



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Measuring Outcomes for
Integrated Communities:

Technical Note





© Crown copyright, 2019

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/mhclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/mhclg>

July 2019

Contents

Introduction	4
Why should we measure integrated communities outcomes?	4
Developing the integrated communities outcome framework	5
Integrated communities outcomes and indicators short list	7
Reviewing and updating this note	12

Definition of terms

Outcomes	The changes that occur as a result of an activity, policy or programme
Indicators	Measures to help show the level of change towards or from the desired outcomes

Introduction

This note sets out how the government will measure and monitor outcomes for integrated communities across England. The note explains the background to the selected indicators, their links to the [Integrated Communities Strategy](#) (2018) and [Action Plan](#) (2019) and details on the sources for the data used to underpin these indicators. The proposals in this paper will be reviewed on a regular basis by analysts in government and an updated note on the methodology will be produced in Spring/Summer 2020 accompanied by the latest data points.

Why should we measure integrated communities outcomes?

The Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper was published in March 2018, setting out the government's vision for building integrated communities ***where people – whatever their background – live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities***. The government re-stated its ambition to help build stronger, more integrated and resilient communities across the country in the Integrated Communities Action Plan published in February 2019, setting out a range of measures and commitments for taking this work forward. Achieving this ambition will involve national and local collaboration to reduce social isolation, tackle social and economic disparities, together with building better social connections across groups and individuals from different backgrounds.

Measuring integration outcomes will help us better understand how well integrated our communities are, and to what extent those outcomes have changed over time. In the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper and Integrated Communities Action Plan government committed to an integration measurement framework which will retain the best of the existing metrics associated with integration, while adding in new metrics where relevant, in order to understand how those indicators are changing over time. The data will also help to show whether any changes to outcomes are occurring in places where our interventions and programmes are operating.

Indicators associated with integration outcomes already exist in government datasets and official statistics but until recently, had not been brought together in a single place to provide a rounded overview of how well different communities of place and people are integrated. Without a common outcomes framework it can be more challenging for people, policy makers and our community and organisational partners to identify the status of different integration outcomes in their areas, and to understand which aspects of integration have improved, stayed the same or worsened over time.

Developing the integrated communities outcome framework

This note builds on earlier work to develop integration indicators that were published in the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper (2018) and publicly consulted upon. The public consultation process generated over 2,500 responses to the questions about integration measures with varying levels of detail about the proposed measurement framework and the types of indicators that the public would like to see included in the framework. The main points raised by organisations and individuals feeding back to the consultation included:

- Asking that we use a combination of qualitative and quantitative data to understand the scale and scope of the outcomes for individuals and groups.
- Flagging up limitations to quantitative data because not all integration impacts can be measured quantitatively.
- Suggesting that data on integration outcomes should be disaggregated, where possible, so that they could provide more detailed information about the outcomes achieved for different groups of people linked to the characteristics of the groups. This includes a suggested breakdown of outcomes by gender, the local area where they live, ethnicity and age, along with other characteristics like place of birth (UK/outside UK) where available.
- Reminding us that integration in the context of immigration/migration is a two-way process between established and new communities and the outcomes for both groups should be measured concurrently.
- Suggesting that integration outcomes should build upon existing integration and social impact frameworks and datasets where those remain relevant.
- Building common ground between integration policies and existing cross-government priorities to boost social inclusion, shared social and economic prosperity and tackling disparities across groups.

In light of the feedback we received through the public consultation, and the direction of the policy priorities set out in the government's Integrated Communities Action Plan, we are proposing to use indicators that:

- already exist in established administrative and survey data sources, which offer us several years' worth of data to provide comparison time points and meet the highest quality standards required of national, or official statistics; and
- are linked to outcomes which can be influenced by government policy at national and local levels.

In this technical note, on the basis of the consultation feedback, we have identified a set of 20 indicators of integration that we will monitor; these are set out in the table on page 8. These are the first wave of indicators for which we have data at national and regional levels and in some cases local area levels that can be disaggregated by socio-demographic

characteristics. This list will form the basis for future monitoring activity and the basis for the development of additional indicators as the policy area develops. The consultation feedback highlighted the benefits of using qualitative data to provide deeper insights into integration outcomes experienced in communities and places across the country. For national level monitoring, qualitative data is less suitable to demonstrate the patterns of change over time across the country. That said, we recognise the value of qualitative data and insights, particularly where they are part of research and evaluation work to understand the impacts and outcomes from projects and programmes implemented to help people become more/better integrated.

The indicators set out in this paper are aligned to existing guidance on measuring integration outcomes published by government so that we can all measure and monitor integration outcomes in a consistent way. The indicators are consistent with those measures referred to in the comprehensive [Home Office Indicators of Integration](#) resource (2019), which provides advice and a practical toolkit for designing interventions and measuring integration outcomes for refugees, asylum seekers and new migrants in local and national projects. The two products provide consistent advice, in varying degrees of detail, and tailored for particular purposes, so that researchers, projects and policy makers can measure integration impacts at local and national levels in a consistent way.

While selecting the short-list of indicators to monitor the integration impacts at a national level set out in this technical note, we identified notable gaps in the type and level of data available for us to use. The main gaps include: information below the national level, particularly, data at local authority and neighbourhood levels, and the availability of data on integration outcomes by certain socio-demographic characteristics, all of which reduce our capacity to show the detailed differences in outcomes between groups in the detailed way that the public consultation process on the Green Paper suggested. We recognise that those gaps will need to be considered and addressed in line with integration policies and with the available resources over the coming years. We will be looking at ways to address those data gaps as part of the on-going work to support the delivery of the Integrated Communities Action Plan.

Integrated communities outcomes and indicators short-list

The following table sets out the existing indicators we propose best demonstrate progress against integration outcomes. This set of indicators covers key outcomes associated with:

- Sharing a common language to enable more effective communication and interaction between groups;
- Increased levels of social mixing among people from different backgrounds, reducing isolation and building connections across communities (for example, through activities such as social mixing in youth groups, participants and supporters coming together through sport, and inter-faith activities).
- More people trusting others in their local area and increased trust between people from different backgrounds;
- More people working together across communities, regardless of background, to improve the places where they live;
- More people feeling a sense of belonging to their local community;
- More people having strong and diverse social networks to improve their social and economic outcomes;
- More people taking part in civic life, reducing social isolation, alienation, disenfranchisement, and increasing feelings of agency;
- Stronger and more resilient diverse communities rather than communities divided by e.g. race or faith or economic circumstances;
- More people feeling safe and reducing hate crime; and
- Reducing the disparities across groups in educational and employment outcomes.

These represent the initial set of indicators that we will measure and monitor going forward over the next twelve months in the first instance, drawing upon the data sources listed in the table on the following page. The table that follows gives more information about the indicators including the level of disaggregation possible for these indicators along with identified existing data gaps that currently exist.

Outcome	Indicator	Question/ measure	Data source	Level of disaggregation possible
1. Sharing a common language (English) to communicate	Percentage of people who speak English well. Percentage of people who don't speak English well or at all.	Survey response to: How well do you speak English?	Currently we use the 2011 Census. New Census data will be available as the question will be retained in the 2021 Census.	National, Local authority and Lower output levels Disaggregation is possible by gender, age, ethnicity and nationality
2. Social mixing	Percentage of people who say they regularly mix with people from different ethnicities or other backgrounds	Survey response to: What proportion of your friends are of the same ethnic group as you? What proportion of your friends are of the same religious group as you? What proportion of your friends have a similar level of education to you?	Community Life Survey data includes these questions as part of their online survey	National and Regional level data only National level disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands) Disaggregation is not possible by LA level
3. Social cohesion	Percentage of people who say that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get along	Survey response to: Is this a place where people from different backgrounds get along together?	This question is included in the Community Life online survey	National and Regional level data only National level disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands) Disaggregation is not possible by LA level
4. Social trust	Proportion of adults who say most of the people in their neighbourhood can be trusted	Survey response to: Thinking about the people who live in this neighbourhood, to what extent do you believe they can be trusted?	This question is included in the Community Life Survey	National and Regional level data only. Potential to disaggregate at the national level by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands)

Outcome	Indicator	Question/ measure	Data source	Level of disaggregation possible
5. Sense of belonging	Percentage of people who say that they feel they strongly belong to their immediate neighbourhood; And to belonging to Britain	Survey response to: How strongly do you feel you belong to your immediate neighbourhood? How strongly do you feel you belong to Britain?	This question is included in the Community Life Survey	National and Regional level data only National disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands)
6. Social capital	Percentage of people who agree that people in their neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood	Survey response to: What extent would you agree or disagree that people in your neighbourhood pull together to improve the neighbourhood?	This question is included in the Community Life Survey	National and Regional level data only National disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands)
7. Reducing social isolation	Percentage of people who agree that there are people who would be there for them if they needed help or if they wanted company or to socialise	Survey response to: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? If I needed help, there are people who would be there for me; If I wanted company or to socialise, there are people I can call on	This question is included in the Community Life Survey	National and Regional level data only National disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity (5 categories) age (6 age bands)
8. Residential segregation patterns	The proportion of people who would need to move home in order for the local area (for example MSOA) to be more representative of the population wider catchment area (for example LA level)	Index of dissimilarity score will be used. There are other indicators which measure contact/exposure between two groups that could also be used, but the Index of dissimilarity is more widely used and understood as a measure.	Census 2001 and Census 2011. We will need to wait for Census 2021 data to review trends in local areas	National and Regional Local Authority level and lower spatial level data. Potential for comparisons between any of the 5 ethnic groups or between White and Non-White residents

Outcome	Indicator	Question/ measure	Data source	Level of disaggregation possible
9. School segregation patterns	We are considering options for the most suitable indicator of school segregation to use. One potential indicator we are considering is the percentage of one group of pupils who would need to move school in order for its distribution across schools to mirror the distribution of the other group in the area.	Drawing on data from the pupil characteristics using the Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics publication data.	This kind of analysis would be possible on an annual basis (retrospectively) and the methodology will need to be developed further over the coming months	National and Local Authority level data available Potential for comparisons between White British and Non-White British pupils
10. Education attainment in primary schools	The percentage of pupils meeting the expected standard in reading, writing and maths by ethnicity: aged 10-11 (key stage 2)	Administrative data produced by DfE on attainment at key stages 2, 4 and 5	These statistics are categorised as administrative data produced annually (retrospectively) These statistics are also published on the Race Disparity Audit (RDA) website	National and Local Authority level data available Disaggregation is possible at a local area level by ethnicity using the 5+1 categories and at a national level by ethnicity using the full 18+1 categories. Analysis is also possible by gender, SEN, first language and disadvantage.
11 and 12. Education attainment in secondary schools and colleges	The percentage of children who achieve grade 5 or above in GCSE English and Maths for children aged 14 to 16 (key stage 4) The percentage of students aged 16 to 18 achieving 3 A grades or better at A level (Key stage 5)	Administrative data produced by DfE on attainment at key stages 2, 4 and 5	These statistics are categorised as administrative data produced annually (retrospectively) These statistics are also published on the Race Disparity Audit (RDA) website	National and Local Authority level data available Disaggregation is possible at a local area level by ethnicity using the 5+1 categories and at a national level by ethnicity using the full 18+1 categories. Analysis is also possible by gender, SEN, first language and disadvantage.

Outcome	Indicator	Question/ measure	Data source	Level of disaggregation possible
13. Education attainment - destinations	Destinations of students after key stage 4 and 5 (usually aged 18 years)	Administrative data produced by DfE on the destination of pupils after key stages 4 and 5 by ethnicity, gender and LA	These Official statistics are produced annually These statistics are also published on the RDA website	National and Local Authority level data available. Ethnicity data is available at national level.
14. Exclusion of children from schools	Percentage of children who are excluded both for fixed periods and permanent period exclusions from schools	Administrative data produced by DfE on the children who are excluded from schools by ethnicity, gender and LA	These National statistics are produced annually These statistics are also published in the RDA website	National and Local Authority level data available Ethnicity data is available for national and LA levels.
15. Working age men and women in employment	Percentage of working age women and percentage of working age men who are in employment	The rates of employment; economic inactivity and unemployment for working aged people (aged 16-64).	The data uses APS data analysed by DWP and published annually on the RDA website.	National and Local Authority level data is available. Disaggregation at the regional level is possible by ethnicity (5+1), sex and age and at the LA level disaggregation is possible by gender, ethnicity using white ethnic group and 'other than white' group categories.
16. Economic inactivity among working age men and women	Percentage of women and men who are economically inactive			
17. Working age men and women who are unemployed	Percentage of women and men who are unemployed			
18. Working age men and women duration unemployed	The length of time a person has been unemployed (under 3 months; 3-12 months; 12+ months)		This analysis is produced annually by DWP using the APS and is published on the RDA website.	Disaggregation at the regional level by using ethnicity categories of white and 'other than white' ethnic groups.

Outcome	Indicator	Question/ measure	Data source	Level of disaggregation possible
19. Employment type	The proportion of people who are in a) full-time and b) part-time employment	Is the person's main job full time or part time.	These statistics are produced annually by DWP using the APS and published on the RDA website	National and regional level data are available.
20. Recorded hate crime	Annual Police recorded hate crime figures by five strands: race, religion, sexual orientation, disability and transgender	Statistics are produced by HO based on recorded crime gathered by Police Force Areas	The hate crime statistics are produced annually by the Home Office Police recorded hate crime data can be disaggregated by age and gender where data is available	National and local police force area level data is available The data are possible to disaggregate by religion and ethnicity

DfE = Department for Education; DWP = Department for Work and Pensions; HO = Home Office; APS = Annual Population Survey; RDA = Race Disparity Audit.

We will collate the latest data (and previous data points) linked to these 20 indicators into a single statistical output (most likely an infographic or dashboard) for publication in Spring/Summer 2020.

Reviewing and updating this note

We will review these 20 indicators again in Spring/Summer 2020 (a year on from the development of this technical note). This technical note will be updated and any additions to the indicators and additional data available from the source datasets to measure the outcomes for integrated communities will be detailed in the refreshed note.