

Community Wellbeing indicators: 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.ascskills.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 | Non-Governmental Organization The project was commissioned by Local Government Improvement and Development and the National | 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 | <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 | <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 | <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 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Development. http://www.ritimo.org/IMG/pdf/Th e-2.pdf | Mental Health Development Unit. | | | <p>People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local business and entrepreneurs | percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality (PSA 21) | <p>wellbeing (e.g. The North West Mental Wellbeing Survey and WEMWBS scale).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-dimensional framework for measuring wellbeing (e.g. NEF's National Accounts of Well-being framework). 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 | <p>Community social capital Community organizational life Engagement with public affairs Social trust</p> <p>Organizational social capital Structural social capital Relational social capital Cognitive social capital</p> |
| Bacon N, et al. (2010). The state of happiness: can public policy shape people's | Non-Governmental (Young Foundation) | Scopes: The report describes the state of play in academic and practical | International National Local | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employed/Unemployed Children and Families Older people Adolescents | 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| wellbeing and resilience? London: The Young Foundation. https://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-State-of-Happiness.pdf | | 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 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. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with mental health issues • People with physical health issues • Community | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social: Family & relationships; Social support & engagement; Sense of belonging & community cohesion. • Personal: Health & mental wellbeing; Engaging activities & achievements; Material & financial wellbeing |
| Baumgartner J | academic | Social inclusion | Any | People with | Systematic review, | Scales/ validated tools | SinQUE 75 items: |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| <p>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</p> | | | | <p>mental health issues</p> | <p>reports on 5 scales:</p> <p>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.;</p> <p>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–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</p> | | <p>Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — productivity (6 items) — consumption (15 items) — access to services (6 items) — political engagement (6 items) — social integration (42 items) <p>SCOPE 48 items:</p> <p>Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — leisure and participation — housing and accommodation — safety — work — financial situation — self-reported health — education — family and social relationships — overall inclusion <p>Social inclusion scale 22 items:</p> <p>Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — building social capital — social acceptance — neighbourhood cohesion — security of housing tenure — engagement in leisure/cultural activities — citizenship <p>Social integration survey 62 items:</p> <p>Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — social perception — work interactions — social skills |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>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 cognition</p> <p>— instrumental activities of daily living/ self-care</p> <p>CIM 10 items:</p> <p>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. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/a</p> | Academic | <p>Definition: Sustainable development</p> <p>Scope: The paper conducted an analysis of the Audit Commission's local QOL</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 |
|---|---------------------------------|---|------------------|---|--|---|---|
| bs/10.1080/03003930.2011.555081 | | indicators' dataset 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 | | | | | Ten most important indicators <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 Pedestrian casualties |
| 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 | Definition: City Liveability Scopes: 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. | 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 | Thriving and prosperous economy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVA • Median wage • Unemployment • Economic activity • Business start-ups • Visitor numbers and tourist spend Safety: <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 Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy • Obesity • Physical activity |

| 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"> • Nutrition • Smoking • Binge drinking <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people with a degree level qualification • 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|---|------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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 | 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 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> | 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: 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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 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 | 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 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> |
| Department of Health (2011). | Governmental | Community engagement | National | Adults; members of the | n/a | Conceptual framework | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved health and wellbeing outcomes and impact on wider determinants of health |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 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 | | (volunteering) | | public | | | (e.g. education, environment, employment and crime); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased learning opportunities, employability and job-related skills; • increased social capital and community resilience; and • increasing integration of the socially excluded. |
| 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/2636 | Governmental The Public Health Outcomes Framework | Public/ community health | Local authorities in England | Entire population in a local authority area. Indicators include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children in poverty • 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training • People in prison who have a mental illness or a significant mental illness • People | Public Health Outcomes Framework | Indicator sets or indicator framework 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 consultation | 1. Improving the wider determinants of health: 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 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 58/2901502_PH_OF_Improving_Outcomes_PT1A_v1_1.pdf | | | | <p>entering prison with substance dependence issues who are previously not known to community treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | | | <p>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;</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>People entering prison with substance dependence issues who are previously not 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;</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---|---|------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | 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; 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- | Governmental commissioned by the Department of Health | <p>Definition: Community Development</p> <p>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</p> | 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| LITERATURE-REVIEW-Brian-Fisher-Revised-edn-2016.pdf | | development, its relationship to community health and to enhancing the responsiveness of commissioning. It also touches on the evidence on CD and behaviour change. | | | | | |
| Foot J. (2012). What makes us healthy? An asset approach in practice: evidence, action, evaluation. http://janefoot.com/downloads/files/healthy%20FINAL%20FINAL.pdf | Local Wellbeing Project, and the Young Foundation, the IDEA/LGID and three councils (NGO/gov) | 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 The advantage of the WARM framework of measures is | Local (neighbourhood) | Neighbourhood/LA | Wellbeing and Resilience measure (WARM) | Conceptual framework | <p>Self: the way people feel about their own lives, personal wellbeing and resilience, as well as other attributes such as income or health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: the quality of social supports and networks within the community, which includes emotional support as well as broader personal support • 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|----------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | <p>that it is designed to be used to measure individual and community wellbeing and resilience in a neighbourhood.</p> <p>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 Mguni, Catherine Russell and Nicola Bacon (February 2010)</p> <p>66 vulnerabilities and disadvantages'.</p> | | | | | <p>employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. |
| Glasgow Centre | The GCPH is a | Definition: | Regional | • Service | Community Profile | • Indicator Framework | Population demographics: |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|--|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| for Population Health. A Community Health and Wellbeing Profile for East Glasgow (http://www.gcph.co.uk/assets/00/00/0622/EastGlasgow.pdf) | partnership between NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow City Council, and the University of Glasgow, funded by the Scottish Government. | 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). | Local | providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planners Policy makers Members of the Public | indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures and scales Indicator framework Validated tools or instruments or question sets | <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 <p>Mortality:</p> <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) <p>Drugs, Alcohol and Smoking:</p> <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) <p>Hospitalisation & Injury:</p> <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 Road accident casualties Assault discharges <p>Mental Health & Function:</p> |

| 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"> • 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 <p>Social Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clients aged 0-15 • Clients aged 16-64 • Clients aged 65+ <p>Prosperity – Poverty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Income deprived • employment deprived • Workless • JSA - Unemployment • Households without • Children in workless • Social grade E - • Workplaces • Employees5 <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school attendance • S4 Pupils with 5+ GCSE equivalents • Adults without qualifications <p>Crime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious violent crime • Domestic abuse incidents • Vandalism • Drug Offenders <p>Housing & Transport:</p> <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_Outcomes_Framework_SU_MMARY.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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>8. Reduce % internet users who only use websites they have used before</p> <p>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</p> <p>10. Increase % adults who agree that the internet makes life easier</p> <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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|--|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <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> <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</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>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> <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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | 41. Increase % internet users finding information that helps them form an opinion |
| 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 | Non-Governmental Governmental Academic 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 Greater Glasgow & Clyde. | Definition: Urban regeneration Scopes: This report focuses on findings from the GoWell Community Health and Wellbeing Survey of 14 neighbourhoods in Glasgow undergoing different types of regeneration. | National Regional Local | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy-makers • GoWell researchers | GoWell Community Health and Wellbeing Survey 2006-2008 | <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 • Recent illness <p>Mental Health and Wellbeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental health problems • Regeneration areas • Quality of life |
| Grant Thornton UK LLP. (2015). | Non-Governmental | Definition: Public health | National Local | Local authorities | The Health and Wellbeing Index | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Framework | <p>Economic:</p> <p>Unemployment, qualifications, childhood</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Growing healthy communities: the Health and Wellbeing Index. London: Grant Thornton UK LLP</p> <p>http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/globalassets/1.-member-firms/united-kingdom/pdf/publication/2015/growing-healthy-communities-health-and-wellbeing-index.pdf</p> | | <p>Scope:</p> <p>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.</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks | <p>education, occupations and income</p> <p>Society: Deprivation, child poverty, fuel poverty, crime and social cohesion</p> <p>Environment: Household occupancy (overcrowding), natural environment, social housing, homelessness and living environment</p> <p>Health Outcome Criteria: Healthy lifestyles: Adult obesity, child obesity, sports participation, smoking, drug misuse, binge drinking, under-age pregnancy and low birth weight</p> <p>Health conditions: Life expectancy, infant mortality, cancer mortality, suicide mortality, circulatory mortality, alcohol mortality, excess winter deaths, hip fractures, diabetes, self-reported wellbeing</p> |
| <p>Happy City Index</p> <p>http://happycityindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Happy-City-Index-Framework-Outline.pdf</p> | NGO (Happy City) | Wellbeing (Individual and community) | Local | Members of the public | The Happy City Index | Conceptual framework; Logic model; measure (survey) | <p>CITY PULSE</p> <p>Job satisfaction; Social isolation; Physical & Mental health; Accommodation; Public Transport; Cultural Engagement; Inter-generational contact; Green Space</p> |
| Helsper E.J. (2012). A | Academic | Definition: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National | Researchers | Social Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Frameworks | Offline Inclusion: |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>corresponding fields model for the links between social and digital exclusion. Communication Theory, 22, pp.403-426.</p> <p>http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01416.x/abstract</p> | | <p>Social and Digital Inclusion/Exclusion</p> <p>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.</p> | | | <p>Mediators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access • Skills • Attitudes <p>Digital Inclusion: Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Ownership • Sustainability | | <p>Economic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income • Employment • Education <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Ethnicity • Generation <p>Social:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Ties • Political and Civic Networks <p>Personal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological Health • Physical Health • Personality <p>Digital Inclusion:</p> <p>Economic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commerce and Finance • Information and Learning <p>Cultural:</p> <p>Participation and Engagement</p> <p>Social:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation and Engagement • Networking and Communication <p>Personal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entertainment and Leisure |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | Non provided | Definition: Community 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local | Local authorities | Answer to the survey question: “What do you see as the 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"> Validated tools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of equalities Addressing unemployment/ under-employment 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 | 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; |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---|---|------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 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 | | | | | | | No sense of community; Isolated; Poor schools. |
| 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 | 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;</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| h.org.uk/sites/default/files/HeadlandsAndHeartAssetsBasedApproachesInHealthCare.pdf | | | | | | | developing policies aimed at tackling poverty and the social, economic and environmental determinants of health. |
| 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 | 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. |
| Jeffrey K, Michaelson J (2015). Five headline indicators of national success: a clearer picture of how the UK is | Non-Governmental Organization Report written with the endorsement of several organizations | Definition: National success Scopes: The report proposes five new headline indicators of | 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 | Good Jobs: <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. Wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average (mean) UK response to the life satisfaction question included in the |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|--|--|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| performing. London: New Economics Foundation. http://neweconomics.org/2015/10/five-headline-indicators-of-national-success/ | (e.g. Happy City, Oxfam, World Future Council) | national success for the UK. Its aim is to realign policy priorities with those of the public, building a stronger, more balanced economy. | | | | | ONS's Annual Population Survey. Environment: <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 Fairness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data from the ONS's Effects of Taxes and Benefits on Household Income Health: <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. Supporting Indicators: Good Jobs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender and other protected characteristics Job satisfaction Median income Housing affordability GDP Wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children's wellbeing Wellbeing inequalities |

| 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"> • 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, Fenton A and, and Fitzgerald A. (2013). Labour's record | Academic Funded by the Joseph Rowntree | Community development National Wellbeing/Success/Development | National | Community Local Authorities | Governmental 'floor targets' | Indicator set or indicator framework | Liveability: Reduce proportion of local authorities with unacceptable litter Reduce number of abandoned cars Increase household satisfaction |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---|--|------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| 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/spsc/wp06.pdf | Foundation and the Nuffield Foundation | Neighbourhood satisfaction | | | | | <p>Neighbourhood satisfaction: Survey of English Housing (SEH)/English Housing Survey (EHS)</p> <p>Worklessness: 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: Reduce the gap in life expectancy by 10% Reduce the gap in deaths from circulatory diseases by 40% Reduce the gap in premature cancer deaths by 6%</p> <p>Education: Reduce inequalities in levels of development at the Foundation Stage Reduce by 40% the proportion of schools in which fewer than 65% of pupils achieve level 4 or above at Key Stage 2 In all schools at least 50% of pupils to achieve Level 5 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. | Academic: Sustainable Places Research Institute & School of Social Sciences, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve social relations • support socio-political empowerment • fulfil the basic needs of the people. | 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 |
|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------|---|--|----------------------|---|
| http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09654313.2015.1082980 | Cardiff University, Wales, UK | Adaptation of 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.</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | sense of empowerment) Partnership working between communities, institutions and governments |
| OECD (2014), How's Life in Your Region? Measuring Regional and Local Wellbeing for Policy Making, OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264217416-en | Governmental | Definition: Regional Wellbeing Scopes: The report presents the OECD analytical 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 | International (Including the UK, see Measuring wellbeing and changes to wellbeing in Newcastle https://www.wellbeingforlife.org.uk/sites/default/files/OECD%20-%20How's%20life%20in%20your%20region.pdf) Regional | <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 | Jobs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment rate Unemployment rate Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life expectancy at birth Age adjusted mortality rate Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homicide rate 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 | Report written by Oxfam | Definition: Community | Regional | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy makers Local | Oxfam Humankind Index | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator sets or indicator frameworks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Health |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 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 | Scotland with the support of the Carnegie UK Trust | 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 them in making a good life. | | authorities • Members of the Public | http://policytool.humankindindex.org/ Indicators' sources: • 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 | • Validated tools or instruments or question sets | • 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 |
| Parsfield M et al. (2015). Community capital: the value of connected communities. London: RSA Action & Research | The Connected Communities for Mental Wellbeing and Social Inclusion programme was funded by the National Lottery through the | Definition: Community Capital Scopes: The report looks at how different interventions can contribute to the development | • Regional • Local | • Policy makers • Local authorities • Members of the Public • Community | The Connected Communities Approach in Policy and Practice | • Conceptual Frameworks • Logic models/logical frameworks/evaluation plans • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks | • Asset-based community development • Coproduction • Sustainability Suggestions for growing community capital: Health and Wellbeing Boards: |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Centre. https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/pdfs/reports/rsaj3718-connected-communities-report_web.pdf | Big Lottery Fund. | <p>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"> 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 run by two or more multidisciplinary local organisations working together |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <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 | 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; People from different backgrounds in the neighbourhood get on; Racial harassment is a problem.</p> <p>Collective efficacy:</p> <p>People in the neighbourhood pull together to improve it; People in the neighbourhood help each other and do things together;</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Phase-1 intervention and their association with health wellbeing and social outcomes. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 68, pp.597-605 9p. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24516117 | | | | | | | <p>Taken any action to solve problems in the local area in past 12 months; Volunteering (any activity in last 12 months); Antisocial behaviour (resident perceptions score).</p> <p>Fear of crime: Feel safe in the neighbourhood (day); Feel safe in the neighbourhood (night).</p> |
| 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 | <p>Objective and subjective indicators of Community Wellbeing</p> <p>Five Ss of wellbeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites • Signs • Sources • Strategies • Synergy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Framework • Indicator sets or indicator frameworks | <p>Objective Indicators:</p> <p>Economic resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities • safety net • policies to promote research • development • investments <p>Health promotion:</p> <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 <p>Function:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper functioning of government services, such as policing, zoning, and education. Timely delivery • of services. • Integrity and corruption <p>Freedom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic elections and institutions • Freedom of expression, movement, and |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | | | 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 for various minorities Subjective Indicators: Economic resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling hopeful about economic future • Feelings related to • Unemployment • Perceptions of economic opportunities Health promotion: <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 Function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions about government efficiency, corruption and transparency Freedom: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling safe and protected. Fear of reprisals by criminals, such as organized crime Equality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling respected by other citizens and government officials, perceptions of fairness in dealings with authorities and |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | businesses Participation and inclusion: <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 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/402889/A_guide_to_community-centred_approaches_for_health_and_wellbeing_briefing.pdf | Governmental | Definition: Community-centred approaches Scopes: This guide outlines a 'family of approaches' for evidence-based community-centred approaches to health and wellbeing. | National | Local leaders, commissioners and service providers | Community-centred approaches: Strengthening Communities; Volunteer and peer roles; Collaboration and partnership; Access to community resources. | <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 |
| Rocket Science UK Ltd (2010) Summative evaluation of the Community Asset Programme. Appendix F: Programme Outcomes Framework | Governmental | Definition: Community Asset Scopes: This report presents the findings and recommendation | 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 | Thriving Civil Society Sector: <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) |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| https://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/research/communities-and-places/publications | | s 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>being given to CSOs related to asset management</p> <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 <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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>is run successfully meets their needs</p> <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.therrsa.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"> • 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 family friendly area in England? London: Family & Childcare Trust. | NGO (Family & Childcare Trust) | Definition: Family and community wellbeing Scopes: The report | National Regional | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy makers • Local authorities • Members of the Public | Family Friendly Indicators Sources: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator set/ Framework | Broad family wellbeing statistics: |
| | | | | | <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"> • 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| | | <p>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> | | | <p>statistical release Breastfeeding initiation and prevalence at 6 to 8 weeks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | | <p>overweight or obese in Year 6 of primary education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---|------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | Communities and Local Government, Statutory Homeless Statistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department for Transport Reported road casualties annual report, 2013 • Public Health England | | learning goals at 4-5 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportions of pupils eligible for free school meals who get 5 grade A*-C grades at GCSE (including English and maths) • 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 | Non-Governmental | Definition: Community Capacity Building | Local | agency, partnership or group of practitioners that has responsibility for supporting community organisations | 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| planning tool for community capacity building in Scotland http://www.scdc.org.uk/what/building-stronger-communities/ | | | | and wider community activity, engagement and involvement | | | |
| Siegler V. (2015a). Measuring national wellbeing. London: Office for National Statistics. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuring-national-wellbeing/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 | 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 | <p>Personal relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of people who have at least 1 close friend; Proportion of people who meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues at least once a week; Proportion of people who have felt lonely all, most or more than half the time (over previous 2 weeks); Proportion of people who belong to a social network website; Average rating of satisfaction with family life; Average rating of satisfaction with social life; Proportion of people who regularly stop and talk with people in neighbourhood. <p>Social network support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of people who have a spouse, family member or friend to rely on if they have a serious problem; Proportion of people who give special help to at least one sick, disabled or elderly person living or not living with them; Proportion of parents who regularly receive or give practical or financial help from/ to a child aged 16 or over not living with them; Proportion of people who borrow things |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuring-national-wellbeing/2015-01-29 | | | | | | | <p>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> <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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <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.skillsforcare.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: The paper scopes the meaning and understanding of neighbours and neighbourhoods and considers how this might inform strategic development on neighbourhood workforce planning and skills development. The paper also locates the discussion within the</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 participatory budgeting • 2008 Place Survey | <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 |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | 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. | | | | | |
| <p>Social Life</p> <p>Reports included:</p> <p>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.p</p> | <p>Non-governmental</p> <p>The report produced by Woodcraft et al. 2012 was commissioned by the Homes and Communities Agency as part of Future Communities.</p> <p>The report produced by Social Life and Dixon T., 2012 was commissioned by the Berkeley</p> | <p>Definition: Social Sustainability</p> <p>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</p> | Regional Local (e.g. Sutton) | Governments, planners, developers and architects, Communities | <p>Building Blocks for social sustainability</p> <p>Selected Indicators: Built environment and public space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Social architectures &</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual frameworks • Evaluation Framework • Indicator sets or indicator • Validated tools or instruments or question sets | <p>1. Amenities & social infrastructure</p> <p>Description: Amenities and support services in place early in life of new community – emphasis on schools, social spaces, transport & community workers.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of community space 2. Transport links 3. Place with a distinctive character 4. Integration with wider neighbourhood <p>2. Social & cultural life</p> <p>Description: Shared spaces, collective activities and and social architecture to foster local</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>df</p> <p>Social Life, Dixon T. (2012). Creating Strong Communities: How 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> | Group | practical examples and approaches from new settlements around the world. | | | <p>supports:</p> <p>5. Hyper-local information about community services and groups.</p> <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,</p> | | <p>networks, belonging and community identity</p> <p>Indicators:</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:</p> <p>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;</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | Residents/Tenant Associations, Pledge bank. 11. Family days, critical walking, neighbourhood walkabouts, Complaints Choirs. 12. Community gardening, community play spaces | | meanwhile use of buildings and public space. Indicator: Not provided in the report commissioned by the Berkeley Group Selected questions: 16. I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years. 17. If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood. 18. Have you recently felt like you were playing a useful part in things? 19. How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark? 20. How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark? 21. How satisfied are you with the quality of facilities for children and young people in your local area? 0-4yrs 22. In the last 12 months, has any organisation asked you what you think about... 23. I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood. 24. Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafés? 25. Public transport accessibility. 26. Does the scheme feel like a place with distinctive character? |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <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, pp.14-21. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.1808/full | 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> |
| Welsh Assembly (2015) Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/annual/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</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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | 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>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: 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</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Wales, takes account of whether doing such a thing may make a positive contribution to global wellbeing. |
| 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 | 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). |
| 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, | academic | Community social capital | Local (Morpeth) | Post-flood residents of Morpeth | SA-SCAT (Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002) to measure social capital. Collective Efficacy scale (Sampson et al. 1997) Residential stability | Validated scales | 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 |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| pp.1715-1720. 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</p> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/ academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|--|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>4. In the last 12 months, have you joined together with other community members to address a problem or common issue?</p> <p>5. In the last 12 months, have you talked with a local authority or governmental organisation about problems in this community?</p> <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: 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> |

| Source | Organisation (Gov/NGO/academic) | Outcome description | Geographic level | Population description | Name of indicator (set) | Level on ladder | Domains |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | | | 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 Residential stability Rented/ owned with mortgage/ owned outright Income |