



Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT)

How to Reference ASCOT

Version 1.0

Stacey Rand and Elizabeth Welch

September 2025

Table of Contents

ASCOT-SCT4 and ASCOT-INT4	3
ASCOT-ER	3
ASCOT Easy Read for Older People (ASCOT-ER (OP))	4
ASCOT-Proxy	4
ASCOT care homes mixed-methods (ASCOT-CH4)	5
ASCOT-CH4 health domains (ASCOT-CH4-HD)	5
ASCOT-Carer SCT4 and INT4	5
ASCOT-Workforce	6
How to quote ASCOT questions	6

ASCOT-SCT4 and ASCOT-INT4

Main academic reference (with preference weights) for ASCOT-SCT4:

Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, Potoglou D, Towers A, Brazier J, Flynn T, Forder J, Wall B (2012) Outcomes of Social Care for Adults: Developing a Preference-Weighted Measure, Health Technology Assessment, 16, 16, 1-165. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta16160

Validity, reliability and feasibility of ASCOT-SCT4:

Rand S, Malley J, Towers A, Netten A, Forder J (2017) Validity and test-retest reliability of the self-completion adult social care outcomes toolkit (ASCOT-SCT4) with adults with long-term physical, sensory and mental health conditions in England, Quality of Life Outcomes, 15:163, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-017-0739-0

Malley J, Towers A, Netten A, Brazier J, Forder J, Flynn, T (2012) An assessment of the construct validity of the ASCOT measure of social care-related quality of life with older people, Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 10:21. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-10-21

Validity, reliability and feasibility of ASCOT-INT4:

Malley J, Rand S, Netten A, Towers A-M, Forder J (2019) Exploring the feasibility and validity of a pragmatic approach to estimating the impact of long-term care: The ,expected' ASCOT method, Journal of Long Term Care, (2019), 67-83.

https://journal.ilpnetwork.org/articles/abstract/11

ASCOT-ER

Main academic reference (with preference weights) for ASCOT-SCT4, of which this measure is an adaptation:

Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, Potoglou D, Towers A, Brazier J, Flynn T, Forder J, Wall B (2012) Outcomes of Social Care for Adults: Developing a Preference-Weighted Measure, Health Technology Assessment, 16, 16, 1-165. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta16160

Development of ASCOT-ER:

Turnpenny A, Caiels J, Whelton R, Richardson L, Beadle-Brown J, Crowther T, Forder J, Apps, J, Rand S. (2016). Developing an Easy Read version of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT). Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 31(1), e36-e48, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12294

Validity, reliability and feasibility of ASCOT-ER:

Rand S, Towers A-M, Razik K, Turnpenny A, Bradshaw J, Caiels J, Smith N (2020) Feasibility, factor structure and construct validity of the easy-read Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT-ER), Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 45(2), 119-132 DOI: https://doi.org/10.3109/13668250.2019.1592126

ASCOT Easy Read for Older People (ASCOT-ER (OP))

Main academic reference (with preference weights) for ASCOT-SCT4, of which this measure is an adaptation:

Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, Potoglou D, Towers A, Brazier J, Flynn T, Forder J, Wall B (2012) Outcomes of Social Care for Adults: Developing a Preference-Weighted Measure, Health Technology Assessment, 16, 16, 1-165. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta16160

Development of ASCOT-ER (OP):

Caiels, J., Rand, S., Mikelyte, R., Webster, L., Field, E., Towers, A-M. (in submission). Enhancing Quality of Life Measurement: Adapting ASCOT-ER for Older Adults accessing Social Care. Quality of Life Research.

Validity, reliability and feasibility of ASCOT-ER (OP):

This will be the focus of future ASCOT work

ASCOT-Proxy

Main academic reference (with preference weights) for ASCOT-SCT4, of which this measure is an adaptation:

Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, Potoglou D, Towers A, Brazier J, Flynn T, Forder J, Wall B (2012) Outcomes of Social Care for Adults: Developing a Preference-Weighted Measure, Health Technology Assessment, 16, 16, 1-165. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta16160

Development of ASCOT-Proxy:

Rand S, Caiels J, Collins G. et al. (2017) Developing a proxy version of the Adult social care outcome toolkit (ASCOT). Health Qual Life Outcomes 15, 108. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-017-0682-0

Caiels J, Rand S, Crowther T. et al. (2019) Exploring the views of being a proxy from the perspective of unpaid carers and paid carers: developing a proxy version of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT). BMC Health Serv Res 19, 201. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4025-1

Validity and Reliability of ASCOT-Proxy

Rand S, Towers A-M, Allan S, Webster L, Palmer S, Carroll R, Gordon A, Akdur G, Goodman C (2024), Exploratory factor analysis and Rasch analysis to assess the structural validity of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit Proxy version (ASCOT-Proxy) completed by care home staff. Quality of Life Research. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-024-03631-1

Silarova B, Rand S, Towers A-M, Jones K (2023), Feasibility, validity and reliability of the ASCOT-Proxy and ASCOT-Carer among unpaid carers of people living with dementia in England. Health Quality of Life Outcomes. 3;21(1):54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-023-02122-0

ASCOT care homes mixed-methods (ASCOT-CH4)

Main academic reference (with preference weights) for ASCOT-SCT4, of which this measure is an adaptation:

Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, Potoglou D, Towers A, Brazier J, Flynn T, Forder J, Wall B (2012) Outcomes of Social Care for Adults: Developing a Preference-Weighted Measure, Health Technology Assessment, 16, 16, 1-165. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta16160

Development of ASCOT-CH4 and its validity and reliability

Towers A, Smith N, Palmer S, Welch E. & Netten, A. (2016). The acceptability and feasibility of using the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT) to inform practice in care homes. BMC Health Services Research. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1763-1

Towers A, Smith N, Allan S, Vadean F, Collins G, Rand S, et al (2021). Care home residents' quality of life and its association with CQC ratings and workforce issues: the MiCareHQ mixed-methods study. Health Serv Deliv Res, 9(19). https://doi.org/10.3310/hsdr09190

Towers A, Rand S, Collins G, Smith N, Palmer S, Cassell J (2023) Measuring quality of life in care homes when self-report is challenging: the construct validity, structural characteristics and internal consistency of the mixed-methods adult social care outcomes toolkit, *Age and Ageing*, 52(9), https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afad168

ASCOT-CH4 health domains (ASCOT-CH4-HD)

Main academic reference

Towers A, Smith N, Allan S, Vadean F, Collins G, Rand S, et al (2021). Care home residents' quality of life and its association with CQC ratings and workforce issues: the MiCareHQ mixed-methods study. Health Serv Deliv Res, 9(19). https://doi.org/10.3310/hsdr09190

ASCOT-Carer SCT4 and INT4

Development of ASCOT-Carer (including preference weights) and its validity and reliability:

Rand S, Malley J, Netten A (2012) Measuring the Social Care Outcomes of Informal Carers, PSSRU Discussion Paper 2833, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, Canterbury.

Rand S, Malley J, Netten A, Forder, J (2015) Factor structure and construct validity of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit for Carers (ASCOT-Carer), Quality of Life Research, 24(11) 2601-2614. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11136-015-1011-x

Rand S, Malley J, Vadean F, Forder J (2019) Measuring the outcomes of long-term care for unpaid carers: Comparing the ASCOT-Carer, Carer Experience Scale and EQ-5D-3L. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 17(184). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-019-1254-2

Batchelder L, Malley J, Burge P, Lu H, Saloniki E.-C, Linnosmaa I, Trukeschitz B, Forder J (2019). Carer social care-related quality of life outcomes: estimating English preference weights for the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit for Carers (ASCOT-Carer). Value in Health, 22(12), P1427-1440. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2019.07.014

ASCOT-Workforce

Main academic reference:

Blake M, Lambert C, Gregory F, Ridge M-C, Dale L, Stadler T, Figgett D, Geddes G, Towers A-M, Rand S, Palmer S, Allan S, Silarova B, Brookes N (2025) *The Adult Social Care Workforce and their Work-related Quality of Life: Findings on Work-related Quality of Life and Wellbeing – Wave 1*, Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), London. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/adult-social-care-asc-workforce-and-work-related-quality-of-life

Validity, reliability and feasibility of ASCOT-Workforce:

Blake M, Lambert C, Gregory F, Ridge M-C, Dale L, Stadler T, Figgett D, Geddes G, Towers A-M, Rand S, Palmer S, Allan S, Silarova B, Brookes N (2025) *The Adult Social Care Workforce and their Work-related Quality of Life: Findings on Work-related Quality of Life and Wellbeing – Wave 1*, Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), London. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/adult-social-care-asc-workforce-and-work-related-quality-of-life

How to quote ASCOT questions

The developers of the ASCOT wish to support the use of ASCOT tools in social care to promote an outcomes approach in policy and practice. However, it is important that any quotations of ASCOT questions in publications do not violate intellectual property, which belongs to the University of Kent.

Including the full ASCOT instrument (i.e., all questions) in publications would be considered a breach of copyright and Intellectual Property.

Authors should provide a fair and reasonable representation of the ASCOT instruments used in their research or practice. Quoting the first ASCOT domain in each measure should be sufficient to give the reader an insight into the ASCOT measure. It is also possible to refer readers to the ASCOT website to access the preview version of the questionnaire. In addition, authors may provide *definitions* of the remaining domains (please refer to the guidance for each measure).

In some cases, funder restrictions and/or preference elicitation studies necessitate full publication of the tool. In which case, please contact Dr Stacey Rand (<u>S.E.Rand@kent.ac.uk</u>).

An example of the correct way to quote ASCOT questions can be found in Van Leeuwen et al, 2015.