
Citation:

Bagnall, A and South, J and Mitchell, B and Pilkington, G and Newton, R and Salvatore, DM (2017) Systematic scoping review of indicators of community wellbeing in the UK. Documentation. What Works Centre for Wellbeing.

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/5238/>

Document Version:

Monograph (Published Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Systematic scoping review of indicators of community wellbeing in the UK

VERSION 1.2

August 2017

Review team

Anne-Marie Bagnall¹, Jane South¹, Ben Mitchell², Gerlinde Pilkington³, Rob Newton¹,
Salvatore Di Martino¹

¹ Centre for Health Promotion Research, Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, Leeds Beckett University

² The Retail Institute, Faculty of Business and Law, Leeds Beckett University

³ Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool

info@whatworkswellbeing.org

[@whatworksWB](https://twitter.com/whatworksWB)

whatworkswellbeing.org

Background.....	3
Aims.....	5
Methods	5
Search strategy	6
Inclusion criteria	6
Study selection	7
Data extraction	7
Results.....	9
Literature search results	9
Map of indicators	10
Conclusions and next steps	18
References	18
APPENDIX A: Search strategy.....	20
APPENDIX B: List of included resources	23
APPENDIX C: Table of included resources.....	27

About the What Works Centre for Wellbeing

- **Our vision** is of a future where the wellbeing of people and communities improves year on year and wellbeing inequalities are reduced.
- **Our mission** is to develop and share robust, accessible and useful evidence that governments, businesses, communities and people can use to improve wellbeing across the UK.
- **Our approach** is independent, evidence based, collaborative, practical, open and iterative.

Acknowledgements

This scoping review was produced by the Communities Evidence Programme team for the What Works Centre for Wellbeing. All members of the Communities consortium have had a chance to comment on drafts and we would like to acknowledge their input, in particular Ian Bache, Hannah Wheatley, Annie Quick and Nicola Bacon.

This review is a working document and further indicators will be added in future iterations.

Background

This review has been commissioned by the What Works Centre for Wellbeing (WWCW), part of a network of What Works Centres. The WWCW aims to understand what governments, businesses, communities and individuals can do to improve wellbeing. This review forms part of the Communities Evidence Programme, which was established to synthesise the evidence on the factors that determine individual and community wellbeing.

The Communities Evidence Programme team in the WWCW have identified a gap in the existing knowledge about measures and indicators of community wellbeing. While there are many well-known scales and measures of individual wellbeing, such as the Life Satisfaction Scale and the Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS), community wellbeing is less well defined as a concept, and indicators and frameworks that measure a community's wellbeing may not be described as such.

To address the gaps in the knowledge base, the Communities Evidence Programme has conducted this rapid scoping review of the indicators, frameworks and measures of community wellbeing (and synonyms or proxies for community wellbeing) used by UK governmental and non-governmental agencies in the last 5 years. We have produced a working document that lists the indicators, frameworks and measures identified, while making reference to the theories and concepts that underpin them (if any). This will then be updated as the evidence review teams conduct systematic reviews of the topic areas in the community wellbeing evidence programme over the next two years. It will also contribute to and complement the working Theory of Change model that is being developed by the WWCW Communities Evidence Programme (South et al. 2017).

Wellbeing is increasingly used to measure how well individuals, communities, and nations are performing. Since 2010 the UK government has sought to use measures of wellbeing alongside existing measures such as GDP, and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) has developed the Measuring National Wellbeing programme to measure wellbeing, a framework of measures including economic performance, quality of life, the state of the environment, sustainability, equality, as well as individual wellbeing¹. However, these measures may not directly capture wellbeing at the community level.

1

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_2_87415.pdf

Community wellbeing is a complex concept, with no agreed definition(s), and many related concepts. A six month stakeholder engagement programme carried out by the Communities Evidence Programme (2015, p. 11), which involved questionnaires, stakeholder workshops, community sounding boards and interviews with policy makers, identified community wellbeing as being primarily “about strong networks of relationships and support between people in a community” and being able to “improve things in, and influence decisions about, their community”. These are very general and broad definitions which may cover a variety of measures and concept defined in different ways across different academic disciplines or governmental departments. This review aims to contribute to the understanding of community wellbeing, and related concepts, and provide more specific definition(s) for policy-makers.

There may be many “proxy” indicators used to describe community wellbeing, ranging from whole area indicators, some based on population data (such as certain aspects of health) and some not (such as access to green space), to instruments, usually based on local sample survey data, that seek to measure aspects of social capital such as trust or levels of crime, to aggregate scores of individual wellbeing across a geographic area (such as the ONS ANS survey indicators of self-reported wellbeing).

A recent systematic review of measurement tools used for evaluating health and wellbeing in community-based interventions provides a good starting point, but used a narrow definition of wellbeing (e.g. excluded items on crime, poverty and environment), included only tools used in multiple research studies, and was not specific to the UK (Dronavalli and Thompson 2015). Five tools were rated as “excellent” by this review: the Quality of Life Scale (QOLS (Burckhardt & Anderson 2003)); the Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI (International Wellbeing Group 2013)); the Community Wellbeing Index (CWI (Forjaz et al. 2011)); the WHO Quality of Life – Brief (WHOQOL-BREF (Amir et al. 2000)) and the Health Related Quality of Life from the Dartmouth Co-operative Information Project/ World Organisation of National Colleges, Academies and Academic Associations of General Practices/ Family Physicians Charts (HRQOL from COOP/WONCA Charts (Martin-Diaz et al. 2006)). Of these, the Community Wellbeing Index (Forjaz et al. 2011) is the only one that meets our definition of community wellbeing, being not solely about individuals’ wellbeing but about their evaluation of their community. It comprises three subscales: community services; community attachment’ and physical and social environment.

Aims

The aim of this rapid systematic scoping review was to compile a list of all the indicators and proxies used to measure community wellbeing, or concepts related to community wellbeing, used by academic institutions, governmental and non-governmental agencies in the UK, in the last 5 years.

Review questions

1. What indicators and proxy indicators are used by governmental agencies to measure and report on community wellbeing in the UK?
2. What indicators and proxy indicators are used by non-governmental agencies (including academic institutions) to measure community wellbeing in the UK?
3. What outcome measures/indicators are used in the evaluation of community wellbeing in the UK?
4. What theories and concepts are used to describe community wellbeing and how are they applied in measurement and evaluation in the UK?
5. What indicator frameworks are used in the measurement of community wellbeing and how are indicators grouped in the UK?

Methods

Due to the broad nature of the research questions and the timescales, a rapid scoping review was carried out to collate an initial set of indicators, frameworks, and measures (including proxy measures) used in the UK in the last 5 years.

Traditional systematic review methodology (Centre for Reviews & Dissemination, 2009) was used to identify relevant evidence from appropriate sources, to select appropriate publications for inclusion based on pre-defined inclusion criteria, and during the data extraction stage, however unlike a traditional systematic review, there was no pooling of data (Thomas et al. 2013).

The results were tabulated and are presented as a narrative summary, grouped by type of organisation and type of indicator. We examined whether there was a difference in indicators used by governmental and non-governmental agencies, and also presented indicators used for each synonym (e.g. social capital; community cohesion; city liveability) of community wellbeing.

Search strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was developed to identify as broad a range of published literature as possible.

Electronic databases: The following databases were searched from 2010 – 2016: IDOX, CINAHL, PsycINFO, MEDLINE, Social Policy and Practice.

Web searching: We also searched a large number of websites of relevant organisations. See Appendix A for full search strategy.

Contacts: We contacted our consortium partners to ask for information on indicators that they use for community wellbeing.

Inclusion criteria

Evidence was included in the review if it met the following criteria:

Population: Communities of interest or of place in the UK (community-related, as defined by the authors of the article *i.e.* if a publication defined itself as measuring something at community level, we included it). We have also included local, regional or national measures of wellbeing, so long as these include domains that relate to proxies for community wellbeing (such as “neighbourhood satisfaction” or “fear of crime”) rather than individual wellbeing alone.

Intervention: Measurement (of community wellbeing) by governmental or non-governmental UK agencies, including research and evaluation studies

Outcomes: Indicators or proxy indicators of wellbeing, at community level.

Study design: Policy documents, evaluations and research studies carried out by governmental and non-governmental agencies (including academic institutions)

Study selection

Results from the electronic searches were uploaded to systematic reviewing software EPPI-Reviewer 4 (Thomas et al. 2010). Titles and abstracts were screened by one of five reviewers (AMB, RN, BM, GP, SDM) to identify potentially relevant articles. To establish consensus, the whole team first screened the same random 10%. Disagreements were resolved through discussion with the wider team. Second, full-text copies of potentially relevant articles were obtained, and assessed for inclusion based on the criteria discussed above. Articles not meeting the criteria were excluded from the review.

Data extraction

Data were extracted by one reviewer into EPPI-Reviewer, with a random 10% checked by a second reviewer. Data were extracted into the following categories: Study ID; organisation/ agency; governmental/ non-governmental/ academic; community (description of population); description of outcome measured (community wellbeing or related concept); indicators used; level of measurement (see below).

Evaluation and measurement may be at a number of levels, ranging from conceptual frameworks that unpack the core areas, or domains of measurement, through to validated instruments that provide a scale or set of measures. A ladder of measurement has been developed as an interim tool to aid the mapping and help categorise the purpose, application and level of specificity of identified frameworks².

² This framework is currently being piloted as part of a literature review examining the evaluation of asset-based approaches.

Table 1: Ladder of measurement


Rungs	Ladder of measurement	What do they do?
1	Conceptual frameworks	Unpack complex constructs into different concepts/elements Provide definitions and may link to validated tools
2	Evaluation frameworks	Provide guidance on what can be measured and how to go about evaluation Frameworks often provide categories or domains of measurement. They can be used to identify measures or to guide data collection and report outcomes
3	Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans	These identify the expected outcomes – short, medium and long term of specific interventions or types of intervention
4	Indicator sets or indicator frameworks	Lists of defined outcomes that could change due to an intervention/type of intervention This can be at population level (e.g. local government indicators) or more specific to an intervention or service Proxy indicators show change in a related outcome using an aspect that is easier to measure than the actual thing
5	Measures and scales	These specify components that can be measured quantitatively. A single indicator can be broken down to a number of measures These may be validated (e.g. social capital or WEMWBS) or non-validated measures/scales Often the terms indicator and measure are used synonymously
6	Validated tools or instruments or question sets	The questionnaires or groups of questions that can be used in evaluation, usually administered through survey

Results

Literature search results

6,494 titles and abstracts were screened, 368 retrieved in full and screened in more detail, and 30 articles were included, along with 14 articles from website searches or expert consensus, making 47 included sources and 43 included indicators or measures in total (see Appendix B for a full list, and Appendix C for details of each included resource). See Figure 1 for study selection process.

Figure 1: Study selection flow chart



Map of indicators

Table 2 presents a matrix of indicators used by governmental, non-governmental and academic organisations.

Governmental indicators (14): Fourteen different indicator sets were developed or used by governmental bodies, from England, Scotland and Wales. These comprised mostly indicator frameworks such as the Public Health Outcomes Framework (Department of Health 2012); ONS Measuring National Wellbeing Programme (Siegler 2015a & b); Cardiff Partnership Board Performance Indicators (City of Cardiff Council 2015); Digital Inclusion Outcomes Framework (Government Digital Service Digital Inclusion Research Working Group 2015); GCPH community profile indicators (Glasgow Centre for Population Health 2014); OECD regional wellbeing framework (OECD 2014); Academy for Sustainable Communities (<http://www.ascskills.org.uk/who-we-are.html>); and also validated questionnaires such as the Living in Wales Survey (Hillcoat-Nalletamby 2014); GoWell Community Health & Wellbeing survey (GoWell 2010).

Governmental bodies also used delivery frameworks or models such as the Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) (Foot 2012); DCLG cohesion delivery framework (DCLG 2010); Wellbeing Goals (Welsh Assembly 2015); as well as conceptual frameworks and logic models such as the PHE/ NHSE guide to community centred approaches (Public Health England & NHS England 2015); Community Asset Programme Outcomes Framework (Rocket Science UK Ltd 2010).

Non-governmental indicators (12): Twelve non-governmental organisations presented indicators or measures, some of which were developed or used in collaboration with governmental and/ or academic organisations. Many were conceptual frameworks with practical applications for assessment and/or delivery, such as the Happy City Index (Happy City 2016); Think Local Act Personal Outcomes (Wilton 2012); the Local Wellbeing Project (Bacon et al. 2010); Head, hands and Heart (Hopkins & Rippon 2015); RSA framework (RSA 2016); Building Stronger Communities (Scottish Community Development Centre).

Some were indicator frameworks, such as five headline indicators of national success (Jeffrey & Michaelson 2015), Oxfam Humankind Index (Oxfam 2016); Family friendly indicators (Rutter 2015).

Some were delivery frameworks, such as the RSA Connected Communities approach (Parsfield et al. 2015), and the DCLG cohesion delivery framework (DCLG 2010).

Academic indicators (14): 14 measures or indicators from academic sources were identified. These were:

Conceptual frameworks or logic models: Evolutionary resilience of a place (Mehmood 2016); Neighbourhood workforce development & community capacity (Hudson & Henwood 2010); Model for links between social & digital exclusion (Helsper 2012); objective & subjective indicators of community wellbeing (Prillitsensky 2012); Andrews 2011 statistical model of organisational and community social capital (Andrews 2011).

Indicator frameworks: GCPH community profile indicators (Glasgow Centre for Population Health 2014); Toronto indicators of community capacity (mentioned in Foot 2012); Governmental “floor targets” (Lupton et al. 2013); Audit commission’s local quality of life indicator set (Campanera & Higgins 2011).

Validated measures or scales: Measures used in Well London (social integration, collective efficacy, fear of crime (Phillips et al. 2014)); Living in Wales survey (Hillcoat-Nalattamby 2014); Wind & Komproe 2012: SA-SCAT to measure social capital (Harpham et al. 2002), collective efficacy scale (Sampson et al. 1997), residential stability; Baumgartner 2015 systematic review of social inclusion scales.

And one evaluation framework was used in a systematic review of community engagement (Milton 2012).

Table 2: Matrix of indicators by type of organisation

	Governmental	NGO	Academic
Indicator frameworks	Public Health Outcomes Framework (Department of Health 2012); ONS Measuring National Wellbeing Programme (Sieglar 2015a & b); Cardiff Partnership Board Performance Indicators (City of Cardiff Council 2015); Digital Inclusion Outcomes Framework (Government Digital Service Digital Inclusion Research Working Group 2015);	Five headline indicators of national success (Jeffrey & Michaelson 2015); Oxfam Humankind Index (Oxfam 2016); Family friendly indicators (Rutter 2015);	GCPH community profile indicators (Glasgow Centre for Population Health 2014); Toronto indicators of community capacity (mentioned in Foot 2012); Governmental “floor targets” (Lupton et al. 2013); Audit commission’s

	<p>GCPH community profile indicators (Glasgow Centre for Population Health 2014);</p> <p>OECD regional wellbeing framework (OECD 2014);</p> <p>Academy for Sustainable Communities (http://www.ascskills.org.uk/who-we-are.html);</p>		<p>local quality of life indicator set (Campanera & Higgins 2011);</p>
Delivery frameworks	<p>Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) (Foot 2012);</p> <p>DCLG cohesion delivery framework (DCLG 2010);</p> <p>Wellbeing Goals (Welsh Assembly 2015);</p>	<p>RSA Connected Communities approach (Parsfield et al. 2015),</p> <p>DCLG cohesion delivery framework (DCLG 2010);</p>	
Conceptual frameworks and logic models	<p>PHE/ NHSE guide to community centred approaches (Public Health England & NHS England 2015);</p> <p>Community Asset Programme Outcomes Framework (Rocket Science UK Ltd 2010).</p>	<p>Happy City Index (Happy City 2016);</p> <p>Think Local Act Personal Outcomes (Wilton 2012);</p> <p>The Local Wellbeing Project (Bacon et al. 2010);</p> <p>Head, hands and Heart (Hopkins & Rippon 2015);</p> <p>RSA framework (RSA 2016);</p> <p>Building Stronger Communities (Scottish Community Development Centre);</p>	<p>Evolutionary resilience of a place (Mehmood 2016);</p> <p>Neighbourhood workforce development & community capacity (Hudson & Henwood 2010);</p> <p>Model for links between social & digital exclusion (Helsper 2012);</p> <p>Objective & subjective indicators of community wellbeing (Prillitensky 2012);</p> <p>Andrews 2011 statistical model of organisational and community social capital (Andrews 2011)</p>
Validated scales/questionnaires	<p>Living in Wales Survey (Hillcoat-Nalletamby 2014);</p> <p>GoWell Community Health & Wellbeing survey (GoWell 2010)</p>		<p>Measures used in Well London (social integration, collective efficacy, fear of crime (Phillips et al. 2014));</p> <p>Living in Wales survey (Hillcoat-Nalatomby 2014);</p> <p>Wind & Komproe 2012: SA-SCAT to measure social capital (Harpham et al. 2002), collective efficacy scale (Sampson et al. 1997), residential stability;</p> <p>Baumgartner 2015 systematic review of social inclusion scales;</p>
Evaluation frameworks			<p>Systematic review of community engagement</p>

			(Milton 2012)
--	--	--	---------------

Concepts

We found only a few sources that directly referred to “community wellbeing” as a concept (Happy City 2016; Prilleltensky 2012; Rutter 2015; PHE & NHSE 2015; GoWell 2010). Those that did included governmental, non-governmental and academic sources. On the other hand, a range of other terms were used, which we considered to be in line with the concept of community wellbeing (Table 3). This presence of different conceptualizations of community wellbeing was to be expected, as in the academic literature community wellbeing is presented as a construct with various meanings, and it is proposed to be almost counterproductive to attempt to pinpoint it with a one size fits all definition (see Lee & Kim, 2015). However, despite the different terms used, all the studies included in this report share a common understanding of what makes a community a good place to live and thrive. Moreover, they are all concerned with different aspects of wellbeing at the community level of analysis. Perhaps, the only exception could be the concept of social inclusion, which seems to relate mostly to individual level indicators of inclusion in the community, rather than a community level measure. However, as already stated, our aim was to cover the great complexity of community wellbeing indicators, and in order to do so we followed an inclusive strategy. Therefore, we have included ‘social inclusion’, at least for the time being.

The 47 documents included in our review, provided a total of 273 raw indicators of community wellbeing. These were first categorized and then grouped by similarity into 25 categories/domains of community wellbeing (Fig. 2). A frequency analysis shows that the most reported indicators accounted for the health and wellbeing domain (11%). These findings are consistent with those reported by Campanera and Higgins (2011), who found health and social wellbeing to be the most important dimension in their definition of Quality of Life patterns in England (p. 159).

On the other side of the spectrum, co-production (1%) and trust (1%) rarely figured as possible domains of community wellbeing. A possible explanation is that the former is a relatively recent term that refers to an emerging area of investigation, which is still not often linked to the concept of community well-being. On the other hand, trust is a well-established concept in the sociological and public health literature. However, in the indicators included in our review, trust is more often recognized as a component of social capital rather than as a community wellbeing indicator in itself.


Table 3: List of synonyms used, and their sources:

<i>List of synonyms for Community wellbeing</i>	• <i>Sources</i>
Community wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy City Index (Happy City 2016) • Prilleltensky 2012
Family & community wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family & Childcare Trust (Rutter 2015)
Local wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young Foundation (Bacon et al. 2010) • Regional wellbeing (OECD 2014)
Community health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHE & NHSE (2015) • GoWell (2010)
Asset based approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head, hands & heart (Hopkins & Rippon 2015) • community assets (Rocket Science UK Ltd 2010)
Public/ Community health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHOF (Department of Health 2012) • Health & Wellbeing Index (GCPH 2012)

<i>List of synonyms for Community wellbeing</i>	• Sources
Social outcomes: social integration; collective efficacy; fear of crime	• Well London (Phillips et al. 2014)
Resilience: Evolutionary resilience of a place	• Mahmood 2016 • Wellbeing and Resilience Measure (WARM) (Foot 2012)
Neighbourhood satisfaction	• Living in Wales survey (Hillcoat-Nalletamby 2014)
Neighbourliness	• Hudson & Henwood 2012
Social capital	• ONS Measuring Wellbeing Programme (Siegler 2015 a & b) • Wind & Komproe 2012 • Andrews 2011 • Wilton 2012 (Think Local Act Personal) • Govt digital inclusion working group (2015)
Community capital	• RSA connected communities (Parsfield et al. 2015)
Social inclusion	• Baumgartner & Burns 2014
Social & digital inclusion/exclusion	• Helsper 2012
Community engagement	• Milton et al. 2012 • Govt digital inclusion working group (2015) • DoH (volunteering) (Department of Health 2011)
Community cohesion	• DCLG 2010 • Hewes & Buonfino 2010
Community development	• Lupton et al. 2013

<i>List of synonyms for Community wellbeing</i>	• Sources
National success	• NEF 5 headline indicators (Jeffrey & Michaelson 2015)
Social settlement	• NEF
City liveability	• Cardiff City Council (2015)
Sustainable community	• Academy for sustainable communities
Sustainable development	• Welsh Assembly (2015)
Social change	• RSA
Community capacity building	• Building stronger communities (Scottish Community Development Centre) • Hudson & Henwood 2012
Community prosperity	• Oxfam Humankind Index (Oxfam Scotland 2013)

Figure 2: Domains included in UK indicators for community wellbeing (and related concepts)



Conclusions and next steps

This is the first iteration of a working document compiling and indexing community wellbeing indicators that are used in the UK. The “live” review is intended to grow throughout the life of the What Works Centre for Wellbeing; as further measures are identified in systematic reviews or by stakeholder engagement, they will be added.

In the current version, we found 43 measures or indicators of community wellbeing that are currently or recently in use in the UK. Governmental organisations were more likely to use indicator frameworks or sets, while non-governmental or academic organisations were more likely to use conceptual frameworks. Academic organisations were the most likely of the 3 organisational types to use validated measures or scales. There was a wide range of synonyms or proxy terms used relating to community wellbeing, and we have begun to map these against the domains included within them. This scoping review and mapping exercise will complement other work being undertaken by the What Works Wellbeing Communities Evidence Programme: developing a working Theory of Change for community wellbeing, and reviewing the conceptual literature on community wellbeing.

References

- Amir M, Marcelo F, Herrman H, Lomachenkov A, Lucas R, Patrick D, LIDO Group. (2000). Reliability, validity and reproducibility of the WHOQOL-BREF in six countries. *Quality of Life Research*, 9, pp.320.
- Burckhardt C, Anderson K. (2003). The Quality of Life Scale (QOLS): reliability, validity and utilization. *Health Quality of Life Outcomes*, 60, pp.1-7.
- International Wellbeing Group (2013). *Personal Wellbeing Index: 5th Edition*. Melbourne: Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University. <http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/acqol/instruments/wellbeing-index/index.php>
- Dronavalli M, Thompson SC. (2015). A systematic review of measurement tools of health and wellbeing for evaluating community-based interventions. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 69, pp.805-815.
- Forjaz MJ, Prieto-Flores ME, Ayala A, Rodriguez-Blazquez C, Fernandez-Mayoralas G, Rojo-Perez F, Martinez-Martin P. (2011). Measurement properties of the Community Wellbeing Index in older adults. *Quality of Life Research*, 20, pp.733-43.
- Lee, S. J., & Kim, Y. (2015). Searching for the meaning of community well-being. In S. J. Lee, Y. Kim, & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Community Well-Being and Community Development* (pp. 9-23). New York: Springer.

Martin-Diaz F, Reig-Ferrer A, Ferrer-Cascales R. (2006). Assessment of health-related quality of life in chronic dialysis patients with the COOP/WONCA Charts. *Nephron Clinical Practice*, 104, pp.c7-c14.

South J, Abdallah S, Bagnall A, Curtis C, Newton R, Pennington A, Corcoran R (2017). *Building community wellbeing – an initial theory of change*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool.

Thomas J, Brunton J, and Graziosi S (2010). *EPPI-Reviewer 4: software for research synthesis*, EPPI-Centre Software, London: Social Science Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education.

Thomas J, Newman M, Oliver S. (2013). Rapid evidence assessments of research to inform social policy: taking stock and moving forward. *Evidence & Policy*; 9, pp.5-27.

APPENDIX A: Search strategy

1. Indicators: measur* or indicator* or evaluat* or prox* or outcome* or impact or value or output* or sign* or symptom* or evidence or quantif* or scale* or metric* or statistic* or score or standard* or assessment or target* or profile* or rating or data or framework or index or benefit* or evidence or instrument or profil* or strateg* or planning or descriptor* or trend* or forecast* or dimension or domain or theme or theor* or concept*
2. Community: communit* or neighbour* or neighbor* or local* or public or social or civic or coproduc* or “asset-based” or citizen* or volunteer* or network* or grassroot* or residen* or area or urban or rural
3. Wellbeing: “well-being” or wellbeing or “quality of life” or happiness or satisfaction or “positive mental health” or wellness or healthy or “physical welfare” or contentment or “purpose in life” or flourish* or prosper* or resilien* or contentment or “self-esteem” or “positive relations” or autonomy or “overall health” or belonging or connection* or fulfil* or connectedness or participation or involvement or inclusion or cohesion or loneliness or isolation or exclusion
 - a. (good adj4 health)
 - b. ((“sense of” or “feeling of”) adj2 (equality or respect or appreciat* or control or achievement or coherence or safe*))

Strategy:

- 1 and (2 adj? 3)
- 1 and 2 and 3a
- 1 and 2 and 3b

Websites: we looked at the websites of the following organisations:

Academy for Sustainable Communities <http://www.ascskills.org.uk/what-we-do.html>

Altogether Better www.altogetherbetter.org.uk

American Public Health Association

Bath University – School for Health <http://www.bath.ac.uk>

BIG Lottery wellbeing evaluation

Bromley by Bow Centre <http://www.bbbs.org.uk>

Carnegie UK Trust

Centre for Salutogenesis, University West, Trollhattan, Norway
www.salutogenesis.hv.se/eng

Charities evaluation service <http://www.ces-vol.org.uk>

Communities in Action Enterprises <http://www.communitiesinaction.org>

Community Catalysts. www.communitycatalysts.co.uk

Community Development Exchange <http://www.cdx.org.uk>

Community Development Foundation <http://www.cdf.org.uk>

Community Health Exchange <http://www.scdc.org.uk>

Community Health Involvement and Empowerment Forum <http://www.chiefcic.com>

Department of Communities and Local Government

Department of Communities and Local Government – Community empowerment division
<http://www.togetherwecan.direct.gov.uk>

Durham University – School of Applied Social Science <http://www.dur.ac.uk/sass>

ESRC research investments: health and wellbeing <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/research/major-investments/health-wellbeing.aspx>

Happy City

[Health and Wellbeing Boards \(e.g. Wakefield, Leeds...\)](#)

Health Empowerment Leverage Project (HELP) www.healthempowerment.co.uk

Health Foundation <http://www.health.org.uk/?gclid=CKzCtrWsnCSFUyeGwodAtQCew>

Home Office

Improvement foundation – healthy community collaborative
<http://www.improvementfoundation.org>

Institute of Equity – Marmot review

Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Lancaster University – School of Health and Medicine <http://www.lancs.ac.uk>

Liverpool University – Institute of Psychology, health and society <http://www.liv.ac.uk>

Local Government Association – health <http://www.local.gov.uk/health>

Locality

London School of Economics – Personal Social Services Research Unit <http://www.lse.ac.uk>

National Council for Voluntary Organisations <http://www.ncvo-vol.org.uk>

NESTA Realising the Value <http://www.nesta.org.uk/event/realising-value> and also People Powered health

New Economics Foundation <http://www.neweconomics.org>

NHS Health Scotland <http://www.healthscotland.com>

NICE – public health evidence <http://www.nice.org.uk/localgovernment/localgovernment.jsp>

NIHR Public Health Research programme <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/phr>

NIHR School for Public Health Research <http://www.sphr.nihr.ac.uk>

[Northampton University – Institute of Health and Wellbeing](#)

Pickering Institute Europe <http://www.pickereurope.org>

Public Health Agency (for Northern Ireland) - Health and social wellbeing improvement
<http://www.publichealth.hscni.net/directorate-public-health/health-and-social-wellbeing-improvement>

Public Health England <http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england>

Royal Society for Public Health <http://www.rsph.org.uk>

Royal Society of Arts (especially Connected Communities project)

SCIE library

The King's Fund – public health and inequalities <http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/topics/public-health-and-inequalities>

Think Local Act personal – building community capacity (BCC)
www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/BCC/

Turning Point <http://www.turning-point.co.uk>

UK Faculty of Public Health <http://www.fph.org.uk/>

University of Central Lancashire – International school for communities, rights and inclusion
<http://www.uclan.ac.uk>

Well London www.welllondon.org.uk

Welsh Assembly website

APPENDIX B: List of included resources

Academy for sustainable communities: <http://www.ascskills.org.uk/who-we-are.html>

Aked J, Michaelson J, Steuer N. (2010). The role of local government in promoting wellbeing. London: Local Government Improvement and Development. <http://www.ritimo.org/IMG/pdf/The-2.pdf>

Andrews R. (2011). Exploring the Impact of Community and Organizational Social Capital on Government Performance: Evidence from England, Political Research Quarterly, 64, pp.938-949. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1065912910381649>

Bacon N, Caistor-Arendar L. (2015). Measuring social sustainability in Sutton. London: The Young Foundation. http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Sutton_Social_Sustainability_Nov14.pdf

Bacon N, Brophy M, Mguni N, Mulgan G, Shandro A. (2010). The state of happiness: can public policy shape people's wellbeing and resilience? London: The Young Foundation. <http://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-State-of-Happiness.pdf>

Baumgartner JN, Burns JK. (2014). Measuring social inclusion-a key outcome in global mental health, International Journal of Epidemiology, 43, pp.354-364. <https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/43/2/354/677726/Measuring-social-inclusion-a-key-outcome-in-global>

Campanera J, Higgins P. (2011). The quality of life in English local authority areas. Local Government Studies, 37, pp.145-169. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03003930.2011.555081>

City of Cardiff Council. (2015). Cardiff: liveable city report. Cardiff: City of Cardiff Council. <https://www.cardiff.gov.uk/ENG/Your-Council/Strategies-plans-and-policies/Liveable-City-Report/Documents/Liveable%20city%20report%202015%20Final.pdf>

Coote A. (2015). People, planet, power: towards a new social settlement. London: New Economics Foundation http://neweconomics.org/2015/02/people-planet-power/?lost=true&sf_s=+publications+++++planet+power+towards+a+new+social+settlement

Department for Communities and Local Government. (2010). Cohesion delivery framework 2010: overview. London: Department for Communities and Local Government. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919132719/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/1501439>

Department of Health. (2011). Social action for health and well-being: building co-operative communities: Department of Health strategic vision for volunteering. London: Department of Health. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/215399/dh_130507.pdf

Department of Health. (2012). Healthy lives, healthy people: improving outcomes and supporting transparency. Part 1: a public health outcomes framework for England, 2012-2016. London: Department of Health. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/263658/2901502_PHOF_Improving_Outcomes_PT1A_v1_1.pdf

Fisher B. (2016). Community Development and Health – Literature Review – Revised 2016. Health Empowerment Leverage Project. <http://www.healthempowerment.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/CD-AND-HEALTH-LITERATURE-REVIEW-Brian-Fisher-Revised-edn-2016.pdf>

Foot J. (2012). What makes us healthy? An asset approach in practice: evidence, action, evaluation. <http://janefoot.com/downloads/files/healthy%20FINAL%20FINAL.pdf>

Glasgow Centre for Population Health. (2008). A Community Health and Wellbeing Profile for East Glasgow. Glasgow: Glasgow Centre for Population Health. <http://www.gcph.co.uk/assets/0000/0622/EastGlasgow.pdf>

Government Digital Service Digital Inclusion Research Working Group. (2015). From volumes to value: an outcomes framework for measuring the benefits of digital inclusion. London: Government Digital Service, Cabinet Office. https://goon-local-prod.s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/resources/files/DI_OutcomesFramework_SUMMARY.pdf

GoWell. (2010). Progress for People and Places: Monitoring change in Glasgow's communities. Evidence from the GoWell Surveys 2006 and 2008. Glasgow: Glasgow Centre for Population Health. [http://www.gowellonline.com/assets/0000/0528/Progress for People and Places - Monitoring change in Glasgow s communities.pdf](http://www.gowellonline.com/assets/0000/0528/Progress%20for%20People%20and%20Places%20-%20Monitoring%20change%20in%20Glasgow%20s%20communities.pdf)

Grant Thornton UK LLP. (2015). Growing healthy communities: The Health and Wellbeing Index. London: Grant Thornton UK LLP. <http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/globalassets/1.-member-firms/united-kingdom/pdf/publication/2015/growing-healthy-communities-health-and-wellbeing-index.pdf>

Happy City. (2016). Happy City Index. <http://happycityindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Happy-City-Index-Framework-Outline.pdf>

Helsper EJ. (2012). A corresponding fields model for the links between social and digital exclusion. *Communication Theory*, 22, pp.403-426. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01416.x/abstract>

Hewes S, Buonfino A. (2010). Cohesive communities: the benefits of effective partnership working between local government and the voluntary and community sector. London: The Young Foundation. <https://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Cohesive-Communities-July-2010.pdf>

Hillcoat-Nalletamby S, Ogg J. (2014). Moving beyond 'ageing in place': older people's dislikes about their home and neighbourhood environments as a motive for wishing to move. *Ageing and Society*, 34, pp.1771-1796. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ageing-and-society/article/moving-beyond-ageing-in-place-older-peoples-dislikes-about-their-home-and-neighbourhood-environments-as-a-motive-for-wishing-to-move/C775967B53700A853F694B4BADEB9647>

Hopkins T, Rippon S. (2015). Head, hands and heart: asset-based approaches in health care: a review of the conceptual evidence and case studies of asset-based approaches in health, care and wellbeing. London: The Health Foundation. <http://www.health.org.uk/sites/health/files/HeadHandsAndHeartAssetBasedApproachesInHealthCare.pdf>

Huxley P, Evans S, Madge S, Webber M, Burchardt T, McDaid D, Knapp M. (2012). Development of a social inclusion index to capture subjective and objective life domains (Phase II): psychometric development study, *Health Technology Assessment*, 16, pp.1-248. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22260923>

Jeffrey K, Michaelson J. (2015). Five headline indicators of national success: a clearer picture of how the UK is performing. London: New Economics Foundation. <http://neweconomics.org/2015/10/five-headline-indicators-of-national-success/>

Lupton R, Fenton A, Fitzgerald A. (2013). Labour's record on neighbourhood renewal in England: policy, spending and outcomes 1997-2010. Social Policy in a Cold Climate Working Paper 6. London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics and Political Science. <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/wp06.pdf>

Mehmood A. (2016). Of resilient places: planning for urban resilience. *European Planning Studies*, 24, pp.407-419.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09654313.2015.1082980>

Milton B, Attree P, French B, Povall S, Whitehead M, Popay J. (2012). The impact of community engagement on health and social outcomes: a systematic review. *Community Development Journal*, 47, pp.316-334.

<http://nphf.nl/footage/fm/File/The%20impact%20of%20community.pdf>

OECD. (2014). *How's Life in Your Region?: Measuring Regional and Local Well-being for Policy Making*, Paris: OECD Publishing.

http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/how-s-life-in-your-region_9789264217416-en

Oxfam Scotland. (2013). *Oxfam Humankind Index: The new measure of Scotland's Prosperity*, first (and second) results. Oxford: Oxfam. <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/oxfam-humankind-index-the-new-measure-of-scotlands-prosperity-second-results-293743>

<http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/oxfam-humankind-index-the-new-measure-of-scotlands-prosperity-second-results-293743>

Parsfield M, Morris D, Bola M, Knapp M, Park A, Yoshioka M, Marcus G. (2015). *Community capital: the value of connected communities*. London: RSA Action & Research Centre.

https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/pdfs/reports/rsaj3718-connected-communities-report_web.pdf

Phillips G, Bottomley C, Schmidt E, Tobi P, Lais S, Ge Y, Lynch R, Lock K, Draper A, Moore D, Clow A, Petticrew M, Hayes R, Renton A. (2014). Measures of exposure to the Well London Phase-1 intervention and their association with health well-being and social outcomes. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 68, pp.597-605.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24516117>

Prilleltensky I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49, pp.1-21. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1007/s10464-011-9448-8/abstract>

Public Health England, NHS England. (2015). *A guide to community centred approaches for health and wellbeing*. London: Public Health England & NHS England.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/402889/A_guide_to_community-centred_approaches_for_health_and_wellbeing_briefi_.pdf

Rocket Science UK Ltd. (2010). *Summative evaluation of the Community Asset Programme. Appendix F: Programme Outcomes Framework*. London: Rocket Science UK Ltd.

<https://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/research/communities-and-places/communities-and-places-publications>

Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA).

<https://www.thersa.org/>

Rutter J. (2015). *Where is the most family friendly area in England?* London: Family & Childcare Trust.

<http://www.familyandchildcaretrust.org/sites/default/files/files/Local%20Family%20Report%20Card%20ENGLAND.pdf>

Scottish Community Development Centre. (2007). *Building stronger communities: A practical assessment and planning tool for community capacity building in Scotland*. Glasgow: Scottish Community Development Centre.

<http://www.scdc.org.uk/what/building-stronger-communities/>

Siegler V. (2015a). *Measuring national well-being: Inequalities in Social Capital by Age and Sex*, July 2015 London: Office for National Statistics.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuringnationalwellbeing/2015-07-09>

Siegler V. (2015b). Measuring national well-being: an analysis of social capital in the UK. London: Office for National Statistics.

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuringnationalwellbeing/2015-01-29>

Skills for Care. (2010). 'Only a footstep away?': neighbourhoods, social capital and their place in the 'big society'. Leeds: Skills for Care.

<http://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/Documents/Learning-and-development/Community-skills-development/Only-a-footstep-away.pdf>

Social Life, Dixon T. (2012). Creating Strong Communities: How to measure the social sustainability of new housing developments. Surrey: The Berkeley Group. http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Creating_Strong_Communities.pdf

Tampubolon G, Subramanian SV, Kawachi I. (2013). NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INDIVIDUAL SELF-RATED HEALTH IN WALES. Health Economics, 22, pp.14-21. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.1808/full>

Welsh Assembly. (2015). Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015.

http://www.legislation.gov.uk/anaw/2015/2/pdfs/anaw_20150002_en.pdf

Wilton C. (2012). Building community capacity: evidence, efficiency and cost-effectiveness. London: Think Local Act Personal.

http://www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/assets/BCC/Building_Community_Capacity_-_Evidence_efficiency_and_cost-effectiveness.pdf

Wind TR, Komproe IH. (2012). The mechanisms that associate community social capital with post-disaster mental health: A multilevel model. Social Science & Medicine, 75, pp.1715-1720. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22883254>

Woodcraft S, Bacon N, Caistor-Arendar L, Hackett T. (2012). Design for social sustainability: A framework for creating thriving new communities. London: Social Life, The Young Foundation.

http://www.social-life.co/media/files/DESIGN_FOR_SOCIAL_SUSTAINABILITY_3.pdf

APPENDIX C: Table of included resources

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
Academy for sustainable communities: http://www.ascskill.s.org.uk/who-we-are.html	Governmental	Definition: Sustainable Community	Not provided	Not provided	Seven key components of a sustainable community that together constitute a 'common goal': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance • Transport and Connectivity • Services • Environmental • Economy • Housing and the Built Environment • Social and Cultural Skills required for Sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement, • leadership • project management, and • partnership working 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance • Transport and Connectivity • Services • Environmental • Economy • Housing and the Built Environment • Social and Cultural
Aked J, Michaelson J, Steuer N. (2010). The role of local government in promoting wellbeing. London: Local Government Improvement and Development. http://www.ritimorq/IMG/pdf/The-2.pdf	Non-Governmental Organization The project was commissioned by Local Government Improvement and Development and the National Mental Health Development Unit.	The report attempts to apply the wellbeing evidence base to the task of re-shaping local government's role.	National	Entire population, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people • Older people • People with mental health issues • Disabled People • Local business and entrepreneurs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment toolkit (PHE) • 5 ways to wellbeing • Commissioning for wellbeing the proportion of people reporting that they belong strongly to their neighbourhood percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality (PSA 21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual framework • Evaluation framework Measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single measure of overall wellbeing • Existing scales for measuring subjective wellbeing (e.g. The North West Mental Wellbeing Survey and WEMWBS scale). • Multi-dimensional framework for measuring wellbeing (e.g. NEF's National Accounts of Well-being framework). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic leadership • Services and commissioning • Strengthening communities • Organisational level activity • Measuring wellbeing outcomes MWIA: Enhancing control; Increasing resilience & community assets; Facilitating participation; promoting inclusion.

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wellbeing within specific life domains 	
Andrews R. (2011). Exploring the Impact of Community and Organizational Social Capital on Government Performance: Evidence from England. Political Research Quarterly, 64, pp.938-949. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1065912910381649	Academic	Organisational and community social capital	Local (authority) in England	local authority; members of the public	Statistical model of organisational and community social capital	Conceptual framework	Community social capital Community organizational life Engagement with public affairs Social trust Organizational social capital Structural social capital Relational social capital Cognitive social capital
Bacon N, et al. (2010). The state of happiness: can public policy shape people's wellbeing and resilience? London: The Young Foundation. https://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-State-of-Happiness.pdf	Non-Governmental (Young Foundation)	Scopes: The report describes the state of play in academic and practical knowledge about wellbeing, including the experience of the Local Wellbeing Project in the UK, one of the few programmes explicitly focused on influencing wellbeing across a range of policy fields. It also includes some UK and international examples that demonstrate the range of practical	International National Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employed/Une mployed Children and Families Older people Adolescents People with mental health issues People with physical health issues Community 	Local wellbeing: can we measure it? (The Local Wellbeing project)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual framework Logic model Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place: Access & opportunities; Safety & security Quality of local area & environment Social: Family & relationships; Social support & engagement; Sense of belonging & community cohesion. Personal: Health & mental wellbeing; Engaging activities & achievements; Material & financial wellbeing

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
		tests of wellbeing theory throughout the world. The report focuses on the key areas where the evidence is strongest, where there is most to learn from practical experience, and where public policy is likely have the greatest traction.					
Baumgartner J N, and Burns J K. (2014). Measuring social inclusion-a key outcome in global mental health. International Journal of Epidemiology, 43, pp.354-364. https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/43/2/354/677726/Measuring-social-inclusion-a-key-outcome-in-global	academic	Social inclusion	Any	People with mental health issues	Systematic review, reports on 5 scales: Social Inclusion Questionnaire User Experience (SInQUE) Mezey GS, White S, Thachil A et al. Development and preliminary validation of a measure of social inclusion for use in people with mental health problems: The SInQUE. Int J Soc Psychiatry 2012;59:501-07.; Social and Community Opportunities Profile (SCOPE) Huxley et al. Development of a social inclusion index to capture subjective and objective life domains (Phase II): psychometric development study. Health Technol Assess 2012;16:iii-vii, ix-	Scales/ validated tools	SinQUE 75 items: Domains: — productivity (6 items) — consumption (15 items) — access to services (6 items) — political engagement (6 items) — social integration (42 items) SCOPE 48 items: Domains: — leisure and participation — housing and accommodation — safety — work — financial situation — self-reported health — education — family and social relationships — overall inclusion Social inclusion scale 22 items: Domains: — building social capital

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
					<p>xii, 1–241.;</p> <p>Social Inclusion Scale (SIS) Secker J, Hacking S, Kent L, Shenton J, Spandler H. Development of a measure of social inclusion for arts and mental health project participants. J Men Health 2009;18:65–72.;</p> <p>Social Integration Survey (SIS) Kawata AK, Revicki DA. Reliability and validity of the social integration survey (SIS) in patients with schizophrenia. Qual Life Res 2008;17:123–35.;</p> <p>Community Integration Measure (CIM) McColl MA, Davies D, Carlson P, Johnston J, Minnes P. The Community Integration Measure: development and preliminary validation. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2001;82: 429–34.</p>		<p>— social acceptance</p> <p>— neighbourhood cohesion</p> <p>— security of housing tenure</p> <p>— engagement in leisure/cultural activities</p> <p>— citizenship</p> <p>Social integration survey 62 items: Domains:</p> <p>— social perception</p> <p>— work interactions</p> <p>— social skills</p> <p>— social cognition</p> <p>— instrumental activities of daily living/ self-care</p> <p>CIM 10 items: Domains:</p> <p>— belonging (includes living situation, feeling accepted and part of the of the community, feeling close to people in community)</p> <p>— independent participation (includes having something to do during the main part of the day that is useful and productive, leisure activities, knowing the community and its rules)</p>
<p>Campanera J, Higgins P. (2011). The quality of life in English local authority areas. Local Government Studies, 37, pp.145-169.</p> <p>http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03003930.2011.555081</p>	Academic	<p>Definition: Sustainable development</p> <p>Scope: The paper conducted an analysis of the Audit Commission's local QOL indicators' dataset</p>	National Regional Local	English local authorities	<p>Audit commission's local quality of life indicator set</p> <p>73 indicators included in the final research study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Framework • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks • Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and place • Community cohesion and Involvement • Community safety • Culture and leisure • Economic wellbeing • Education and life-long learning • Environment • Health and social wellbeing • Housing • Transport and access

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
		to paint a picture of the QOL conditions across English local authorities during a time when the UK's SD agenda has been orientated towards a sustainable communities/QOL focus					<p>Ten most important indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 GCSE • Traffic flow • Most deprived • Children income deprived. • Elder income deprived. • Claiming key benefits. • Job seekers • Outside day safety • Life expectancy <p>Pedestrian casualties</p>
City of Cardiff Council (2015). Cardiff: liveable city report. Cardiff https://www.cardiff.gov.uk/ENG/Your-Council/Strategies-plans-and-policies/Liveable-City-Report/Documents/Liveable%20city%20report%202015%20Final.pdf	Governmental	<p>Definition:</p> <p>City Liveability</p> <p>Scopes:</p> <p>The report outlines Cardiff's strengths and weaknesses, and compares its performance to that of other major UK cities which face similar challenges, across the factors that make up a great liveable city.</p>	Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Public • Local Authorities • Community 	Cardiff Partnership Board Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator Framework • Measures and scales • Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	<p>Thriving and prosperous economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVA • Median wage • Unemployment • Economic activity • Business start-ups • Visitor numbers and tourist spend <p>Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total recorded crime • Hate crime • Violence against the person • Anti-social behaviour • House burglaries • Other thefts • Criminal damage • Perceptions of crime <p>Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy • Obesity • Physical activity • Nutrition • Smoking • Binge drinking <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people with a degree level

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>qualification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of people with no qualifications The number of people with the equivalent of 5 GCSEs Performance at primary school level Those not in education, employment or training (NEETs) <p>Clean, Attractive and Sustainable Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carbon emissions Sustainable travel Waste and recycling figures Cleanliness Parks and green spaces <p>Fair, Just, and Inclusive Society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income Child poverty Unemployment Affordable housing Health Crime <p>Liveability, Work, and Leisure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> European Commission Urban Audit UK quality of life index UK's best city to be young
Coote A. (2015). People, planet, power: towards a new social settlement. London: New Economics Foundation. http://neweconomics.org/2015/02/people-planet-power/?lost=true&_sf_s=publication	Non-Governmental (NEF)	<p>Definition: Social settlement</p> <p>Scopes: The report offers proposals for moving towards a new social settlement that is able to meet the challenges of the twenty-first</p>	National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the Public Local Authorities 	People, planet, power (NEF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual frameworks Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Justice Environmental Sustainability More Equal Distribution Of Power <p>Rebalance work and time: Secure, satisfying, and sustainable work for all; Shorter and more flexible hours of paid work; Decent hourly rates of pay; Universal, high-quality childcare.</p> <p>Release human resources:</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
s++++planet+power+towards+anew+social+settlement		century. It is NEF's contribution to current debates about how we live together and shape the future, our relationship with each other and with government, the role of the welfare state, and the quality of everyday life.					<p>Build capacity and control in the core economy; Promote co-production; Commission services for outcomes and co-production;</p> <p>Strengthen social security: More diverse, open, and collaborative public services; A more rounded, inclusive, and democratic benefits system.</p> <p>Plan for a sustainable future: Develop eco-social policies that promote both social justice and environmental sustainability; Offset the regressive effects of pro-environmental measures; Change practice through public institutions; Create mechanisms for future-proofing policies</p>
<p>Department for Communities and Local Government. (2010). Cohesion delivery framework 2010: overview. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.</p> <p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919132719/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/1501439</p>	Governmental	Community cohesion	National; local	Local authorities	Cohesion delivery framework 2010	Conceptual framework	<p>Govt sets out a vision for an integrated and cohesive community, based on three foundations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities • People knowing their rights and responsibilities • People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly. <p>And three key ways of living together:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared future vision and sense of belonging • A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity • Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds. <p>3 national indicators: The percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>get on well together in their local area; The percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood; The percentage of people who have meaningful interactions with people from different backgrounds.</p> <p>The first two are measured locally by the Place Survey. All three are measured nationally by the Citizenship Survey.</p>
<p>Department of Health (2011). Social action for health and well-being: building co-operative communities: Department of Health strategic vision for volunteering. London: Department of Health.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/215399/dh_130507.pdf</p>	Governmental	Community engagement (volunteering)	National	Adults; members of the public	n/a	Conceptual framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved health and wellbeing outcomes and impact on wider determinants of health (e.g. education, environment, employment and crime); • increased learning opportunities, employability and job-related skills; • increased social capital and community resilience; and • increasing integration of the socially excluded.
<p>Department Of Health (2012). Healthy lives, healthy people: improving outcomes and supporting transparency. Part 1: a public health outcomes framework for England, 2012-</p>	<p>Governmental</p> <p>The Public Health Outcomes Framework</p>	Public/ community health	Local authorities in England	<p>Entire population in a local authority area. Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children in poverty • 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training • People in prison 	Public Health Outcomes Framework	<p>Indicator sets or indicator framework</p> <p>62 indicators that were included in the original Public Health Outcomes Framework consultation document, plus a further 25 indicators that were proposed by stakeholders in response to the</p>	<p>1. Improving the wider determinants of health:</p> <p>Children in poverty; School readiness; Pupil absence; First-time entrants to the youth justice system; 16-18 yo NEET; Adults with LD/ in contact with secondary mental health services who live in stable and appropriate accommodation; People in prison who have a mental illness or a</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
2016. London: Department of Health. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/263658/2901502_PHOF_Improving_Outcomes_PT1A_v1_1.pdf				<p>who have a mental illness or a significant mental illness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People entering prison with substance dependence issues who are previously not known to community treatment • Falls and injuries in people aged 65 and over • Take up of the NHS Health Check Programme – by those eligible • People presenting with HIV at a late stage of infection • People with dementia 		consultation	<p>significant mental illness; Employment for those with LTCs including adults with LD or who are in contact with secondary MH services; Sickness absence rate; Killed and seriously injured casualties on England's roads; Domestic abuse; Violent crime; Reoffending levels; % population affected by noise; Statutory homelessness; Use of green space for exercise/ health reasons; Fuel poverty; social isolation; Older people's perception of community safety.</p> <p>2. Health improvement Low birth weight of term babies; Breastfeeding; Smoking status at time of delivery; Under 18 conceptions; Child development at 2-2½ years (under development); Excess weight in 4-5 and 10-11 year olds; Hospital admissions caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries in children and young people aged 0-14 and 15-24 years; Emotional wellbeing of looked after children; Smoking prevalence – 15 year olds (placeholder); Self-harm; Diet; Excess weight in adults; Proportion of physically active and inactive adults; Smoking prevalence – adult (over 18s); Successful completion of drug treatment; People entering prison with substance dependence issues who are previously not</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>known to community treatment; Recorded diabetes; Alcohol-related admissions to hospital; Cancer diagnosed at stage 1 and 2; Cancer screening coverage; Access to non-cancer screening programmes; Take up of the NHS Health Check Programme – by those eligible; Self-reported wellbeing; Falls and injuries in people aged 65 and over.</p> <p>3. Health protection Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate air pollution; Chlamydia diagnoses (15-24 year olds); Population vaccination coverage; People presenting with HIV at a late stage of infection; Treatment completion for Tuberculosis (TB); Public sector organisations with board-approved sustainable development management plan; Comprehensive, agreed inter-agency plans for responding to health protection incidents and emergencies.</p> <p>4. Healthcare, public health and preventing premature mortality Infant mortality; Tooth decay in children aged 5; Mortality from causes considered preventable; Mortality from all cardiovascular diseases (including heart disease and stroke); Mortality from cancer; Mortality from liver disease; Mortality from respiratory diseases; Mortality from communicable diseases; Excess under 75 mortality in adults with serious mental illness;</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							Suicide rate; Emergency readmissions within 30 days of discharge from hospital; Preventable sight loss; Health-related quality of life for older people; Hip fractures in people aged 65 and over; Excess winter deaths; Estimated diagnosis rate for people with dementia.
Fisher B. (2016). Community Development and Health – Literature Review – Revised 2016, Health Empowerment Leverage Project. http://www.healthempowerment.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/CD-AND-HEALTH-LITERATURE-REVIEW-Brian-Fisher-Revised-edn-2016.pdf	Governmental commissioned by the Department of Health	Definition: Community Development Scopes: This literature review aims to offer relevant definitions, a brief background to the current state of play in the statutory services, the nature of community development, its relationship to community health and to enhancing the responsiveness of commissioning. It also touches on the evidence on CD and behaviour change.	Local	Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortality • Mental health • Life Satisfaction • Responding to stress • The elderly • Cardiac Disease • Resilience Health Inequalities	Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-production • Social networks • Associational life • Community Empowerment • Social Capital • Community capital • Community Organising Big Society
Foot J. (2012). What makes us healthy? An asset approach in practice: evidence, action, evaluation. http://janefoot.com	Local Wellbeing Project, and the Young Foundation, the IDEA/LGID and three councils	The advantage of the WARM framework of measures is that it is designed to be	Local (neighbourhood)	Neighbourhood/LA	Wellbeing and Resilience measure (WARM)	Conceptual framework	Self: the way people feel about their own lives, personal wellbeing and resilience, as well as other attributes such as income or health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: the quality of social supports

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
/downloads/files/healthy%20FINAL%20FINAL.pdf	(NGO/ gov)	<p>used to measure individual and community wellbeing and resilience in a neighbourhood. The premise is that 'the key to flourishing neighbourhoods is to boost local assets and social wealth, while also tackling The advantage of the WARM framework of measures is that it is designed to be used to measure individual and community wellbeing and resilience in a neighbourhood. The premise is that 'the key to flourishing neighbourhoods is to boost local assets and social wealth, while also tackling</p> <p>86 Building resilient communities. A Young Foundation report for Wiltshire Think Family Board, Vicki Sellick, Nina</p>					<p>and networks within the community, which includes emotional support as well as broader personal support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure and systems: the strength of the local economy, availability of local services, infrastructure and environment which support people to achieve their aspirations and live a good life. <p>The tool makes use of existing data and new local data to measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current wellbeing as well as local circumstances or context • assets or strengths such as social capital, confidence among residents, the quality of local services and availability of employment • vulnerabilities such as isolation, crime, and unemployment • subjective perceptions, for example satisfaction with GPs alongside objective factors such as the number of GPs in an area.

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
		Mguni, Catherine Russell and Nicola Bacon (February 2010) 66 vulnerabilities and disadvantages'.					
Glasgow Centre for Population Health. A Community Health and Wellbeing Profile for East Glasgow (http://www.gcph.co.uk/assets/0000/0622/EastGlasgow.pdf)	The GCPH is a partnership between NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow City Council, and the University of Glasgow, funded by the Scottish Government.	Definition: Community Health and Wellbeing Scopes: This profile provides indicators for a range of health outcomes (e.g. life expectancy, mortality, hospitalisation) and health determinants (e.g. smoking levels, breastfeeding, income, employment, crime, education).	Regional Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service providers Planners Policy makers Members of the Public 	Community Profile indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator Framework Measures and scales Indicator framework Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	Population demographics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child population (aged 0-15) Adult population (aged 16-64) Elderly population (aged 65+) Minority ethnic groups Asylum Seekers Life expectancy - males Life expectancy - females Live births Households - Single adults Single parents Mortality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deaths all ages (5 yrs) Coronary heart disease deaths in under 75s (5 yrs) Cancer deaths in under 75s (5 yrs) Cerebrovascular disease deaths in under 75s (5 yrs) Drugs, Alcohol and Smoking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alcohol related and attributable hospital Alcohol related deaths (5 yrs) Estimated smokers (16+) Drug related hospital patients Drug related deaths (10 yrs) Hospitalisation & Injury: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients registered with cancer Heart disease patients Cerebrovascular disease Emergency medical admission Multiple admission patients Unintentional Injury patients Patients prescribed statins

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road accident casualties Assault discharges Mental Health & Function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suicide (5 yrs) Self-assessed health (classified as 'Not Good') First hospital admission - psychiatric Patients prescribed drugs for Incapacity Benefit & SDA Claimants Long-term limiting illness Social Work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients aged 0-15 Clients aged 16-64 Clients aged 65+ Prosperity – Poverty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Income deprived employment deprived Workless JSA - Unemployment Households without Children in workless Social grade E - Workplaces Employees5 Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary school attendance S4 Pupils with 5+ GCSE equivalents Adults without qualifications Crime: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious violent crime Domestic abuse incidents Vandalism Drug Offenders Housing & Transport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing type - tenements House prices Housing tenure - Owner Occupiers Overcrowding Travelling to work by foot/bike or public

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							transport Child & Maternal Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smoking during pregnancy (3 yrs) • Breastfeeding (at 6 - 8 week review) • Low birth-weight babies (3 yrs) • Immunisation uptake at 24 mths - MMR • -all excl. • Dental hospital admissions for children • Teenage pregnancy - under 18 years (3 yrs) • Road accident casualties - children
Government Digital Service Digital Inclusion Research Working Group (2015). From volumes to value: an outcomes framework for measuring the benefits of digital inclusion. London: Government Digital Service, Cabinet Office. https://goon-local-prod.s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/resources/files/DI_OutcomesFramework_SUMMARY.pdf	Governmental	Social capital; Community engagement/ participation	National	Members of the public	Digital Inclusion Outcomes Framework	Indicator set or framework	DIGITAL OUTCOMES All citizens access the internet <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase % households with an internet connection 2. Increase % of adults accessing the internet 'on the go' using mobile phones and/or portable computers 3. Increase % of non-internet users who intend to get access in the next year All citizens make use of the internet regularly <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Increase % of internet users who go online daily 5. Reduce % of adults who have never used the internet Everyone has the skills and confidence to use the internet <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Increase % internet users who rate their ability to use the internet as good or excellent 7. Increase % adults who have basic online skills 8. Reduce % internet users who only use websites they have used before 9. Increase % internet users who are aware that some websites listed by a search engine will be accurate or unbiased and some won't be 10. Increase % adults who agree that the internet makes life easier

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>11. Increase % non-users who feel they could perform daily tasks better if they used the internet</p> <p>12. Increase % people who agree that “The internet is for people like me”</p> <p>ECONOMIC OUTCOMES</p> <p>Help people to improve their employment prospects</p> <p>13. Increase % internet users seeking information about jobs/work online</p> <p>14. Increase % internet users looking at job opportunities online</p> <p>15. Increase % internet users who report that they have found a job online</p> <p>Help people to improve their level of educational attainment</p> <p>16. Increase % internet users doing an online course to achieve a qualification</p> <p>17. Increase % of children aged 5-15 who go online at home or elsewhere using any device</p> <p>Help people to manage and save money</p> <p>18. Increase % internet users who compare products online</p> <p>19. Increase % of internet users who use online bank services</p> <p>20. Increase % internet users who report they have saved money online</p> <p>21. Increase % internet users paying bills online</p> <p>Help to support creativity and entrepreneurialism</p> <p>22. Increase % internet users confident in using the internet to do creative things such as making blogs, sharing photos or uploading videos</p> <p>HEALTH & SOCIAL OUTCOMES</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>Enable people to live healthier lifestyles</p> <p>23. Increase % internet users making an online appointment with a doctor or other health practitioner</p> <p>24. Increase % of internet users seeking health information online</p> <p>25. Increase % internet users who report that they have found information to improve their health</p> <p>Enable people to communicate and connect with others</p> <p>26. Increase % internet users sending and receiving emails</p> <p>27. Increase % internet users looking at social networking sites/apps</p> <p>28. Increase % internet users using Instant Messaging services / online chatrooms</p> <p>29. Increase % internet users making or receiving telephone or video calls using services like Skype or FaceTime</p> <p>Help people in their leisure pursuits and entertainment</p> <p>30. Increase % internet users finding information for leisure time including cinema and live music</p> <p>31. Increase % internet users finding information for booking holidays</p> <p>32. Increase % internet users who listen to or download music online</p> <p>33. Increase % internet users who watch online or download TV programmes or films</p> <p>34. Increase % internet users who have found out about an event online</p> <p>Make it easier for people to access public services</p> <p>35. Increase % internet looking for information on central government services</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>36. Increase % internet users paying a central government tax, TV licence fee, car tax disc</p> <p>37. Increase % internet users looking for information about local council services</p> <p>38. Increase % internet users paying a local council tax, fine or service</p> <p>Support greater democratic and civic participation</p> <p>39. Increase % internet users contacting a local councillor / MP online</p> <p>40. Increase % internet users finding out about news/events in local area or community</p> <p>41. Increase % internet users finding information that helps them form an opinion</p>
<p>GoWell (2010). Progress for People and Places: Monitoring change in Glasgow's communities. Evidence from the GoWell Surveys 2006 and 2008. Glasgow: Glasgow Centre for Population Health. http://www.gowellonline.com/assets/000/0528/Progress_for_People_and_Places_-_Monitoring_change_in_Glasgow_s_communities.pdf</p>	<p>Non-Governmental Governmental Academic</p> <p>GoWell is a collaborative partnership between the Glasgow Centre for Population Health, the University of Glasgow and the MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, sponsored by Glasgow Housing Association, the Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland and NHS</p>	<p>Definition: Urban regeneration</p> <p>Scopes: This report focuses on findings from the GoWell Community Health and Wellbeing Survey of 14 neighbourhoods in Glasgow undergoing different types of regeneration.</p>	<p>National Regional Local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy-makers • GoWell researchers 	<p>GoWell Community Health and Wellbeing Survey 2006-2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual frameworks • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<p>People and Circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Gender • Ethnicity <p>Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of house • Residential stability • Satisfaction with housing • Improvement <p>Neighbourhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood satisfaction • Anti-social behaviour • Safety at night <p>Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community spaces • Inclusion • Belonging <p>Physical Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General health • Long term illness

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
	Greater Glasgow & Clyde.						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent illness Mental Health and Wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental health problems Regeneration areas Quality of life
Grant Thornton UK LLP. (2015). Growing healthy communities: the Health and Wellbeing Index. London: Grant Thornton UK LLP http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/globalassets/1.-member-firms/united-kingdom/pdf/publication/2015/growing-healthy-communities-health-and-wellbeing-index.pdf	Non-Governmental	Definition: Public health Scope: The health and wellbeing index highlights the extent to which economic, social and environmental determinants translate to good or bad health outcomes in their broadest sense. It also shows the scale and nature of inequality across the country and reiterates the need for a local, place-based approach to tackling health outcomes.	National Local	Local authorities	The Health and Wellbeing Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Framework Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	Economic: Unemployment, qualifications, childhood education, occupations and income Society: Deprivation, child poverty, fuel poverty, crime and social cohesion Environment: Household occupancy (overcrowding), natural environment, social housing, homelessness and living environment Health Outcome Criteria: Healthy lifestyles: Adult obesity, child obesity, sports participation, smoking, drug misuse, binge drinking, under-age pregnancy and low birth weight Health conditions: Life expectancy, infant mortality, cancer mortality, suicide mortality, circulatory mortality, alcohol mortality, excess winter deaths, hip fractures, diabetes, self-reported wellbeing
Happy City Index http://happycityindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Happy-City-Index-Framework-Outline.pdf	NGO (Happy City)	Wellbeing (Individual and community)	Local	Members of the public	The Happy City Index	Conceptual framework; Logic model; measure (survey)	CITY PULSE Job satisfaction; Social isolation; Physical & Mental health; Accommodation; Public Transport; Cultural Engagement; Inter-generational contact;

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							Green Space
Helsper E.J. (2012). A corresponding fields model for the links between social and digital exclusion. Communication Theory, 22, pp.403-426. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01416.x/abstract	Academic	Definition: Social and Digital Inclusion/Exclusion Scopes: This article proposes a theoretical model that hypothesizes how specific areas of digital and social exclusion) n influence each other. It article focuses on correspondence across key resource fields that exist online and offline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National 	Researchers	Social Impact Mediators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Skills Attitudes Digital Inclusion: Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Ownership Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual Frameworks 	Offline Inclusion: Economic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income Employment Education Cultural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender Ethnicity Generation Social: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Ties Political and Civic Networks Personal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Psychological Health Physical Health Personality Digital Inclusion: Economic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commerce and Finance Information and Learning Cultural: Participation and Engagement Social: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation and Engagement Networking and Communication Personal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entertainment and Leisure
Hewes S, Buonfino A. (2010). Cohesive	Non provided	Definition: Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local 	Local authorities	Answer to the survey question: "What do you see as the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of equalities Addressing unemployment/ under-employment

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
communities: the benefits of effective partnership working between local government and the voluntary and community sector. London: The Young Foundation. https://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Cohesive-Communities-July-2010.pdf		Cohesion Scopes: The report focuses specifically on the relationship between the Voluntary Community Sector (VCS) and local authorities, asking how that relationship could be made stronger to promote cohesion and enhance wellbeing.			most important facet of community cohesion in your authority? (aggregated results of respondents' assigned rankings from 1 to 5 where '1' = most important)"		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing unemployment/ under-employment Engaging with different groups in the community Empowering communities
Hillcoat-Nalletamby S, and Jim O G. G. (2014). Moving beyond 'ageing in place': older people's dislikes about their home and neighbourhood environments as a motive for wishing to move. Ageing and Society, 34, pp.1771-1796. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ageing-and-society/article/moving-beyond-ageing-in-place-older-peoples-dislikes-about-their-home-and-	Governmental/academic	Neighbourhood dislikes – from "living in Wales" survey 2004	National	Older people, aged 50 years or more (n=2,336)	Living in Wales survey	Indicator set	Neighbourhood: Children/ young people hanging around; Noisy/ not peaceful; Not well-maintained/ dirty/ litter; Car parking; People/ neighbours; Poor public transport; No/ poor facilities for teenagers; No/ poor shops; Not safe/ secure/ lot of crime; Drug users/ pushers; No/ poor facilities for children; No sense of community; Isolated; Poor schools.

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
neighbourhood-environments-as-a-motive-for-wishing-to-move/C775967B53700A853F694B4BADEB9647							
Hopkins T, Rippon S. (2015). Head, hands and heart: asset-based approaches in health care: a review of the conceptual evidence and case studies of asset-based approaches in health, care and wellbeing. London: The Health Foundation. http://www.health.org.uk/sites/health/files/HeadHandsAndHeartAssetBasedApproachesInHealthCare.pdf	Non-Governmental Research commissioned and funded by the Health Foundation	Scopes: The report sets out some of the territory, opportunities and challenges in adopting asset-based approaches for improving health and wellbeing.	Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the Public Local Authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual frameworks Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities Social Networks Connectedness Resilience Psychosocial Health <p>improved measures of physical and mental wellbeing; greater positive experiences of caring and being cared for fostering a sense of connectedness; encouraging greater citizen involvement and activity by people to promote their own interests and those of others and the creation of a flourishing civil society; development of strong communities and social capital; challenging and reducing health inequities; developing policies aimed at tackling poverty and the social, economic and environmental determinants of health.</p>
Huxley P, Evans S, Madge S, Webber M, Burchardt T, McDaid D, Knapp M. (2012). Development of a social inclusion index to capture subjective and objective life domains (Phase II): psychometric	Academic	Social capital; Happiness/ wellbeing	National; Regional; Local	Adults	Short Social and Community Opportunities Profile (mini-SCOPE)	Measure or scale Drawn from existing national surveys	Leisure time; Housing & accommodation; Work; Finances; Safety; Education; Health; Family & Friends.

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
development study, Health Technology Assessment, 16, pp.1-248. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22260923							
Jeffrey K, Michaelson J (2015). Five headline indicators of national success: a clearer picture of how the UK is performing. London: New Economics Foundation. http://neweconomics.org/2015/10/fiv-e-headline-indicators-of-national-success/	Non-Governmental Organization Report written with the endorsement of several organizations (e.g. Happy City, Oxfam, World Future Council)	Definition: National success Scopes: The report proposes five new headline indicators of national success for the UK. Its aim is to realign policy priorities with those of the public, building a stronger, more balanced economy.	National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees • Self-employed people • Adults • Children • Socioeconomic status • Gender 	NEF 5 Headline Indicators of national success:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Framework • Measures and scales 	<p>Good Jobs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of the labour force employed in secure jobs that pay at least enough to allow for an acceptable standard of living. <p>Wellbeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average (mean) UK response to the life satisfaction question included in the ONS's Annual Population Survey. <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual release of UK carbon emissions in relation to a global emissions 'budget' set at a level consistent with a two-in-three chance of avoiding dangerous climate change <p>Fairness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from the ONS's Effects of Taxes and Benefits on Household Income <p>Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONS statistic on avoidable deaths, which measures the proportion of deaths in England and Wales which were from causes considered avoidable through good quality healthcare or wider public health interventions. <p>Supporting Indicators:</p> <p>Good Jobs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender and other protected characteristics

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job satisfaction • Median income • Housing affordability • GDP <p>Wellbeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children's wellbeing • Wellbeing inequalities • Other subjective wellbeing indicators • Mental wellbeing scale • Social trust <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indicator of biodiversity • Indicators of natural resource use • An indicator of local air quality <p>Fairness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary statistics of income inequality • A measure of wealth inequality • A measure of gender inequalities • A measure of inequalities between ethnic groups • An indicator highlighting the extent of health inequalities <p>Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indicator of overall health outcomes • An indicator more directly focused on the quality of the health service • An indicator of the quality of health provision for the over-75s (who are not counted within many causes of death in the headline indicator) • An indicator highlighting the extent of health inequalities between socio-economic groups
Lupton R and,	Academic	Community	National	Community	Governmental 'floor	Indicator set or indicator	Liveability:

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
Fenton A and, and Fitzgerald A. (2013). Labour's record on neighbourhood renewal in England: policy, spending and outcomes 1997-2010. Social Policy in a Cold Climate Working Paper 6. London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics and Political Science. http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/wp06.pdf	Funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Nuffield Foundation	development National Wellbeing/Success/Development Neighbourhood satisfaction		Local Authorities	targets'	framework	<p>Reduce proportion of local authorities with unacceptable litter</p> <p>Reduce number of abandoned cars</p> <p>Increase household satisfaction</p> <p>Neighbourhood satisfaction:</p> <p>Survey of English Housing (SEH)/English Housing Survey (EHS)</p> <p>Worklessness:</p> <p>Using the method of English Indices of Multiple Deprivation in using the total of Job Seekers Allowance and Incapacity Benefit/Serious Disablement Allowance claimants (and, latterly, also Employment Support Allowance), divided by the working-age population, as a proxy for 'work deprivation'</p> <p>Health:</p> <p>Reduce the gap in life expectancy by 10%</p> <p>Reduce the gap in deaths from circulatory diseases by 40%</p> <p>Reduce the gap in premature cancer deaths by 6%</p> <p>Education:</p> <p>Reduce inequalities in levels of development at the Foundation Stage</p> <p>Reduce by 40% the proportion of schools in which fewer than 65% of pupils achieve level 4 or above at Key Stage 2</p> <p>In all schools at least 50% of pupils to achieve Level 5</p> <p>In all schools, at least 20% of pupils to achieve 5 GCSEs at A*-C</p>
Mehmood A. (2016). Of resilient places: planning for urban resilience. European Planning Studies, 24, pp.407-419. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/1	Academic: Sustainable Places Research Institute & School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University, Wales, UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve social relations support socio-political empowerment fulfil the basic needs of the people. <p>Adaptation of</p>	Local	Community of place	Evolutionary resilience of a place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual Framework 	<p>Community Resilience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active learning Robustness, Transformability and Innovation Adaptability to change <p>Transition Towns' principles:</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
0.1080/09654313.2015.1082980		Davoudi et al (2013) conceptual framework of evolutionary resilience					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavioural change • Community building • Localization • Preparedness • Persistence
Milton B, et al. (2012). The impact of community engagement on health and social outcomes: a systematic review. Community Development Journal, 47, pp.316-334. http://nphf.nl/footage/fm/File/The%20impact%20of%20community.pdf	academic	Community engagement	Local	Some indicators of disadvantage in the 13 included studies e.g. homeless or at risk of homelessness; substance use issues; socioeconomic disadvantage	Framework developed for systematic review of community engagement	Evaluation framework	<p>Primary</p> <p>Individual or population health (morbidity and mortality)</p> <p>Health-related risk factors (e.g. smoking rates)</p> <p>Environmental and socio-economic indicators (e.g. housing)</p> <p>Health inequalities within/between communities</p> <p>Intermediate</p> <p>Level/diversity of community members engaged</p> <p>Communication between the community and service providers</p> <p>Rates of service uptake or new services reflecting community-perceived needs</p> <p>Identification of community needs</p> <p>Community engagement (e.g. ensuring that community members' expectations of involvement are met)</p> <p>Community involvement in planning, design, delivery and governance of services</p> <p>Enhanced social inclusion, cohesion or capital</p> <p>Enhanced community wellbeing (e.g. sense of empowerment)</p> <p>Partnership working between communities, institutions and governments</p>
OECD (2014), How's Life in Your Region? Measuring Regional and Local Wellbeing for Policy Making, OECD Publishing, Paris.	Governmental	<p>Definition:</p> <p>Regional Wellbeing</p> <p>Scopes:</p> <p>The report presents the OECD analytical</p>	International (Including the UK, see Measuring wellbeing and changes to wellbeing in Newcastle https://www.wellbeingforlife.org.uk/sit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy makers 	OECD Regional Wellbeing Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks • Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	<p>Jobs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment rate • Unemployment rate <p>Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy at birth • Age adjusted mortality rate <p>Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homicide rate

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264217416-en		framework for measuring wellbeing at the regional level, as well as internationally comparable indicators on 9 wellbeing dimensions for 362 regions across 34 OECD countries. It also sets out guidance for all levels of government in using wellbeing measures to better target policies at the specific needs of different communities	es/default/files/OCDE%20-%20How's%20life%20in%20your%20region.pdf Regional				Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour force with at least a secondary degree Income: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household disposable income per capita Civic engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voters in last national election Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of air pollution experienced by regional population Access to services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household with broadband access Housing: Rooms per person
Oxfam Scotland (2013) Oxfam Humankind Index: The new measure of Scotland's Prosperity, first (and second) results http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/oxfam-humankind-index-the-new-measure-of-scotlands-prosperity-second-results-293743	Report written by Oxfam Scotland with the support of the Carnegie UK Trust	Definition: Community prosperity Scopes: This is the second report of the Oxfam Humankind Index for Scotland, following publication of the first results in April 2012. The Oxfam Humankind Index is a new way of measuring the prosperity of Scotland over time, based on what communities across Scotland say is important to	Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy makers Local authorities Members of the Public 	Oxfam Humankind Index http://policytool.humankindindex.org/ Indicators' sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2009-2010 Scottish Household Survey (SHS) 2009-2010 Scottish Social Attitudes Survey (SAS). Local Area Labour Markets in Scotland, Statistics from the Annual Population Survey 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator sets or indicator frameworks Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Health Neighbourhood/Environment Work Satisfaction Good relationships Safety Green Spaces Secure/Suitable Work Having enough money Financial Security Culture/Hobbies Local Facilities Skills and Education Community Spirit Good Transport Good services Tolerance Feeling Good

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
		them in making a good life.					
Parsfield M et al. (2015). Community capital: the value of connected communities. London: RSA Action & Research Centre. https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/pdfs/reports/rsaj3718-connected-communities-report_web.pdf	The Connected Communities for Mental Wellbeing and Social Inclusion programme was funded by the National Lottery through the Big Lottery Fund.	<p>Definition: Community Capital</p> <p>Scopes: The report looks at how different interventions can contribute to the development of resilient, inclusive communities with higher subjective wellbeing.</p> <p>The report also examines how interventions affect relationships and attitudes, and how relationships and attitudes affect individuals' and communities' propensity to foster various kinds of social value, including better wellbeing, greater citizenship and empowerment, improved capacity and economic advantages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional • Local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy makers • Local authorities • Members of the Public • Community 	The Connected Communities Approach in Policy and Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Frameworks • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset-based community development • Coproduction • Sustainability <p>Suggestions for growing community capital:</p> <p>Health and Wellbeing Boards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside a percentage of funds to commission community interventions such as co-produced and peer support groups • Adopt and develop a connectivity focused commissioning approach and a strategic commissioning framework <p>Education and Children's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use schools as anchor institutions to connect with other services • Connect pupils with local mentors and employers • Facilitate parents to build community connections with each other <p>Local Authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use co-ordinating role to facilitate collective impact approaches, drawing together different stakeholders to tackle isolation • Recruit para-social workers to develop personal community connection plans with individuals, or community organisers to work to weave new connections in a place <p>Business and Civic Society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEPs and charities could make 'community chest' small grant funding packages available for new initiatives

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>run by two or more multidisciplinary local organisations working together</p> <p>CCGs and Public Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission co-produced peer support groups like Murton Mams and the drug and alcohol recovery peer group Aspire 2B <p>Housing and Planning Officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds to provide versatile community venues, facilities and residents associations Local authorities could work with residents to coproduce projects funded by the 15% neighbourhood share of CIL funds <p>Residential and Adult Social Care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position key staff as community engagement workers, using a Connected Communities approach to better support aging in place
Phillips G, Bottomley C, Schmidt E, Tobi P, Lais S, Ge Y, Lynch R, Lock K, Draper A, Moore D, Clow A, Petticrew M, Hayes R, and Renton A. (2014). Measures of exposure to the Well London Phase-1 intervention and their association with health	academic	Well London: measures of social outcomes	Local	Deprived neighbourhoods in London	Social integration; Collective efficacy; Fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated tools 	<p>Social integration:</p> <p>Some/ most people in neighbourhood can be trusted;</p> <p>People from different backgrounds in the neighbourhood get on;</p> <p>Racial harassment is a problem.</p> <p>Collective efficacy:</p> <p>People in the neighbourhood pull together to improve it;</p> <p>People in the neighbourhood help each other and do things together;</p> <p>Taken any action to solve problems in the local area in past 12 months;</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
wellbeing and social outcomes. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 68, pp.597-605 9p. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24516117							Volunteering (any activity in last 12 months); Antisocial behaviour (resident perceptions score). Fear of crime: Feel safe in the neighbourhood (day; Feel safe in the neighbourhood (night).
Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 49(1-2), 1-21. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1007/s10464-011-9448-8/abstract	Academic	Definition: Community Wellbeing	National	Researchers	Objective and subjective indicators of Community Wellbeing Five Ss of wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites • Signs • Sources • Strategies • Synergy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Framework • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	Objective Indicators: Economic resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities • safety net • policies to promote research • development • investments Health promotion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to high quality health care. • Policies and programs to promote healthy eating and physical activity. • Prevention of epidemics and exposure to toxic substances. • Public awareness campaigns Function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper functioning of government services, such as policing, zoning, and education. Timely delivery • of services. • Integrity and corruption Freedom: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic elections and institutions • Freedom of expression, movement, and association Equality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protections for minorities • Equality before the law • Affirmative action policies Participation and inclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to participate in public affairs, such as referenda, and presence of services

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>for various minorities</p> <p>Subjective Indicators:</p> <p>Economic resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling hopeful about economic future • Feelings related to • Unemployment • Perceptions of economic opportunities <p>Health promotion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress related to access to health care and poor health services. • Awareness of health policies and health • Information • Perceptions of fairness in health system. • Knowledge of health promotion information <p>Function:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions about government efficiency, corruption and transparency <p>Freedom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling safe and protected. Fear of reprisals by criminals, such as organized crime <p>Equality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling respected by other citizens and government officials, perceptions of fairness in dealings with authorities and businesses <p>Participation and inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feelings of inclusion, belonging and sense of community
Public Health England, NHS England (2015) A guide to community centred approaches for health and wellbeing. London: Public Health England & NHS England	Governmental	<p>Definition:</p> <p>Community-centred approaches</p> <p>Scopes:</p> <p>This guide outlines a 'family of approaches' for evidence-based community-centred</p>	National	Local leaders, commissioners and service providers	<p>Community-centred approaches:</p> <p>Strengthening Communities;</p> <p>Volunteer and peer roles;</p> <p>Collaboration and partnership;</p> <p>Access to community resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual frameworks • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social capital • Community resilience • physical, social and economic environment • community resources

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/402889/A_guide_to_community-centred_approaches_for_health_and_wellbeing_brief.pdf		approaches to health and wellbeing.					
Rocket Science UK Ltd (2010) Summative evaluation of the Community Asset Programme. Appendix F: Programme Outcomes Framework https://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/research/communities-and-places-publications	Governmental	<p>Definition: Community Asset</p> <p>Scopes: This report presents the findings and recommendations of the summative evaluation of the Community Asset Programme, managed by the BIG Lottery Fund on behalf of the Office for Civil Society (OCS).</p>	Regional Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BIG: Community Assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Framework Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	<p>Thriving Civil Society Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of secured external funding leveraged into the asset Value of surplus generated for the project through management of the asset 'Score' for robustness of business plan? Value of funding being channelled to CSOs in the locality generated as a surplus from the management of the asset Value of in-kind support (£/per hour) being given to CSOs related to asset management <p>Diversified service delivery routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the number and value of public service contracts delivered by the CSO at the start of the project and tracked over time % of board of CSO that feel that having control of the asset is crucial to the delivery of public service contract <p>Influence of local decision-making by local community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of local people on the board of the CSO Number of local people actively involved in the organisation of events run by the CSO % of local people who feel that the asset enables them to have greater influence on local decision-making

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>Increase in community cohesion and inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of different groups from a range of backgrounds and interests using the asset on a regular basis • • Number of people from a range of backgrounds that use the asset regularly • % of local people from a range of backgrounds that feel the way the asset is run successfully meets their needs <p>Increase in civic participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of local people actively involved as volunteers in the running of the asset • % of local people who would be feel that they would be welcome as volunteers in the management of the asset <p>Increase in community capacity to effect change/development of social capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of people undertaking skill development programmes • % increase in skill levels among board members and wider community
Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA) https://www.thersa.org/	Non-Governmental	Definition: Social Change	National Regional Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Public • Local Authorities • Community 	Selected Indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Society • Climate Change • Education • Employment • Localism • Pensions • Social mobility • Teaching • Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual frameworks • Evaluation Framework • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Services and Communities • Creative Learning and Development • Economy, Enterprise & Manufacturing
Rutter J. (2015). Where is the most	NGO (Family &	Definition:	National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy makers 	Family Friendly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator set/ Framework 	Broad family wellbeing statistics:

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
family friendly area in England? London: Family & Childcare Trust.	Childcare Trust)	<p>Family and community wellbeing</p> <p>Scopes: The report examines trends towards becoming family friendly in England and accompanies the National Report Card for 2015. The authors have analysed 27 different sets of statistics that relate to wellbeing, income and poverty, employment, public services, housing and infrastructure. The analysis of the family friendly indicators was then collated and used to rank each local authority area, according to how family friendly we judged it to be.</p>	Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local authorities Members of the Public 	<p>Indicators Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Population Survey Police force recorded crime statistics NHS England statistical release Breastfeeding initiation and prevalence at 6 to 8 weeks Department for Culture, Media and Sports Active People Survey 2012 Census 2011 Department for Work and Pensions Households Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2014 Labour Force Survey Department for Education Provision for children under five statistics Department for Education Early Years Foundation Stage Profile attainment, 2013/14 Department for Education, GCSE attainment by pupil National Pupil Dataset Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings Conception statistics, England and Wales Department for Communities and Local Government Department for Communities and Local 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average (mean) life satisfaction rating All recorded crime in 12 months to June 2014, per head of population Percentage of babies totally or partially breastfed at the 6-8 week development check Percentage of children who are overweight or obese in Year 6 of primary education Adult participation in sport in reference week of Active People Survey Percentage of the over-3 population who cannot speak English well or at all Single parent households with dependent children, as a percentage of all households <p>Income and poverty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child poverty – the percentage of children living in households receiving out-of-work benefits or on work tax credits where the household income is less than 60 per cent of median income Gross median weekly pay, for all employee jobs by residency Percentage of the 16-64 population who are unemployed or economically inactive Difference between Living Wage and gross hourly pay for the lowest paid 20% of employees (by residency) <p>Family friendly work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difference between gross hourly pay for female fulltime and female part-time workers Percentage of local authority residents aged 16-74 in employment who worked more than 49 hours per week in the week before Census 2011 Percentage of the 16-64 population working Saturday and/or Sunday Average journey to work times in minutes <p>High quality public services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage uptake of free early education among eligible two year olds The percentage of boys achieving at least the expected levels in all 17 early learning goals at 4-5 years Proportions of pupils eligible for free school

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
					Government, Statutory Homeless Statistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department for Transport Reported road casualties annual report, 2013 Public Health England 		meals who get 5 grade A*-C grades at GCSE (including English and maths) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of 16-64 population with Level 4 qualifications Conception rate per 1,000 females under 18 Local authority revenue expenditure for cultural services per head Family friendly infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children in households accepted as homeless and in temporary accommodation, per head of population Percentage of families with dependent children who live in the private rental sector Reported child casualties by local authority, England, 2009 – 2013, as a percentage of 0-18 population, Percentage of families with dependent children who have no access to a car or van Under Five childcare places per 100 children Estimate of the percentage of deaths that had particulate air pollution as a contributory factor
Scottish Community Development Centre. (2007). Building stronger communities: A practical assessment and planning tool for community capacity building in Scotland http://www.scdc.org.uk/what/building-stronger-communities/	Non-Governmental	Definition: Community Capacity Building	Local	agency, partnership or group of practitioners that has responsibility for supporting community organisations and wider community activity, engagement and involvement	Building Stronger Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance and Management Resources and assets Links and networks Effectiveness Accountability and legitimacy
Siegler V. (2015a). Measuring national wellbeing. London: Office for National Statistics. https://www.ons.gov.uk/measuring-national-wellbeing	Governmental	ONS measures of social capital from the Measuring National Wellbeing Programme	National	Whole population	25 headline measures of social capital from the ONS Measuring National Wellbeing Programme	Indicator set	Personal relationships: Proportion of people who have at least 1 close friend; Proportion of people who meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues at least

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
ov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuringnationalwellbeing/2015-07-09 & Siegler V. (2015b). Measuring national wellbeing: an analysis of social capital in the UK. London: Office for National Statistics. http://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuringnationalwellbeing/2015-01-29							<p>once a week;</p> <p>Proportion of people who have felt lonely all, most or more than half the time (over previous 2 weeks);</p> <p>Proportion of people who belong to a social network website;</p> <p>Average rating of satisfaction with family life;</p> <p>Average rating of satisfaction with social life;</p> <p>Proportion of people who regularly stop and talk with people in neighbourhood.</p> <p>Social network support:</p> <p>Proportion of people who have a spouse, family member or friend to rely on if they have a serious problem;</p> <p>Proportion of people who give special help to at least one sick, disabled or elderly person living or not living with them;</p> <p>Proportion of parents who regularly receive or give practical or financial help from/ to a child aged 16 or over not living with them;</p> <p>Proportion of people who borrow things and exchange favours with their neighbours.</p> <p>Civic engagement:</p> <p>Proportion of people who volunteered in the last 12 months;</p> <p>Proportion of people who are members of political. Voluntary, professional or recreational organisations;</p> <p>Proportion of people who have been involved in at least one social action project in their local area in the previous 12 months;</p> <p>Proportion of people who definitely agree or tend to agree that they can influence decisions affecting their local area;</p> <p>Proportion of people who voted in the UK general elections;</p> <p>Proportion of people who have been involved in at least one political action in the previous 12 months;</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>Proportion of people who are very or quite interested in politics.</p> <p>Trust & Cooperative Norms</p> <p>Proportion of people who have trust in national government;</p> <p>Proportion of people who would say that most people can be trusted;</p> <p>Proportion of people who would say that most people in their neighbourhood can be trusted;</p> <p>Proportion of people who definitely agree or tend to agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together;</p> <p>Proportion of people who feel very or fairly [safe] walking alone at night in their local area;</p> <p>Proportion of people who agree or strongly agree that people around where they live are willing to help their neighbours;</p> <p>Proportion of people who agree or strongly agree that they feel they belong to their local area.</p>
Skills For Care (2010). 'Only a footstep away'? neighbourhoods, social capital and their place in the 'big society'. Leeds: Skills for Care. http://www.skillsfor-care.org.uk/Documents/Learning-and-development/Community-skills-development/Only-a-footstep-away.pdf	Non-Governmental	<p>Definition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbouring/ Neighbourliness • Community capacity building <p>Scopes:</p> <p>The paper scopes the meaning and understanding of neighbours and neighbourhoods and considers how this might inform strategic development on neighbourhood</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National • Local 	Policy Makers	<p>Neighbourhood workforce development and Community Capacity</p> <p>Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaskin's 4 characteristics of community capacity • Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) • 2007/8 Citizenship Survey • Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders (DCLG 2008) • National evaluation of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity • Timeliness • Physical environment • Length of residence • Social polarisation • Personal circumstances

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
		workforce planning and skills development. The paper also locates the discussion within the context of the emerging debate around the meaning of social capital, the concept of the 'Big Society' and empowerment of people and communities as a platform for the delivery of fairness and opportunity.			participatory budgeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2008 Place Survey 		
Social Life Reports included: Woodcraft S, Bacon N, Caistor-Arendar L, and Hackett T. (2012). Design for social sustainability: A framework for creating thriving new communities. http://www.social-life.co/media/files/DESIGN_FOR_SOCIAL_SUSTAINABILITY_3.pdf Social Life, Dixon T. (2012). Creating Strong Communities: How	Non-governmental The report produced by Woodcraft et al. 2012 was commissioned by the Homes and Communities Agency as part of Future Communities. The report produced by Social Life and Dixon T., 2012 was commissioned by the Berkeley Group	Definition: Social Sustainability Scopes: The paper sets out how to plan, design and develop successful and socially sustainable new communities. The ideas and examples are drawn from a large scale review of evidence about what makes communities flourish, with practical examples and approaches from new	Regional Local (e.g. Sutton)	Governments, planners, developers and architects, Communities	Building Blocks for social sustainability Selected Indicators: Built environment and public space: 1. Early provision of schools, nursery and childcare 2. People-friendly layouts e.g. car free areas, speed reductions, eyes on the street, well-lit areas. 3. Community advocate for future residents. 4. Flexible and adaptable housing Social architectures & supports: 5. Hyper-local information about community services and groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual frameworks Evaluation Framework Indicator sets or indicator Validated tools or instruments or question sets 	1. Amenities & social infrastructure Description: Amenities and support services in place early in life of new community – emphasis on schools, social spaces, transport & community workers. Indicators: 1. Provision of community space 2. Transport links 3. Place with a distinctive character 4. Integration with wider neighbourhood 2. Social & cultural life Description: Shared spaces, collective activities and and social architecture to foster local networks, belonging and community identity Indicators:

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
<p>to measure the social sustainability of new housing developments. http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Creating_Strong_Communities.pdf</p> <p>Bacon N, Caistor-Arendar L (2015). Measuring social sustainability in Sutton. http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Sutton_Social_Sustainability_Nov14.pdf</p>		settlements around the world.			<p>6. Time banking – promoting mutual exchange and development of social capital through peer-to-peer time banking or people-to agency time banking.</p> <p>7. Democratic governance structures e.g. Parish or Neighbourhood Council.</p> <p>8. Flexible stewardship strategy – scope for governance structures and actions to change over time to reflect evolving population and needs.</p> <p>Social practices:</p> <p>9. Baby-sitting circles, parent and baby groups, car clubs, lift share schemes, walking school bus, cycle clubs neighbouring networks.</p> <p>10. Neighbourhood-based groups e.g. Neighbourhood Watch, Residents/Tenant Associations, Pledge bank.</p> <p>11. Family days, critical walking, neighbourhood walkabouts, Complaints Choirs.</p> <p>12. Community gardening, community play spaces</p>		<p>5. Positive local identity</p> <p>6. Relationships with neighbours</p> <p>7. Wellbeing</p> <p>8. Feelings of safety</p> <p>9. Community facilities</p> <p>10. Perceptions of ability to influence local area</p> <p>11. Willingness to act to improve area</p> <p>12. Integration with wider neighbourhood</p> <p>13. Accessible and safe street layout</p> <p>14. Physical space on development that is adaptable in the future</p> <p>3. Voice and influence:</p> <p>Description: Governance structures to represent future residents and engage new ones in shaping local decision-making and stewardship</p> <p>Indicator: 15. Perceptions of ability to influence local area</p> <p>4. Space to grow/Adaptability & Resilience</p> <p>Description: Flexible planning: housing, infrastructure & services that can adapt over time; meanwhile use of buildings and public space.</p> <p>Indicator: Not provided in the report commissioned by the Berkeley Group</p> <p>Selected questions:</p> <p>16. I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years.</p> <p>17. If I needed advice about something I could</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>go to someone in my neighbourhood.</p> <p>18. Have you recently felt like you were playing a useful part in things?</p> <p>19. How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?</p> <p>20. How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?</p> <p>21. How satisfied are you with the quality of facilities for children and young people in your local area? 0-4yrs</p> <p>22. In the last 12 months, has any organisation asked you what you think about...</p> <p>23. I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood.</p> <p>24. Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafés?</p> <p>25. Public transport accessibility.</p> <p>26. Does the scheme feel like a place with distinctive character?</p> <p>27. Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?</p> <p>28. Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?</p> <p>29. Do internal spaces and layout allow for adaption, conversion or extension?</p>
Tampubolon G, Subramanian S V, and Kawachi I. (2013). NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INDIVIDUAL SELF-RATED HEALTH IN WALES. Health Economics, 22,	Academic, governmental	Social capital measures from the Living in Wales survey 2007	LSOA (neighbourhood/local)	Whole population	Living in Wales survey (social capital measures)	Indicator set	<p>Social capital questions from the Living in Wales survey:</p> <p>Would you say that you trust 'most of the people in the neighbourhood', 'many', 'a few', or 'do not trust people in the neighbourhood'?</p> <p>What do you like most about living in this neighbourhood? Options include 'Friendly people or neighbours', 'sense of community', and 25 others (see other citation)</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
pp.14-21. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.1808/full							
Welsh Assembly (2015) Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/anaw/2015/2/pdfs/anaw_20150002_en.pdf	Governmental	<p>Definition: Sustainable Development</p> <p>Scopes: An Act of the National Assembly for Wales to make provision requiring public bodies to do things in pursuit of the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales in a way that accords with the sustainable development principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Local 	Local Authorities	The wellbeing goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual Framework 	<p>Prosperity: An innovative, productive and low carbon society which recognises the limits of the global environment and therefore uses resources efficiently and proportionately (including acting on climate change); and which develops a skilled and well-educated population in an economy which generates wealth and provides employment opportunities, allowing people to take advantage of the wealth generated through securing decent work.</p> <p>Resiliency: A nation which maintains and enhances a biodiverse natural environment with healthy functioning ecosystems that support social, economic and ecological resilience and the capacity to adapt to change (for example climate change).</p> <p>Health: A society in which people's physical and mental wellbeing is maximised and in which choices and behaviours that benefit future health are understood.</p> <p>Equality: A society that enables people to fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances (including their socio economic background and circumstances).</p> <p>Cohesion: Attractive, viable, safe and well-connected communities.</p> <p>Culture and Language:</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>A society that promotes and protects culture, heritage and the Welsh language, and which encourages people to participate in the arts, and sports and recreation.</p> <p>Global Responsibility: A nation which, when doing anything to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of Wales, takes account of whether doing such a thing may make a positive contribution to global wellbeing.</p>
Wilton C. (2012). Building community capacity: evidence, efficiency and cost-effectiveness. London: Think Local Act Personal. https://www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/assets/BCC/Building_Community_Capacity_-_Evidence_efficiency_and_cost-effectiveness.pdf	NGO	Social Capital	local	Local authorities/ community members	Think local act personal outcomes	Conceptual framework	<p>Four key areas in relation to social capital: Building social support networks; Encouraging membership of groups; Nurturing an inclusive community; Enabling everyone to make a contribution (participation and co-production).</p>
Wind T R, and Komproe I H. (2012). The mechanisms that associate community social capital with post-disaster mental health: A multilevel model. Social Science & Medicine, 75, pp.1715-1720.	academic	Community social capital	Local (Morpeth)	Post-flood residents of Morpeth	<p>SA-SCAT (Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002) to measure social capital.</p> <p>Collective Efficacy scale (Sampson et al. 1997)</p> <p>Residential stability</p>	Validated scales	<p>SA-SCAT (social capital): Group membership items 1. In the last 12 months have you been an active member of any of the following types of groups in your community? Work related/trade union Community association/co-op Women's group Political group Religious group Credit/funeral group</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22883254							<p>Sports group Other: specify</p> <p>Support from groups items 2. In the last 12 months, did you receive from the group any emotional help, economic help or assistance in helping you know or do things? Work related/trade union Community association/co-op Women's group Political group Religious group Credit/funeral group Sports group Other: specify</p> <p>Support from individuals items 3. In the last 12 months, have you received any help or support from any of the following, this can be emotional help, economic help or assistance in helping you know or do things? Family Neighbours Friends who are not neighbours Community leaders Religious leaders Politicians Government officials/civil service Charitable organisations/NGO Other: specify</p> <p>Citizenship activities items 4. In the last 12 months, have you joined together with other community members to address a problem or common issue? 5. In the last 12 months, have you talked with a local authority or governmental organisation about problems in this community?</p>

Source	Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic)	Outcome description	Geographic level	Population description	Name of indicator (set)	Level on ladder	Domains
							<p>Cognitive social capital items</p> <p>6. In general, can the majority of people in this community be trusted?</p> <p>7. Do the majority of people in this community generally get along with each other?</p> <p>8. Do you feel as though you are really a part of this community?</p> <p>9. Do you think that the majority of people in this community would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance?</p> <p>Collective efficacy scale:</p> <p>Informal social control - Likelihood that neighbours could be counted on to intervene if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner 2. children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building 3. children were showing disrespect to an adult 4. a fight broke out in front of their house, and 5. the fire station closest to their home was threatened with budget cuts. <p>Social cohesion and trust:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. people around here are willing to help their neighbours 2. this is a close-knit neighbourhood 3. people in this neighbourhood can be trusted 4. people in this neighbourhood generally don't get along with each other 5. people in this neighbourhood do not share the same values <p>Residential stability</p> <p>Rented/ owned with mortgage/ owned outright</p> <p>Income</p>

