healthc. Mark.*, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1108/IJPHM-05-2023-0036.
- [10] T. NYENGERAI *ET AL.*: Quality of service and Continuous Quality Improvement in Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision Programme Across Four Provinces in South Africa: Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Programme Data. *PLOS ONE*, vol. 16, no. 8, p. e0254850, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0254850.
- [11] WHO: Working documents in public consultation. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/teams/health-product-and-policy-standards/standards-and-specifications/norms-and-standards-for-pharmaceuticals/guidelines/quality-assurance>
- [12] J. HALL, M. GAVED, AND J. SARGENT: Participatory Research Approaches in Times of Covid-19: A Narrative Literature Review. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 20, p. 16094069211010087, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1177/16094069211010087.
- [13] R. HARRISON, B. JONES, P. GARDNER, AND R. LAWTON: Quality Assessment with Diverse Studies (Quads): An Appraisal Tool for Methodological and Reporting Quality in Systematic Reviews of Mixed- or Multi-Method Studies. *BMC Health Serv Res*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 144, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06122-y.
- [14] E. K. OSAYSA: Improving the Quality of Marketing Analytics Systems. *Int. J. Qual. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 119–132, 2022, doi: 10.24874/IJQR16.01-08.
- [15] D. F. HUNT, M. DUNN, G. HARRISON, AND J. BAILEY: Ethical Considerations in Quality Improvement: Key Questions and A Practical Guide. *BMJ Open Qual*, vol. 10, no. 3, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1136/bmjoq-2021-001497.
- [16] E. MUNRO AND J. HARDIE: Why We Should Stop Talking About Objectivity and Subjectivity in Social Work. *The British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 411–427, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcy054.
- [17] G. G. WOOD AND C. T. TULLY: The Structural Approach to Direct Practice in Social Work: A Social Constructionist Perspective. Columbia University Press, 2006.
- [18] K. SCHICK-MAKAROFF, M. MACDONALD, M. PLUMMER, J. BURGESS, AND W. NEANDER: What Synthesis Methodology Should I Use? A Review and Analysis of

- Approaches to Research Synthesis. *AIMS Public Health*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 172–215, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.3934/publichealth.2016.1.172.
- [19] IFSW: Cross-Border Collaboration: ASO and IRASW Social Workers Workers Unite to Support Separated Children – International Federation of Social Workers. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ifsw.org/cross-border-collaboration-aso-and-irasw-social-workers-workers-unite-to-support-separated-children/>
- [20] V. BRAUN AND V. CLARKE: Thematic Analysis, in *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. F. Maggino, Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2023, pp. 7187–7193. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17299-1\\_3470](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17299-1_3470)
- [21] M. JIAN, M. WANG, Y. DU, AND H. YAN: What Has Been Done for Social Workers’ Self-Care Practice? A Systematic Review of Interventions. *Int. Soc. Work*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 1163–1178, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1177/00208728241237938.
- [22] A. JENSEN-DOSS AND K. M. HAWLEY: Understanding Barriers to Evidence-Based Assessment: Clinician Attitudes Toward Standardized Assessment Tools. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 885–896, Nov. 2010, doi: 10.1080/15374416.2010.517169.
- [23] C. ABLAZA, E. KUSKOFF, F. PERALES, AND C. PARSELL: Responding to Domestic and Family Violence: The Role of Non-Specialist Services and Implications for Social Work. *Br. J. Soc. Work*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 81–99, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcac125.
- [24] M. MÄNTTÄRI-VAN DER KUIP: Moral Distress Among Social Workers: The Role of Insufficient Resources. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 86–97, 2016, doi: 10.1111/ijsw.12163.
- [25] K. BELANGER AND W. STONE: The Social Service Divide: Service Availability and Accessibility in Rural Versus Urban Counties and Impact on Child Welfare Outcomes. *Child Welfare*, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 101–124, 2008.
- [26] J. FORDER AND J.-L. FERNANDEZ: Using a ‘Wellbeing’ Cost-Effectiveness Approach to Improve Resource Allocation in Social Care. 2015, [Online]. Available: <https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/61221/>
- [27] M. NEWCOMB: Supportive Social Work Supervision as an Act of Care: A Conceptual Model. *The British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 1070–1088, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcab074.
- [28] B. WOO, M. CANO, AND M. PITT-CATSOPHES: Research Note-Equity and Justice in the Social Work Explicit Curriculum. *J. Soc. Work Educ.*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 611–618, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1080/10437797.2021.1895931.
- [29] L. SIMMONS, E. SLAYTER, AND L. M. JOHNSON: Using an Anti-Racist, Equity-Minded Lens in Assessment of Teaching and Learning. *Social Work Education*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 2274–2290, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1080/02615479.2023.2254777.
- [30] T. GUAN ET AL.: Oncology Social Workers’ Involvement In Palliative Care: Secondary Data Analysis from Nationwide Oncology Social Workers Survey. *Pall Supp Care*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1310–1316, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1017/S1478951524000622.
- [31] S. AMADASUN AND M. GRAY: Enhancing the Relevance of Social Work Education In Nigeria. *The British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 534–551, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcac144.
- [32] B. CLOUGH: Accountability, Social Justice, And Social Care Decision-Making: Reflections On The Responsive State. In *Ageing, Gender and Family Law*, Routledge, 2018.

- [33] S. B. NDULI AND M. MTHEMBU: Exploring The Perceptions of Correctional Service Providers and Elderly Parolees of Post-Incarceration Social Work Programmes in Ethekwini Metropolitan. *SWORK*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2022, doi: 10.15270/58-2-1044.
- [34] B. BELA, A. BROKA, F. RAJEVSKA, AND L. RASNAČA: Transformative Change in Social Service Delivery and Social Work Practice in Latvia during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *European Journal of Social Work*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 816–828, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1080/13691457.2021.1977255.
- [35] J. IFE, K. SOLDATIĆ, AND L. BRISKMAN: Human Rights and Social Work. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [36] M. BERG-WEGER AND S. W. TYUSE: The Practice of Generalist Social Work, 6th ed. New York: Routledge, 2023.
- [37] N. LONG, F. GARDNER, S. HODGKIN, AND J. LEHMANN: Developing Social Work Professional Identity Resilience: Seven Protective Factors. *Australian Social Work*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 214–227, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1080/0312407X.2022.2160265.
- [38] C. FERRIER: Risking Subjectivity in Everyday Social Work Practice. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 181–187, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1080/17496535.2018.1467591.
- [39] R. INGRAM: Understanding Emotions in Social Work: Theory, Practice and Reflection. McGraw-Hill Education (UK), 2015.
- [40] L. O’CONNOR: How Social Workers Understand and Use Their Emotions In Practice: A Thematic Synthesis Literature Review. *Qualitative Social Work*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 645–662, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1177/1473325019843991.
- [41] BASW: About the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) | BASW. [Online]. Available: <https://basw.co.uk/training-cpd/professional-capabilities-framework/about-professional-capabilities-framework-pcf>
- [42] CSWE: Accreditation. CSWE. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cswe.org/accreditation/>
- [43] NASW: National Association of Social Workers. [Online]. Available: <https://www.socialworkers.org/>
- [44] AASW: Australian Association of Social Workers. AASW. [Online]. Available: <https://www.aasw.asn.au/>
- [45] P. STEPNEY: The Paradox of Reshaping Social Work as “Tough Love” In The Nordic Welfare States. *Nordic Journal of Social Work*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 293–305, Feb. 2007, doi: 10.18261/ISSN1504-3037-2006-04-03.
- [46] IFSW: International Federation of Social Workers – Global Online Conference. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ifsw.org/>
- [47] SACSSP: Council for Social Service Professions. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sacssp.co.za/>
- [48] ISO: ISO - Certification, ISO. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iso.org/certification.html>
- [49] ISO: ISO - International Organization for Standardization, ISO. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iso.org/home.html>
- [50] EQUASS: Rights & the Rights-Based Approach - Knowledge Hub - Social Services. [Online]. Available: <https://knowledge.epr.equass.be/article/365-rights-based-approach>
- [51] EQUASS: EQUASS - Certification System. [Online]. Available: <https://equass.be/index.php/certif-system>
- [52] USACAMERICA: United States Accreditation Council (USAC)e. [Online]. Available: <https://usacamerica.us/>

- [53] WHO: The Role of Health and Social Care Workers in Supporting Health. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/tools/your-life-your-health/a-healthy-world/people-s-roles/the-role-of-health-and-social-care-workers-in-supporting-health>
- [54] WHO: Ending NTDs Together Towards 2030. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/teams/control-of-neglected-tropical-diseases/ending-ntds-together-towards-2030>
- [55] C. N. DULMUS AND K. M. SOWERS: *The Profession of Social Work: Guided by History, Led by Evidence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [56] SOCIALWORKDEGREES: Social Work Credentials and Certifications. Social Work Degrees. [Online]. Available: <https://www.socialworkdegrees.org/faq/social-work-credentials>
- [57] ASWB: Association of Social Work Boards. Association of Social Work Boards. [Online]. Available: <https://www.aswb.org/>
- [58] EASSW: EASSW - European Association of Schools of Social Work. [Online]. Available: <https://www.eassw.org/Pages/GlobalDefinition/GlobalDefinition.php>
- [59] CEUNITS: Social Workers Continuing Education Units CEU CE Units. [Online]. Available: [https://www.ceunits.com/social-workers/?gad\\_source=1&gclid=CjwKCAiAzba9BhBhEiwa7glbakQYs8mPIfveR7-oNSwSZf7AuzDGNIX6i2ca2LFllHwVDF4b4BTBthoCGzkQAvD\\_BwE](https://www.ceunits.com/social-workers/?gad_source=1&gclid=CjwKCAiAzba9BhBhEiwa7glbakQYs8mPIfveR7-oNSwSZf7AuzDGNIX6i2ca2LFllHwVDF4b4BTBthoCGzkQAvD_BwE)
- [60] CPDSTANDARDS: What is CPD? The CPD Standards Office. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cpdstandards.com/resources/what-is-cpd/>
- [61] R. and C. C. IMMIGRATION: Get Your Credentials Assessed in Canada. [Online]. Available: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/settle-canada/credential-assessment.html>
- [62] E. M. GOLDBERG AND R. W. WARBURTON: *Ends and Means in Social Work: The Development and Outcome of a Case Review System for Social Workers*. Taylor & Francis, 2021.
- [63] A. K. SCHNACKENBERG, E. TOMLINSON, AND C. COEN: The Dimensional Structure of Transparency: A Construct Validation of Transparency as Disclosure, Clarity, And Accuracy in Organizations. *Human Relations*, vol. 74, no. 10, pp. 1628–1660, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1177/0018726720933317.
- [64] M. HUGHES AND M. WEARING: *Organisations and Management in Social Work: Everyday Action for Change*. SAGE, 2021.
- [65] R. ESTES: Social Work., Social Development and Community Welfare Centers in International Perspective. *ResearchGate*, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1177/002087289704000104.
- [66] A. C. KING *ET AL.*: Community-Based Approaches to Reducing Health Inequities and Fostering Environmental Justice through Global Youth-Engaged Citizen Science. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 3, p. 892, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18030892.
- [67] O. R. ALUKO, G. I. IDORO, AND M. C. MEWOMO: Relationship Between Perceived Service Quality and Client Satisfaction Indicators of Engineering Consultancy Services in Building Projects. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 557–577, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1108/JEDT-03-2020-0084.
- [68] M. E. MEURICE, K. C. WHITEHOUSE, R. BLAYLOCK, J. J. CHANG, AND P. A. LOHR: Client Satisfaction and Experience of Telemedicine and Home Use of Mifepristone and Misoprostol for Abortion up to 10 Weeks' Gestation at British Pregnancy Advisory Service: A Cross-Sectional Evaluation. *Contraception*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 61–66, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.contraception.2021.04.027.

- [69] T. WALSH AND B. LORD: Client Satisfaction and Empowerment Through Social Work Intervention. *Soc Work Health Care*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 37–56, 2004, doi: 10.1300/J010v38n04\_03.
- [70] LINKEDIN: How Can You Use Social Impact Assessments to Collaborate with Other Organizations? [Online]. Available: <https://www.linkedin.com/advice/1/how-can-you-use-social-impact-assessments-collaborate>
- [71] R. KADEL, A. STIELKE, K. ASHTON, R. MASTERS, AND M. DYAKOVA: Social Return on Investment (SROI) of Mental Health Related Interventions—A Scoping Review. *Front. Public Health*, vol. 10, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.965148.
- [72] HELPSHIFT: What is a Resolution Rate? [Online]. Available: <https://www.helpshift.com/glossary/resolution-rate/>
- [73] J. ELDER AND I. MANNING: Social Benchmarks and Indicators. *National Economic Review*, no. 46, pp. 34–45, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.3316/ielapa.200109241.
- [74] F. G. REAMER: Artificial Intelligence in Social Work: Emerging Ethical Issues. *Int J SW Values and Ethics*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 52–71, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.55521/10-020-205.
- [75] SOCIALWORKERS: AI and Social Work. [Online]. Available: <https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/AI-and-Social-Work>
- [76] C. ANCHIA: Measuring Success: Key Metrics and KPIs for AI Initiatives. Acacia Advisors. [Online]. Available: <https://chooseacacia.com/measuring-success-key-metrics-and-kpis-for-ai-initiatives/>
- [77] C. K. CHENG, D. K. IP, B. J. COWLING, L. M. HO, G. M. LEUNG, AND E. H. LAU: Digital Dashboard Design Using Multiple Data Streams for Disease Surveillance With Influenza Surveillance as an Example. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. e1658, Oct. 2011, doi: 10.2196/jmir.1658.
- [78] W. W. ECKERSON: Performance Dashboards: Measuring, Monitoring, and Managing Your Business. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
- [79] J. HARRIS: Neoliberal Social Work and Digital Technology. In *The Routledge Handbook of International Critical Social Work*, Routledge, 2022, pp. 135–147.
- [80] PSICOSMART: The Role of Dashboards in RealTime Organizational Performance Monitoring. [Online]. Available: <https://psico-smart.com/en/blogs/blog-the-role-of-dashboards-in-realttime-organizational-performance-monitoring-178286>
- [81] GROW: Why Transparency in Dashboard Business Intelligence Can Make or Break Your Strategy. Medium. [Online]. Available: <https://medium.com/@grow.com/why-transparency-in-dashboard-business-intelligence-can-make-or-break-your-strategy-4a8e70b95b6c>