COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION RESEARCH

2) Community Development Evaluation Measures: Indicators of Success

Prepared by Simon Harger-Forde
Commissioned by Community Waitakere
August 2012

community
Waitakere

Community Waitakere has a vision for a sustainable Waitakere with thriving, connected communities.

Community Waitakere is a community development organisation committed to achieving strong, dynamic, sustainable community and voluntary sectors in Waitakere. **Community Waitakere** strengthens the links between community groups, organisations, businesses, government and individuals by promoting and modeling collaboration and partnering, enhancing networking and communication, developing projects and helping to foster collective visions of positive change in Waitakere.

Community Waitakere commissioned **innovate change** to conduct a research project on community development evaluation methods and methodologies. The research and writing of these case studies was a part of that project.

innovate change is a social innovation practice that collaborates to identify and implement new and creative ways to respond to social challenges. **innovate change** works on the design, review, planning and delivery of health, community and social programmes.
www.innovatechange.co.nz

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This document brings together a collection of indicators as a part of the Community Waitakere project *Research on Community Development Methods and Methodologies*. The indicators are part of a wider project, and organisations may also be interested in the literature review and case studies commissioned by Community Waitakere as a part of this project.

These social and community well-being indicators are intended as a resource for community development organisations, as they design and develop evaluation within their programmes and services.

The indicators have been chosen based on their ability to capture important factors in community health and well-being, organisations will need to have careful discussion about whether they are appropriate indicators to use as effectiveness indicators of their own community development work. Broader indicators may be appropriate for community-wide projects that are likely to have multiple organisations involved (e.g. business, local government, community organisations, and others).

The level of attribution of community development activity and work initiated by community development organisations seeking to use the indicators will be essential to identify, otherwise there will be significant risk that organisations could be held accountable for indicators that are too wide or outside their mandate.

In terms of evaluation, indicators should be developed alongside programme outcomes, not in isolation. Developing indicators as a separate exercise to programme outcomes and activities will lead to difficulties attributing and aligning project and programme activities, organisational strategic goals, and indicators.

INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING

#	Indicator	Source
Advocacy or Policy Issue Related Work		
1.	Number of mutually-beneficial relationships with other organisations or individuals who support or participate in an advocacy strategy, activity, or project *Consideration: Could also be "Quality of mutually-beneficial relationships…"*	Coffman, J. 2011. "Examples of Advocacy Interim Outcomes" in *Advocacy Evaluation Update*, issue 11. Centre for Evaluation Innovation: Washington.
2.	The ability of a community development organisation to lead, adapt, manage, and technically implement an advocacy strategy/activity/project *Consideration: How do you assess 'ability'?*	
3.	Number of individuals or groups co-ordinating their work and acting together *Consideration: What would the data source be?*	
4.	Number of previously unengaged individuals who take action in support of an issue, activity, project or position *Consideration: What would the data source be?*	
5.	Number of high-profile individuals who adopt an issue and publicly advocate for it *Consideration: What would the data source be?*	
6.	Increase in the number of individuals who can be counted on for sustained advocacy or action on an issue *Consideration: What would the data source be?*	
7.	Quantity and/or quality of coverage generated in print, broadcast, or electronic media *Consideration: What is 'quality coverage'?*	
8.	The community development organisation is identified as a credible organisation to lead a campaign or advocacy project or issue	Adapted from Coffman, 2011
9.	Quantity and/or quality of online discussion and social media interaction *Consideration: What is 'quality online discussion or interaction'?*	
10.	Changes in how an issue is presented, discussed,	Coffman, J. 2011.

		or perceived.	"Examples of Advocacy Interim Outcomes" in *Advocacy Evaluation Update*, issue 11. Centre for Evaluation Innovation: Washington.
	11.	Community members' or community organisations' recognition that a problem exists	
	12.	Willingness of a target audience (e.g. community members) to act in support of an issue or policy proposal	
	13.	Willingness of local boards and/or local council to act in support of an issue or policy proposal raised by the community development organisation	Adapted from Coffman, 2011
	14.	Changes in awareness on a particular issue	Reisman, J., Gienapp, A. and Stachowiak, S. 2007. *A Guide to Measuring Advocacy and Policy.* The Annie E. Casey Foundation: Maryland.
	15.	Increased agreement on the definition of a problem *Consideration: Need indicators of agreement, e.g. common language used increasingly*	
	16.	Increased engagement on an issue or problem *Consideration: Need indicators of engagement (e.g. more engagement on social media, more people attending hui, etc)*	
	17.	Changes in public behaviour *Consideration: Will need to be more specific depending on the behaviour the community development organisation is seeking to change with what audience*	
	18.	Increased number of partners supporting an issue	
	19.	Improved alignment of partnership efforts (e.g. shared priorities, shared goals, common accountability system)	
	20.	Strategic alliances with important partners (e.g. stronger or more powerful relationships and alliances)	
	21.	Increased ability of coalitions working toward policy change to identify policy change process (e.g. venue of policy change, steps of policy change based on strong understanding of the issue and barriers, jurisdiction of policy change)	
	22.	Increased level of actions taken by champions of an issue	
	23.	Increased voter registration	
	24.	Changes in voting behaviour	
	25.	Increased breadth of partners supporting an issue (e.g. number of "unlikely allies" supporting an issue)	
	26.	Increased media coverage (e.g. quantity, prioritisation, extent of coverage, variety of media "beats," message echoing)	

27.	Increased visibility of the campaign message (e.g. engagement in debate, presence of campaign message)	
28.	Improved social and physical conditions for community/community members (e.g., poverty, habitat, diversity, health, equality, democracy)	
29.	A policy the community development organisation has been working towards is adopted, implemented or enforced	Adapted from Reisman et al, 2007
30.	Improved strategic abilities of organisations involved with advocacy and policy work	Reisman, J., Gienapp, A. and Stachowiak, S. 2007. *A Guide to Measuring Advocacy and Policy*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation: Maryland.
31.	Improved capacity to communicate and promote advocacy messages of organisations involved with advocacy and policy work	
32.	Improved stability of organisations involved with advocacy and policy work	

Community Investment and Facilities		
33.	Number of new public or private funders or individuals who contribute funds or other resources for a local cause or project	Adapted from Coffman, 2011
34.	Level of funding or other resources for local causes or projects *Consideration: 'Other resources' need to be quantified*	
35.	Number of community members that find it *easy* or *very easy* to get to a local park or other green space in their city or local area	AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington
36.	Number of community members that find it easy or very easy to get to a library in their city or local area	Adapted from AC Neilson, 2010
37.	Number of community members that find it easy or very easy to get to a swimming pool in their city or local area	
38.	Number of community members that find it easy or very easy to get to a recreation centre in their city or local area	

Health		
39.	Rate of General Practitioners per 100,000 people	Waitakere City Council, 2008. *The Community Outcomes for Waitakere City 2006-2009.* Waitakere City Council: Auckland.
40.	Number of people enrolled in a Primary Health Organisation (PHO)	
41.	▪ Number of people reporting difficulty accessing primary care due to cost or health care *or* ▪ Number of people reporting difficulty accessing primary care due to local general practice register being full *or*	

	▪ Number of people reporting difficulty accessing primary care due to difficulty getting to appointments	
42.	Percentage of resident who report good or very good health	
43.	Frequency of doing physical activity	AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington
44.	Self rating of emotional wellbeing	
45.	Youth Fertility Rate	World Health Organization. 2011. *Indicator Code Book: World Health Statistics Indicators.* World Health Organization: Geneva.
46.	Annual number of births to women aged 15-19 years per 1,000 women	
47.	Adult Literacy Rate	
48.	Adult mortality rate (probability of dying between 15 to 60 years per 1000 population)	
49.	Age-standardized mortality rate (per 100 000 population)	
50.	Alcohol Consumption Rate	
51.	Exclusive breastfeeding under 6 months	
52.	Smoking rates	Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata.* Ministry of Social Development: Wellington.
53.	Suicide rates	
Sector Capacity		
54.	Number of organisations working towards community development and strengthening in Waitakere	Adapted from Spellerberg, 2001
55.	Number of paid people engaged in those organisations	
56.	Number of unpaid people engaged in those organisations	
Community Capacity (including Employment, Education and Income)		
57.	Number of marae in the community	Spellerberg, A. 2001. *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand.* Statistics NZ: Wellington.
58.	Number of people engaged in marae activities within the last 12 months	
59.	Number of sports groups in the community	
60.	Number of people engaged in sports group activities within the last 12 months	
61.	Number of arts groups in the community	
62.	Number of people engaged in arts group activities within the last 12 months	
63.	Number of cultural groups in the community	
64.	Number of people engaged in cultural group activities within the last 12 months	
65.	Number of church or religious groups in the community	
66.	Number of people engaged in church or religious	

	group activities within the last 12 months	
67.	Number of service organisations (e.g. Lions, Rotary) active in the community	
68.	Number of people regularly engaged with service organisations in the community	
69.	Number of community members that feel they have enough money from their total income to meet their everyday needs	AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington
70.	The proportion of people living in households with real gross income less than 60 percent of the median household equivalised national gross income benchmarked at 2001	Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata*. Ministry of Social Development: Wellington.
71.	The percentage of the population aged 15–64 years who are employed	
72.	Number of people aged 15 years and over who are not employed and who are actively seeking and available for paid work	
73.	The proportion of secondary school leavers who left school with a qualification at National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) Level 2 or above	
74.	The proportion of adults aged 25–64 years with an educational attainment of at least upper secondary school level (at least upper secondary school level includes any formal qualification at NCEA Level 1 (or its predecessor, School Certificate) or higher)	
75.	The proportion of new school entrants (Year 1 students) who had attended early childhood education services	
76.	Number of community members in a leadership role with a local community group	Simon Harger-Forde
Organisational Capacity		
77.	Level of staff retention	Simon Harger-Forde
78.	Level of staff and board member engagement in strategic issues and decision making	
79.	Level of key stakeholder engagement in issues of importance to the community development organisation	
80.	Level of community engagement with the community development organisation	
81.	Financial records in good order (according to external assessment)	
Safety		
82.	Level of safety of community members (self reported – e.g. How safe do you feel living in your local area?)	Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise. 2010. *Community Star Outcomes Evaluation Toolkit.* Triangle Consulting Social

		Enterprise: UK
83.	Percentage of community members who think their area is a safe place to be	Waitakere City Council, 2008. *The Community Outcomes for Waitakere City 2006-2009*. Waitakere City Council: Auckland.
84.	Percentage of people that view vandalism as a problem within their community over the last twelve months	AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report*. AC Neilson: Wellington.
85.	Level of car thefts and/or damage to cars in the community	
86.	Percentage of people who perceive the presence of unsafe people as a problem in their area over the last twelve months	
87.	Percentage of people who perceive alcohol or drugs as a problem in their area over the last twelve months	
88.	Percentage of people feeling fairly safe or very safe in their home during the day	
89.	Percentage of people feeling fairly safe or very safe in their home after dark	
90.	Percentage of people feel fairly safe or very safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark	
91.	Percentage of people feel safe in their city centre during the day	
92.	Percentage of people feel safe in their city centre after dark	
93.	Percentage of people rated the safety of unsupervised children in their local area as very safe or fairly safe	
94.	Number of family violence incidents	Simon Harger-Forde (data collected by NZ Police)
Inclusion, Connection, Contribution and Sense of Community		
95.	The proportion of secondary school students aged 12–18 years who said they get enough time with their Mum and/or Dad most of the time	Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata*. Ministry of Social Development: Wellington.
96.	Percentage of community members who have undertaken voluntary work in the past 12 months	Waitakere City Council, 2008. *The Community Outcomes for Waitakere City 2006-2009*. Waitakere City Council: Auckland.
97.	Percentage of community members that feel a sense of community with others in their local neighbourhood	
98.	Percentage of community members that belong	AC Neilson. 2010.

	to a network or group that is mostly based in the same local area	*Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington.
99.	Level of community contact (self reported – e.g. How much contact do you have with people locally?)	Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise. 2010. *Community Star Outcomes Evaluation Toolkit.* Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise: UK
100.	Perceived level of community member influence (e.g. Do you feel you can influence what happens in your community)	
101.	Level of community involvement *Consideration: This would need an indicator/s – e.g. number of community groups engaged with locally*	
102.	Number of individuals who can be counted on for sustained involvement and contribution to a community project	Adapted from Coffman, 2011
103.	Percentage of community members that report having a positive outlook for the future of their community	Spellerberg, A. 2001. *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand.* Statistics NZ: Wellington.
104.	Percentage of community members that report social contact with their neighbours in the last month	
105.	Percentage of community members that report borrowing something from their neighbours in the last 12 months	
106.	Percentage of community members that know the names of some elected members of the local council	
107.	The proportion of people aged 15 years and over who had been treated unfairly or had had something nasty done to them because of the group they belonged to or seemed to belong to (hereafter called discriminated against) in the past 12 months	Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata.* Ministry of Social Development: Wellington.
108.	The proportion of people aged 18 years and over who perceived selected groups as being the targets of "some" or a "great deal" of discrimination	
109.	Percentage of young people that report that their community cares about their views	Simon Harger-Forde
110.	Percentage of young people that report having a positive outlook for the future of their community	Adapted from Spellerberg, 2001.
Social Support and Connectedness		
111.	The proportion of the population with telephone and internet access in the home	Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata.* Ministry of

		Social Development: Wellington.
112.	Percentage of people who have someone to turn to for help if they were faced with a serious illness or injury, or needed emotional support during a difficult time	AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington.
113.	Percentage of people that felt isolated or lonely over the past twelve months	
114.	Level of social network support (e.g. Do you have relatives or friends you can count on to help you whenever you need them?)	OECD. 2011. *How's Life?: Measuring well-being.* OECD Publishing: Paris.
115.	Frequency of social contact with friends or family	
116.	Time spent volunteering	
117.	Levels of trust in others – (people reporting that "most people can be trusted")	
118.	Percentage of community members that enjoy living amongst the diversity of Waitakere	Spellerberg, A. 2001. *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand.* Statistics NZ: Wellington.
119.	Percentage of community members who report that they would help a stranger	
120.	Percentage of community members that have a positive attitude towards caring	
121.	Percentage of community members that have a positive attitude towards co-operating	
122.	Percentage of community members that have a positive attitude towards tolerance	
123.	Percentage of community members that have donated to a local charity in the last twelve months	
124.	Likelihood of discussing problems with friends or family members	

REFERENCE LIST

AC Neilson. 2010. *Quality of Life Survey 2010: Eight Cities Report.* AC Neilson: Wellington.

Coffman, J. 2011. "Examples of Advocacy Interim Outcomes" in *Advocacy Evaluation Update*, issue 11. Centre for Evaluation Innovation: Washington.

Ministry of Social Development. 2010. *2010: The Social Report: Te Pūrongo Oranga Tangata*. Ministry of Social Development: Wellington.

OECD. 2011. *How's Life?: Measuring well-being.* OECD Publishing: Paris.

Reisman, J., Gienapp, A. and Stachowiak, S. 2007. *A Guide to Measuring Advocacy and Policy.* The Annie E. Casey Foundation: Maryland.

Spellerberg, A. 2001. *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand.* Statistics NZ: Wellington.

Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise. 2010. *Community Star Outcomes Evaluation Toolkit.* Triangle Consulting Social Enterprise: UK

Waitakere City Council, 2008. *The Community Outcomes for Waitakere City 2006-2009*. Waitakere City Council: Auckland.

World Health Organization. 2011. *Indicator Code Book: World Health Statistics Indicators.* World Health Organization: Geneva.