Interprofessional work in the network for social intervention. Possibilities and limitations (*El trabajo interprofesional en red para la intervención social. Posibilidades y limitaciones*)

Joaquín Gairín-Sallán[a], Edgar Iglesias-Vidal[b] and Anna Díaz-Vicario[a]

[a]Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona; [b]Universitat de Girona

ABSTRACT
Coordinated work among the professionals involved is increasingly necessary in response to the social educational needs of a region. This contribution analyses the case of an interprofessional network (XAFIR) of more than 130 professionals in the city of Barcelona, working to improve social and educational assistance to children and their families. A simple instrumental type case study is used to identify the determining factors for the proper working order of a network of this type. The analysis covers 52 questionnaires, 16 interviews and 2 focus groups, gathering information from professionals, users, and policymakers. The results show that an interprofessional network endures over time when it has established common objectives, has a formal organisational structure and working order, and when backed by the institutional commitment of the services and entities that form part of it. The challenge is to establish shared workspaces where knowledge can be generated and that can have an influence on the improvement of the actions of the professionals of the Network.

CONTACT Anna Díaz-Vicario, Department of Applied Pedagogy. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Barcelona, Plaça del Coneixement (Edifici G6 – 248). Campus de la UAB. 08193 Bellaterra, Spain. E-mail: anna.diaz@uab.cat

Social-educational intervention tries to create educational programmes that have a social impact. It thereby attempts to transcend merely applying the educational measure, providing actions that go beyond the limits of the organisations and the programmatic and formative sphere. The individual performance of professionals within the various organisations, or that are specialists in certain aspects of intervention, are faced with the challenge of dealing with social-educational problems. In fact, many of them can be better understood and dealt with by using a global, community-based and interprofessional approach and many research projects show how the collaborative work has a positive impact in complex situations (Beneyto, 2015; Esquivel, 2013; Pascual, 2010). This is the case, for example, with improved levels of school success in the US (Renée & McAllister, 2011), prevention of school dropout in Spain (Iglesias et al., 2017) or the effect of greater optimisation of educational resources (Mourshed et al., 2012).

Consequently, it is not surprising that intersectional and cross-disciplinary type analysis and frameworks are promoted for addressing current social problems (Milward & Provan, 2006). They are considered more efficient, both in terms of their capacity for analysis and for their more complex practical basis (Brown, 2019).

The analysis of the interprofessional network XAFIR can be a good example of action within the framework of other interprofessional actions that are demanded from different perspectives (Mondragón & Trigueros, 2004; Ortiz, 2014; Unda et al., 2015; Rodríguez, 2015a). There are various references and works that all defend the need for a comprehensive, transformative and multidisciplinary approach (Carbonero et al., 2016; González & Jaráiz; 2012; López-Peláez & Segado, 2012; Muñoz, 2014; Ortega, 2015; Ubieto, 2009; Rodríguez, 2015b). The common denominator is the importance of collaboration for creative problem resolution, the promotion of practice based on reflection, and the sense of institution, extending the professionalism of the participants.

This contribution uses these approaches to analyse the specific situation of a network attending children and families (XAFIR) in a Barcelona neighbourhood. The data provided serves for identifying and analysing the possibilities and limitations of interprofessional work in the social educational field.

Collective educational approaches to complex realities

Social educational intervention in community is based on the idea and aim to increase the efficiency and organisation of the collective of agents involved, with regards to their own challenges and needs. Interprofessional activity not only improves the quality of the work, but also makes it possible to include the community and all its potential (Marchioni, 1997; 2004). As Civís (2018) points out, the community is both educating agent and educational environment.

Individual and collective capital is currently considered one of the main resources that people, and organisations have for their development. The society of knowledge has made apparent the need to share and collaborate in a complex and changing context. In fact, the approaches of professionals without interaction with their surroundings are anachronistic, if we consider the current tendency to configure human groups in constant interaction through networks or communities (Figueroa, 2017; Gairín, 2011; Kangpeng, 2014; Ubieto, 2007). Specialisation allowed more influence in aspects of the reality but distanced us from the global comprehension of it and the interrelations involved. In this context, we promote interprofessional work both within the organisations as well as between them, especially when dealing with social situations and people. We share the idea that collaborative interprofessional work fosters social capital among its members (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003) and that mutual trust is considered positive in the learning process carried out (Renée & McAlister, 2011).

These global approaches are contextualised and related in various conceptual delimitations (Marchioni, 1997; 2004), one of them being the reference to the territory. The territory is considered the geographical area of intervention with the community, where professionals interact and share resources coming from different organisations, whether public or private, to reach common objectives.

We can talk about an educational ecosystem if we consider that the existing interprofessional networks include collaborative work and scenarios for the construction of cooperative relationships (Mueller & Toutain, 2015). We highlight the capacity ecosystems have to generate a common space of action, which, in this case, addresses the link between educational problems and a set of agents coming from different institutions that are committed to change and prepared to leave their professional comfort zone.

Based on the classic considerations of Agranoff and McGuire (1999), the participating agents in the social educational networks define and share common objectives. By the actors asking each other what their needs are, a structural logic is created from a dual perspective: internal for coordination and procedures, and external for social educational action and intervention. The principle of collaboration therefore includes sharing objectives, resources, and actions (Bremm & Drucks, 2018; Renée & Mcalister, 2011), as well as configuring the necessary conditions so that the members of the network take joint responsibility for building shared visions and purposes.

Networks and collaborative work as an efficient response

There are many international experiences of networks that work on educational and social development; for example, the networks of innovative schools (Spain), the priority action zones (France), the educational action zones or extended schools (United Kingdom), the Kvarter-Lǿft (Germany), the educational zones (Australia) or the school networks (Chile). All these networks are based on a planned and collaborative process and are related with tangible

products. As Díaz-Gibson et al. (2013) point out, its management provides strategic planning and evaluation as functional elements to guarantee quality, sustainability, and efficiency.

The Catalan Social and Family Welfare Department (2014) characterises work in networks as including individuals, organisations or a combination of both. As far as their purpose is concerned, it can be thematic or territorial. Therefore, a thematic network is defined by shared activities, regardless of where the intervention takes place, while a territorial network is made up of people and/or organisations that work in the same territory. The organisational system may be a vertical model in which have a single central nucleus for decisions and management, or a horizontal model, which is characterised by more direct and equal relationships among its members.

In all cases, professional networks become mechanisms for the relationship and exchange between people that share needs and problems (Harasim et al., 2000). In territorial cases (Díaz-Gibson et al., 2013), community links are forged in response to the real needs of the people living in the area, seeking better adherence or commitment from its participants when faced with the social problems and needs (O'Leary & Bingham, 2009).

Such interdependent relationships have to do with the simultaneous development of three basic principles (Iglesias, 2017): a) transform fragmented views of the educational situation into more global and communal ones; b) establish relationships based on helpful attitudes; c) transform the educational situation through actions promoted by the community. For this, the networks are made up of nodes (educational or social agents) and connections (the relationships established between them) and depending on the exchange, the fluidity and multidirectionality of the connections, the networks have more or less potential.

In any case, establishing this collaborative culture is not an easy task, if we take into consideration the fact that individual aspects have an influence (individualistic or not very collaborative attitudes, interests, languages and work cultures that are very different) and

other management aspects (inefficient models or that are incapable of valuing the common objectives of its members). In this sense, the perspective of network governance is especially relevant for its proper development (Díaz-Gibson & Civís, 2011). We are particularly interested in going deeper into the demands of a horizontal management model (Díaz-Gibson, et al., 2013) where collaborative work among its agents is put into the context of interprofessional and interinstitutional collaboration, seeking to establish a culture of collaboration, connected to the collective and capable of going beyond sporadic collaborations (Gairín, 2000).

Within this context, we see varying degrees of commitment and, therefore, collaboration: from sharing information and resources to participating in common projects, establishing networks that work as a collective. It is precisely when there is a high degree of commitment and collaboration that we can talk about collective impact (Kania & Kramer, 2011), where agents have a common agenda for change that includes understanding the problem, the development of shared measurements for the evaluation of the results and the alignment of responsibility, as well as smooth communication processes.

We can consider different degrees of development of social intervention networks. Díaz-Gibson & Civís (2011) distinguish between the accumulative (connection maintaining total independence), distributive (connection of agents but not resources), interconnection (in addition to interconnection there are exchanges in both directions) and knowledge networks (there are common products, as well as exchanges). Networks can offer an alternative to the traditional organisational model, capable of integrating institutions and actors with responsibility in a theme, sharing analysis and needs and the projects of an area or community and coordinating actions comprehensively and coherently.

Finally, we cannot overlook how modern technology favours the development of networks and supports collaborative work among professionals. Although it should be considered as

additional support (Del Moral et al., 2007) which the members of a work group communicate, coordinate, and collaborate. In that sense, collaborative technology (groupware) permits the creation of documents, the classification of information and aids decision-making processes and any other function that assists work as a group.

Methods

It is an instrumental simple case study (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994) developed using a mixed method and explanatory sequential design (Creswell, 2013). Quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (interviews and discussion groups) data collection techniques have been designed and applied in order to understand the peculiarities and complexities of the case in its real context (Yin, 1994).

Selection of the case

The network analysed is the XAFIR (https://xafir.org/) that attends children and their families in the Raval neighbourhood of Barcelona city. Due to its trajectory and the achievements, it is a well-known network both in Barcelona and in other local contexts, as it has been capable of generating the necessary mechanisms and conditions to respond to the challenges presented in the immediate social context.

The Network has been selected for its interest and uniqueness (Stake, 1995), but also for the characteristics it shares with other types of interprofessional networks in the field of social intervention. The Network complies with the fundamental features indicated in the literature and research carried out in the field of social educational intervention (Brown, 2019; Figueroa, 2017; Marchioni, 1997; Nuñez, 2009; Ubieto, 2009) and that, in practice, make up a working network:

   a) From a cross-disciplinary position, the Network is born and is understood as seeking social transformation;

b) From a community position, it helps overcome the classic distinction between formal and informal areas or public and private ones;

c) From a complex approach, it addresses social problems from an intersectoral perspective;

d) From a community position and action, it suggests shared work processes among various professionals, services, and entities within the territory; and,

e) From a position of collective responsibility, the professionals within the Network have common challenges that must be addressed via shared work processes.

Presentation of the case

XAFIR has been in operation for more than 10 years in one of the most highly populated neighbourhoods of the city of Barcelona. The 2.93% of the residents of the city are concentrated here (47,986 inhabitants), with a population density that is above the average, and with 49.6% of the residents being foreigners. This depicts a complex social situation if we take the level of poverty and economic inequality into consideration. Furthermore, the area has one of the highest unemployment rates in the city of Barcelona (9.7%, 3.2 times more than the average in Barcelona) and the level of income is below the average with an index of 74.6% (Barcelona = 100). There is also a higher demand for attention at social services centres in the area, with 11% of the cases of the whole of Barcelona (Municipal Data Office [OMD] of Barcelona City Council, 2019).

Given the social reality of the neighbourhood, the Network was created for a collective demand of professionals from social, educational and health entities. They perceived the need for better coordination, cooperation and communication among professionals that intervene in the area. The objectives are offering a cross-sectional response to local families' needs, increasing knowledge of the children and families' realities, and making it easier for services and entities to cooperate. It has its own organisational structure (specialist team) that acts as a

central nucleus for decision-making and management, as well as various workspaces, such as plenary sessions, the case teams and the training spaces to foster the participation and implication of all of the services and entities in the area. Likewise, it has generated its own work methodology over the years that they use to address complex situations.

Currently, about 130 professionals participate in the Network from more than 25 different services and entities related to health, education, open centres, social services, teams dedicated to attending children and adolescents, as well as other services promoted by public Administration. The Network identifies itself as a collaborative network made up of professionals and institutions that work in the same geographical area.

Participants

We have collected opinions from people that are both internal and external to the Network, as well as those that benefit directly or indirectly from its actions. When referring to internal people we are talking about professionals from services and entities that form part of the Network and the external ones are professionals from services and entities that do not form part of the Network but that are within the same area of influence. The various people have participated by means of questionnaires, interviews and focus groups.

Fifty-two people answered the questionnaire, from a population of 130 professionals. The 56% are professionals that currently participate in the Network, with an average of 4 years and 10 months of association with the Network ($SD = 3.483$). By service and entity, 21.2% of the professionals are related to health services, 21.2% to open centres, 17.3% to social services, 11.5% to teams attending children and adolescents, 11.5% to other services promoted by public administration and the remaining 5.8% to other services attending families. In relation with the area of dependence of the service, 69.2% of the professionals work in public services, while the remaining percentage are related to private entities (30.8%).

Sixteen people were interviewed, guaranteeing a balanced representation of members from inside and outside of the specialist team, also incorporating the view of professionals outside of the Network (see Table 1). A non-probabilistic sampling was carried out for its selection by quotas.

Table 1.

In addition, two focus groups were held, one with professionals linked to entities and services ($n = 5$) and another with families ($n = 4$), aimed at deepening understanding and complementing information on key aspects identified in the previous situational questionnaires. The selection of the participants was carried out using a sampling based on convenience and accessibility.

Procedure

Three techniques were applied to gather data in two differentiated and sequential moments: In an initial phase, for the gathering of information (questionnaire) and, in a second phase, to contrast information (interviews and focus group).

The questionnaire was created "ad hoc" for the case study. It provides descriptive information regarding how professionals linked to the Network view the nine indicators (objectives, structure, actions, methodology, knowledge, coordination, relations, training and dissemination) grouped in three dimensions of analysis (methodological, knowledge and relations). In total, the participants evaluated 72 items using a four-point Likert scale.

The semi-structured interview was designed and applied once the first results of the questionnaire were analysed, for a deeper understanding of the meanings and views of the participants. The questions were grouped around the same dimensions of analysis of the questionnaire and refer to the nine indicators of the analysis. A different script was designed

for each profile: professionals within the specialist team, professionals from outside of the specialist team, professionals that have never participated in the Network but that form part of the local entities, and policymakers.

Finally, the focus groups made it possible to clarify some of the data collected from the questionnaires and interviews. The discussion topics were about the dimensions and indicators previously mentioned.

Analysis

The data gathered via the questionnaires was analysed by the SPSS version 20 statistics analysis programme for Windows. Given the final number, analysis of frequencies and averages have been carried out. The notes taken from the interviews and focus groups have been analysed using a deductive coding process based on the nine indicators and the three previously mentioned dimensions.

Results

We present the main results of the study in three sections. First, we describe the opinion that professionals have about the working order of the Network. Secondly, we identify the conditions for the proper function of a Network of this type, and we conclude with the analysis of the possibilities and limitations of interprofessional work as a network.

Working order of the Network

The professionals that participate in the Network confirm that they are aware of its objectives (86.5%). They consider that, over the more than 10 years of work, the initial objectives established have been reached (average mark of 3.15 on a scale of 4).

If we focus on the structure, the general opinion of the professionals is positive (see Table 2). They consider that having a specialist team and working with commissions is suitable as it promotes work as a network ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.70$) and the coordination between entities ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.64$).

Table 2.

The Network carries out many diverse actions and the professionals consider that working as a Network has "improved communication among professionals" ($M = 3.50, SD = 0.56$), "permitted action among services and entities" ($M = 3.47, SD = 0.56$) and "diminished professional isolation" ($M = 3.14, SD = 0.72$) (see Table 3). On the other hand, the Network is considered to have contributed, to a lesser extent, to "the unification of intervention protocols" ($M = 2.67, SD = 0.72$ and "improving the relationship with the children and families in the area" ($M = 2.67, SD = 0.63$).

Table 3.

The actions carried out have contributed to the improvement of "the collaborative creation of professional knowledge" ($M = 3.17, SD = 0.65$), "knowledge of other services and entities that work in the area" ($M = 3.15, SD = 0.54$), as well as "the degree of coordination among professionals" ($M = 3.13, SD = 0.66$) (see Table 4). To a lesser extent, it has helped to "satisfy the needs of the area by generating professional tools" ($M = 2.52, SD = 0.64$) and "knowledge of the reality via the creation of a permanent observatory" ($M = 2.63, SD = 0.74$).

Table 4.

Determining factors for the proper working order of the Network

There are three basic elements that have guaranteed and guarantee the permanence of the Network analysed over the years: Sharing common objectives, having a stable work structure and defining a framework of action for the Network, all based on communication, participation and mutual respect.

With regards to the first aspect, professionals share and know the objectives of the Network, although they are not entirely visible for external professionals. On the other hand, a clear commitment is identified on a personal level, but not so much on an institutional level, as some services and entities do not identify the Network's objectives as their own. In this regard, a professional from the specialist team believes that:

> The objectives are valid, but it is necessary to consider to what extent each of the participating institutions integrate them in their own objectives and ways of working. People participate and get involved because they are personally and professionally interested, but I get the impression that this is where the commitment ends.

As for the second aspect, the permanence of the Network is possible for the existence of a stable working structure where representation of the different fields of work is guaranteed. All services and entities can participate in commissions, case teams and groups on equal terms, creating various channels for decision making, participating and collaboration. The communication that has taken place in the different workspaces, mainly face to face, has contributed to the various services and entities and roles getting closer and of knowledge and recognition of the job that each of them carry out in the area. As an example, someone in a political role highlights:

> Having a common space for communication makes it possible to share experiences and concerns […] It is very positive for the professionals to have a more global view of the cases and the common problems.

With regards to the third aspect, the Network works to advance a project of collaboration and inter-service knowledge and entities that has improved the quality of interventions with children and families. The commissions, case teams and groups, as well as more informal gatherings, have put an end to the lack of coordination among services: Knowledge and mutual recognition among services and entities have been increased, points of view have been exchanged, processes for the detection of needs have been carried out as well as shared analysis of the area. The first protocols and instruments for shared intervention have been created and some protocols and action guidelines have been agreed upon. In this sense, a professional that is external to the specialist team states:

> What is enriching about working as a network is that there are many views of the same situation and everyone brings their own perspective to the discussion. But, when it comes to acting and making decisions, agreements are reached.

Possibilities and limitations of interprofessional work in a network

The improvement of coordination between the services and entities in the area was one of the main reasons for creating the Network. The objective has been achieved by creating trust and participation, but interprofessional work continues to face some challenges.

One of the main challenges is to organise the participation of the professionals in the Network as part of the work that they do within the framework of the service or entity they work for. Participating in the specialist team, case teams or work commissions should be an institutional decision and not an individual one, recognised as part of the roles and tasks that form part of that particular job. A professional from the specialist team states:

> To improve this is it necessary to dedicate time and space to coordination and not leave everything up to the good will of the professionals. Day-to-day life overwhelms us and prevents us from planning ahead, unless we put aside time in our schedules.

There must, therefore, be interest on behalf of the services and entities that goes beyond the mere presence or attendance due to the individual's initiative. A professional from the specialist team believes that:

It is important that the professional who participates in the specialist team is interested and with the ability to be a leader within their organisation.

Secondly, the network has generated and generates plenty of interprofessional knowledge that stays within the individual sphere and is not passed on to the group or organisation. The retention and socialisation of knowledge are seen as key elements for the permanence of the Network and the settling of a common view of the area. A professional external to the specialist team states that:

We have a lot of information, but it is not always well coordinated and transmitted.

Thirdly, the Network continues to act reactively, offering a limited response to the needs of the area. What is more, interprofessional work is only possible now in the most urgent cases and when all prior attempts to address the situation have failed. Preventive actions are also considered necessary which include the local families as well as the professionals. The Network must think about the ideal final scenario, overcoming formal mechanisms for coordination in order to move towards more professional and institutional models and that prioritise the children and families above the competition among the different services or entities or individual ways of working.

Discussion

The Network analysed has sufficient history and solidity to identify the conditions necessary to promote interprofessional work as a network. Its organisation and structure promote a set of workspaces that gather professionals from various services and entities, with different fields of knowledge, at the same time and in the same place. The case analysed is an example of a territorial network (Department of Social and Family Welfare, 2014) made up of

organisations that confront the same problems (Bremm & Drucks, 2018; Harasim et al, 2000) and that attend the same type of service users, sharing them on many occasions.

The XAFIR Network is a clear example of how improving communication between services that come from different cultures and work dynamics. Different languages and work processes does not have to be an obstacle to providing a response to a common objective (Agranoff & McGuire, 1999; Bremm & Drucks, 2018).

The degree of success achieved is not unrelated to the correct working order and development following good models of organisation: Shared objectives, common lines of action, a specific organisational structure with representatives of the services and entities of the area, with internal coordination mechanisms and decision making, time and spaces for exchange and coordination, promotion of joint action and internal-external dissemination channels. The existence of a positive and open atmosphere among professionals is also essential for exchange and participant implication (Ehren, 2018; Gairín, 2011, Molina & Maya, 2010).

While it is true that many institutions and organisations already have a certain history of networking, here we are interested in highlighting the aspects that can be used to improve models of networking and interprofessional intervention.

First and foremost, we refer to the risk that the interventions become fragmented into different areas, programmes, and professionals, making the processes more bureaucratic and losing sight of the user as the main reference. It is worth emphasising that the evaluative evidence is necessary about the impact decisions, procedures and actions by the network have on the needs and problems that initially justify its existence. Not having such assessments can lead to said fragmentation and digression.

Secondly, comes the need to review and integrate intervention models, ensuring maximum coherence in the philosophy, principles, and practices of the intervention. It is, without a doubt, a great challenge to create a space for permanent intersection between the action and

the professional role according to each organisational context and the action and functions promoted by the Network.

Thirdly and finally, we consider that a desirable collaboration network includes horizontal work models, which include dialogue and are based on trust and affective bonds (Díaz-Gibson et al., 2013). From the point of view of governance, interprofessional Networks should permit the exchange of knowledge and relationships, processes for detection and analysis of needs, as well as the design of some protocols and instruments for intervention. In turn, it is advisable to develop cross-disciplinary work and overcome organisational limitations of the entities and services within it.

In any case, it is possible to consider that networking is a way of doing things that is built upon every day and that requires creating relationships based on the situations that come up in everyday life. This also includes identifying, protecting and fuelling the spaces for meeting and common action, understanding that the dynamic within the processes and the interactions is above the organisational structures that, without devaluing them, can act as facilitators or limiters for collective work.

The core theme must be the objectives or strategic targets proposed, rather than the networking itself. The network makes no sense if it is not viewed in terms of what is done and achieved. It is true that efficiency and effectiveness do not make sense if a dysfunctional system creates tension that prevents moving forward, but it is also true that professional networks behave as such to the extent that they achieve specific objectives that are linked to their activity.

Perhaps the most important thing for final success is to participate in a common collaborative culture that favours and permits individual and collective learning and that links it to the needs of the activity. And the result is more fruitful if it is registered and ordered, allowing

other people to learn, as well as permitting social and institutional knowledge to settle and take root; going beyond the mere sporadic actions of professionals.

Even though we conducted a unique case study, the issues raised have already been evidenced in the literature for other areas (Araneda & Haramoto, 2017; Figueroa, 2017; Gairín, 2011; Rodríguez, 2015a) confirming its importance in the world of social intervention.

Table 1. Profile of the sample of participants in the interviews.

	Service Manager – Open centre – Private Entity Currently participates – 11 years of relations
	Specialist – Health – Public service Currently participates – 10 years of relations
Professionals of the specialist team (*n* = 6)	Specialist – Health – Private service Currently participates – 10 years of relations
	Specialist – Education – Public service Currently participates – 2 years of relations
	Street educator – Social services – Public service Currently participates – Has known XAFIR for years
	Social worker – Attending families – Public service Currently participates – Has known XAFIR for years
	Coordinator – Education – Private entity
	Specialist – Health – Public service
Professionals outside of the specialist team (*n* = 6)	Educator – Attending families – Public service
	Director – Education – Private entity
	Coordinator – Attending families – Public service
	Specialist – Social services – Public service
Professionals that have never participated in the Network, but that form part of the entities of the territory (*n* = 2)	Coordinator – Non-profit entity Has known the Network for 10 years Coordinator – Foundation – Third sector Has known the Network for 6 years
Political roles (*n* = 2)	District Counsellor District Counsellor

Table 2. Assessment of the structure of the Network.

Item	M *(SD)*
It is adequate	3.18 (0.46)
Helps improve the quality of the interventions in the field or work with children and families	3.03 (0.64)
Promotes maximum representation of the social network of children and families in the area	3.21 (0.70)
Promotes working as a network	3.36 (0.70)
Promotes coordination between entities	3.30 (0.64)

Table 3. Assessment of actions by the Network.

Item	M *(SD)*
The Network has improved / has permitted…	
Action between services and entities	3.47 (0.56)
Responding to children's and families' needs	2.92 (0.50)
Agree on criteria for analysis, action and assessment	2.97 (0.56)
Establish a common working methodology	2.89 (0.62)
Communication between professionals	3.50 (0.56)
Establish jointly agreed intervention plans	3.03 (0.56)
Unify intervention protocols	2.67 (0.72)
Joint supervision of cases	2.94 (0.67)
Intercultural management of the area	2.97 (0.74)
Go deeper into the needs of the local groups	3.11 (0.67)
Give cross-sectional responses to situations regarding children and families in the area	3.00 (0.68)
Improve the relationship with the children and the families in the area	2.67 (0.63)
Response to the needs in the area	2.78 (0.54)
Make the institutional field aware of the needs in the local area	2.75 (0.65)
Training of professionals that intervene in the area	3.11 (0.52)
Intervention of the services / entities that I work in	2.83 (0.65)
My professional intervention	2.72 (0.88)
Diminishing professional isolation	3.14 (0.72)

Table 4. Assessment of the knowledge generated around the Network.

Item	M *(SD)*
The Network has improved …	
The professionals' knowledge of the sociocultural reality of the area	3.06 (0.57)
The professionals' knowledge of the children's and families' realities	3.00 (0.49)
The collaborative creation of professional knowledge	3.17 (0.65)
As professionals, we share what we learn in the Network	3.00 (0.69)
Knowledge of the reality through the creation of a permanent observatory of local children's and families' situation.	2.63 (0.74)
Satisfaction of local needs through the generation of professional tools	2.52 (0.64)
The degree of coordination between professionals	3.13 (0.66)
My training	2.75 (0.76)
My knowledge of the social and family context	2.79 (0.70)
Interventions with children and families	2.65 (0.62)
Knowledge of other services and entities	3.15 (0.54)
Knowledge about the working method of other services and entities	2.96 (0.68)

References

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (1999). Expanding Intergovernmental Management's Hidden Dimensions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *29*(4), 352-369.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative Public Management; new strategies for local governments*. Georgetown University Press.

Araneda, P. & Haramoto, K. (2017). *Modelo de trabajo para redes de mejoramiento*. Centro de liderazgo para la mejora escolar.

Beneyto, S. (2015). *Entono familiar y rendimiento académico*. Editorial 3 Ciencias.

Bremm, N., & Drucks S. (2018). *Building up school to school networks using an evidence based approach*. Presented at the European Conference on Educational Research annual meeting, Bolzano (Italy), 4 to 7 September 2018.

Brown, C. (2019). Exploring the current context for Professional Learning Networks, the conditions for their success, and research needs moving forwards. *Emerald Open Research*, *1*(1), 1-21.

Carbonero, D., Raya, N., & Gimeno, C. (Coords.) (2016). *Respuestas transdisciplinares en una sociedad global, Aportaciones desde el Trabajo Social.* Universidad de la Rioja.

Civís, M. (2018). *Desenvolupar el potencial educatiu de la comunitat. Programa Educació 360*. Sesión 01/06/2018 (material fotocopiado).

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.·). Sage Publications.

Del Moral, A., Pazos, J., Rodríguez, E., Rodríguez-Patón, A., & Suárez, S. (2007). *Gestión del conocimiento*. Thomson.

Departament de Benestar Social i Família (2014). Guia facilitadora del treball en xarxa per a la inclusió social. Institut Català d'Assistència i Serveis Socials. *Papers, 28*, 1- 17.

Díaz-Gibson J., Civís, M., & Longás, J. (2013). La gobernanza de redes socioeducativas: claves para una gestión exitosa. *Revista Teoría de la Educación*, *25*(2), 213-230.

Díaz-Gibson, J., & Civís, M. (2011). Redes socioeducativas promotores de capital social en la comunidad: un marco teórico de referencia. *Cultura y Educación, 23*(3), 415-429

Ehren M. (2018, April 30). *Accountability and trust: two sides of the same coin?* [Invited talk recorded]. University of Oxford. Retrieved from https://mediacentral.ucl.ac.uk/Play/12187

Esquivel, C.I. (2013). *La familia, base fundamental en el rendimiento académico de los estudiantes en Educación Básica Primaria*. IDEAD; Universidad de Tolima (documento multicopiado).

Figueroa, C. (2017). tejeREDES. *Trabajo en red y sistemas de articulación colaborativos*. Autoedición. Retrieved from https://cpalsocial.org/documentos/445.pdf

Gairín, J. (2000). La colaboración entre centros educativos. In J. Gairín & P. Darder, *Portal Organización y gestión de centros educativos*. Barcelona: Wolters Kluwer.

Gairín, J. (2011) (Coord.). *El trabajo colaborativo en red. Actores y procesos en la creación y gestión del conocimiento colectivo*. DaVinci Continental

González, K., & Jaraíz, G. (2012). La intervención social. Una mirada desde esquemas de complejidad. In E. Ruiz, & J.L. Solans (Eds.), *Complejidad y Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 263-293). UNIA.

Harasim, L., Rozanne, S., Turoff, M., &Teles, L. (2000). *Redes de aprendizaje. Guía para la enseñanza y aprendizaje en red.* Gedisa.

Iglesias, E. (2017). Claves teórico-prácticas para el desarrollo de estrategias educativas de base comunitaria. In El M. Homrani, F., Peñafiel, F., & A. Hernández, A., *Entornos y estrategias educativas para la inclusión social* (pp. 125-132). Granada: Comares.

Iglesias, E., Sánchez-Romero, C., & Castillo, S. (2017). La dimensión comunitaria como factor de prevención del abandono escolar. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, *8*(1), 214-225.

Kangpeng, S. (2014). *Servant Leadership: The Approach*, *Theory, and Reasearch*. Apichat Printing.

Kania, J. & Kramer, K. (2011). Collective Impact. *Stanford social innovation review,* 1-66.

López-Peláez, A., & Segado, S. (2012). Personas, grupos, sociedades: perspectivas para la intervención social comunitaria en el siglo XXI. In J. Fombuena (Coord.), *El trabajo social y sus instrumentos: elementos para una interpretación 'a piacere'* (pp. 227-248). Nau Llibres.

Marchioni, M. (1997). *Planificación Social y Organización de la Comunidad. Alternativas avanzadas a la crisis*. Editorial Popular.

Marchioni, M. (2004). *La acción social en y con la comunidad*. Libros Certeza.

Milward, B., & Provan, K. (2006). *A Manager's Guide to Choosing and Using Collaborative Networks*. IBM Center for the Business of Government. Retrieved from http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/ProvanReport.pdf

Molina, J.L., & Maya, I. (Eds.) (2010). Elementos para el trabajo en red. Apuntes desde el análisis de redes sociales. *Redes. Revisa Hispana para el Análisis de Redes Sociales*, volumen especial, 1-116.

Mondragón, J. & Trigueros, I. (2004*). Intervención con menores. Acción socioeducativa*. Narcea.

Mourshed, M., Chijioke, C., & Barber, M. (2012). *How the World's Most-improved School Systems Keep Getting Better*. McKinsey & Co.

Mueller, S. & Toutain, O. (2015). The outward looking school and its ecosystem. *Entrepreneurship 360. Thematic paper, OECD*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Outward-Looking-School-and-Ecosystem.pdf

Municipal Data Office [OMD] of Barcelona City Council (Oficina Municipal de Datos [OMD]) (2018). *El Raval. Ciutat Vella. Juny de 2018.* Ajuntament de Barcelona, Gabinet Tècnic de Programació. Retrieved from https://www.bcn.cat/estadistica/catala/documents/barris/01_CV_Raval_2018.pdf

Muñoz, G. (2014). La intervención social interdisciplinar en Chile. *Intervención, 3*, 19-29.

Nuñez, J.C. (2009). Motivación, aprendizaje y rendimiento académico. In B. D. Silva, L. S. Almeida, A.P. Barca & M. Peralbo (Coords.), *Actas del X Congreso Internacional Galego-Portugués de Psicopedagogía* (pp. 41-67). Centro de Investigación en Educación (CIEd)-Universidade do Minho.

O'Leary, R. & Bingham, L. (2009). *The collaborative public manager: New ideas for the twenty first century*. Georgetown University Press.

Ortega, M. B. (2015). Trabajo social como transdisciplina: hacia una teoría de la intervención. *Cinta de Moebio, 54*, 278-289.

Ortiz, M.J. (2014). *Desarrollo afectivo y social*. Pirámide.

Pascual, L. (2010). *Educación, familia y escuela: el desarrollo infantil y el rendimiento escolar*. Homo Sapiens.

Renée, M. & McAlister, S. (2011). *The Strengths and Challenges of Community Organizing as an Education Reform Strategy: What the Research Says*. Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University. Retrieved from https://www.myctb.org/wst/CEJ/SiteAssets/The%20Strengths%20and%20Challenges%20of%20Community%20Organizing%20as%20an%20Education%20Reform%20Strategy.pdf

Rodríguez, M. D. (2015a). El trabajo social comunitario en el ámbito local: protagonismo colectivo y nuevas realidades de convivencia. *Documentación Social, 173*, 189-204.

Rodríguez, M.D. (2015b). Redes profesionales e interdisciplinariedad en trabajo social comunitario: una respuesta integral a problemas sociales multidiscplinares. *Zerbitzuan, 58,* 41-50.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications.

Ubieto, J. R. (2007). Modelos de trabajo en red. *Educación social, 36*, 26-39.

Ubieto, J. R. (2009). *El trabajo en red. Usos posibles en Educación, Salud Mental y Servicios Sociales*. Gedisa.

Unda, R., Mayer, L., & Llanos, D. (2015). *Socialización: procesos, experiencias y trayectos*. Universidad Politécnica Salesiana.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research design and methods*. Sage publications.