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Introduction
Over half of the world’s population currently resides in cities, a number that is expected to rise to 70% by 2050.

Moving in the opposite direction, trends worldwide indicate that social capital is on the decline and societies around the world are experiencing all-time highs of polarization and loneliness. If the future is urban, how can we ensure a scenario where residents of cities (and elsewhere) not only survive, but thrive? Building community and social cohesion are critical factors in this effort, with invaluable benefits for cities as they prepare for the known and unknown challenges of the decades ahead. A strong social fabric is the foundation needed for communities and individuals to weather whatever may come, and emerge for the better: ranging from one-time “shocks” such as an emergency caused by a natural disaster or an economic crisis with long after-effects, to chronic “stresses” such as poverty, migration, or crumbling infrastructure. The ever-growing threat of climate change alone has, in addition to inflicting billions of dollars of damage to livelihoods and property, exposed fundamental flaws in our society – often along racial, socio-economic, and geographic lines.

Faced with irreversible global trends, cities are taking action. They are changing their approach to planning and design, overlaying a resilience lens to efforts which hold potential for improving the lives of billions of urban residents worldwide. A cohort of cities have benefited from membership in a network hosted by 100 Resilient Cities – Pioneered by The Rockefeller Foundation (100RC) – a global effort dedicated to helping cities become more resilient to the physical, social, and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st century. Participating in this multi-phase program helps member cities advance holistic resilience thinking at the community and municipal levels, curate a body of tactical knowledge, and produce integrated, scalable solutions which address a multitude of challenges stemming from or related to social cohesion.

Since the world’s first Resilience Strategy was unveiled in New York City in 2015, member cities and 100RC’s large network of nonprofit, private sector, and academic partners have undertaken ground-breaking work in areas such as participatory governance, water management, transportation, data and technology, and climate mitigation and adaptation. Overlapping many of these challenges has been an intent focus on building and measuring social cohesion within cities as a means to activate urban resilience.
100 Resilient Cities defines urban resilience as the capacity of individuals, communities, institutions, businesses, and systems within a city to survive, adapt, and grow no matter what kinds of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience.

Resilience is what helps cities adapt and transform in the face of these 21st-century challenges, helping them to prepare for both the expected and the unexpected.

We likewise see a movement taking shape, of bottom-up organizing to build community and promote social cohesion. The rise of digital platforms provide an opportunity for bridging communities on both a local and global scale, and with much greater speed than ever before. At the same time, there is significant risk in these platforms, which, if managed poorly, can turn into echo chambers of hate and lead to social fragmentation. By working to understand how social cohesion can be a positive driver for good, and creating the policies and mechanisms to enable strong community-building in a manner that serves all of society, we can work to build stronger cities that are more resilient to the shocks and stresses of the 21st century.

Among the digital platforms at our disposal today, Facebook has demonstrated a commitment to supporting community entrepreneurs, who are solving problems by connecting individuals to one another and creating online and offline spaces where people can develop deeper understanding of one another.
Resilience leaders in cities are using these same tools to complement offline engagement practices. Taken together, a promising movement of cities taking action and individual leaders working to build social cohesion is already showing early signs of success.

We need to better understand the impact of their efforts in order to mobilize more resources, hone these approaches, and scale up efforts which underscore social cohesion as a driver of resilience in cities. Central to that effort is the establishment of well-understood impact metrics on specific social issues, on social cohesion, and on business outcomes. A new partnership between 100 Resilient Cities and Facebook seeks to identify the drivers and barriers to successful measurement of social cohesion, with the goal of helping city and community leaders demonstrate and communicate the value of their work to potential funders and the public at large.

The pages that follow represent a scan of the global 100RC network and community leaders supported through Facebook’s Community Leadership Program to see the breadth of work that is underway to build and measure social cohesion. Through this Network Review, we highlight common measurement challenges and opportunities as identified by our partners, and share resources that we found particularly useful in understanding the various approaches to measurement. This project expanded and deepened our understanding of the range of work being done in communities around the globe to build social cohesion – and the real challenges to articulating the value of that work. Our hope is that this handbook will foster a conversation around measuring impact among both actors in this space and a wider audience keen on spreading the positive effects of social cohesion.

Facebook and Community Entrepreneurship

There is a new breed of entrepreneurship evolving in the world today – individuals who are solving problems by connecting individuals to one another and creating online and offline spaces where people can develop deeper understanding of one another. We believe our mission – “to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer” – is interwoven with the health and sustainability of these community entrepreneurs. Like other entrepreneurs (tech entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, etc.), Facebook believes these leaders need institutional support from a variety of sources: reliable income and funding to grow their communities, the ability to measure success and tell their stories, training and support to become better at their craft, job security and the capacity to hire others, connection to other community entrepreneurs in order to share experiences and grow, and a professional identity they are proud of, and have built programs like the Facebook Communities Summit and the Facebook Community Leadership Program to provide this support. An important dimension of these programs is articulating the impact of the work of community entrepreneurs has on “bringing the world closer” and increasing social cohesion and social capital in cities across the world and was the impetus of this partnership.

– Deepti Doshi, FACEBOOK
Scope of Project

To complete the Network Review, we sourced input from 10 city officials, subject matter experts, public and private partners, and academics from 100RC's urban network on their approaches to measuring social connection and cohesion. We also heard from 5 community leaders supported by the Facebook Community Leadership Program, many of whom reside in 100RC member cities, to understand the commonalities, differences and synergies between place-based and digital initiatives for community building. The interviews sought to understand how practitioners define and measure social cohesion, and what challenges and gaps they have confronted in this work. We sought representation from leaders across diverse regions, sectors, and issue areas, but acknowledge our limitations in securing an even greater diversity of perspectives.

This handbook is meant as a practical guide for community entrepreneurs and urban practitioners interested in understanding how their peers are measuring social cohesion. The pages that follow do not represent an exhaustive literature review, but rather a sample of monitoring and evaluation practices in use by pioneers in this field. Through this Network Review, we explore the qualities and values laden in the concept of social cohesion, and discuss common approaches, metrics, and challenges for measuring change. Our hope is this handbook will help arm practitioners from varying backgrounds – and with varying degrees of measurement experience – with the tools and vocabulary to articulate and measure the value of building social cohesion, with the ultimate goal of supporting them to replicate and scale this critical work.
To date, 100RC member cities around the world have proposed more than 600 initiatives focused on building social cohesion within their communities.

These initiatives are equally represented across all regions.*

*no data available on African cities as of July 2019

Cities associate the lack of social cohesion most closely with the shocks of flooding, earthquakes, economic crises, and extreme heat, among others.

Cities associate the lack of social cohesion most closely with the stresses of youth disenfranchisement, crime and violence, climate change, and economic inequality, among others.
We interviewed 15 Chief Resilience Officers, community leaders, subject matter experts, public and private-sector partners, and academics around the world to understand their approaches and best practices to enhance and measure social cohesion within their communities.
“The definition of social cohesion can evolve over time. And it will likely mean something different to different people. When trying to define social cohesion, it’s often helpful to think about what it is not. Social cohesion is not imposing a narrative on people. It is not forgetting to consider how your actions now have an impact on people before and after you.”

- Garance Choko, CODA SOCIETIES
Defining social cohesion

Social cohesion is founded on the strength of social relationships, characterized by the presence of trust and participation among individuals within that society. But it’s so much more than the mere existence of positive social relationships; social cohesion also describes the sense of belonging and connection felt by those individuals. This is predicated on the inclusion of all groups in the society – within formal governance processes, in informal networks, and in day-to-day social interactions. Social cohesion therefore takes account of the strength of relationships within and across demographic divides, ensuring that all residents of a city or community are connected to one another and to the broader institutions that make up society. It is inherently based on the existence of social equity: without equitable access to opportunities and resources, and without inclusion in civil life, a sense of alienation has a chance to grow and the fabric of society weakens.

In completing this review, all participants placed critical importance on social cohesion as a concept, though varied in their definitions depending on the social, cultural, and geographic circumstances. Given the importance of local context, we recommend that practitioners create their own common definition for their group or community, while being mindful of issues of inclusion and equity. The following qualities of social cohesion that emerged from the review can serve as a helpful resource:

1. The formation of bonds between individuals, which can lead to a shared sense of identity. This can help elevate the voice and power of the collective, and is linked to movement-building, or convening vulnerable people in big numbers in order to create more influence than they would ordinarily have individually.

2. The ability of people to relate to one another across societally-enforced divides such as gender, class, and ethnicity. In this context, social cohesion is inherently linked with inclusion and connectedness, where bridging occurs across or among communities or groups of differing realities or values, in a shared social contract. This can have tangible results: a more connected community can, for example, work across salient divides in times of crisis.

3. The willingness for individuals in a society to participate and engage in their communities to achieve better outcomes for the group. The recognition that more can be done by working as a group, rather than individuals, can in itself foster social cohesion.

4. The presence of trust and reciprocity across individuals in a group. Social cohesion can be seen in group relationships that lead to altruistic actions, sacrifices for one another, and support for other community members.

5. The presence of trust in government and institutions. Beyond the trust that exists between members of the group, important to building social cohesion are quality links with institutions. This can take the form of a mayor, elected official, or neighborhood representative that can be called upon to initiate changes.
Social cohesion or social capital?

While similar, the terms social cohesion and social capital are not the same.

Social capital describes the interpersonal networks of relationships among people who live and work in a society, often based on common interests. Social capital is a neutral term – it can be catalyzed to produce either “good” or “bad” outcomes. It merely describes the strength and existence of relationships between people. Social capital can be classified as “bridging” (across different demographic divides), “bonding” (the strength of relationships between individuals), or “linking” (trust between individuals and government or other institutions).

Social cohesion is a broader concept that includes social capital. It encompasses not only the presence of interpersonal relationships, but results in positive quality of relationships that is rooted in equal and just treatment, respect, and care for one another. This inherently requires an equitable distribution of resources and opportunities across individuals that can lend itself to stronger bonds across demographic divides.
Social cohesion as a driver for resilient communities

At 100 Resilient Cities, we take the position that social cohesion – both within homogenous and across heterogenous communities – is an essential component to building urban resilience. Higher levels of social cohesion and positive social interactions serve to strengthen the overall fabric of the city, allowing communities to bounce back faster and rebuild more efficiently after experiencing major shocks and stresses.

When individuals or communities are not included in day-to-day civil and social processes, they run the risk of being left out of critical disaster preparedness and response efforts, ultimately increasing their vulnerability during times of emergency. On the other hand, a higher level of social cohesion increases the likelihood of community members connecting to formal government recovery processes as well as reaching out to one another in the aftermath of a major disaster, allowing affected communities to regroup faster following such an event. Where there are higher levels of trust and goodwill, members of the community, as well as networks of multiple communities, can also work together to better prepare for disasters ahead of time, thereby mitigating the worst impacts.

Social cohesion is not only a key ingredient to better disaster preparedness and response; the lack of social cohesion in a city can be a major stress unto itself. Sharp divides among different urban populations, if left untouched, grow over time. The marginalization of specific community groups deprives them of the opportunities and resources they need to succeed. Both conditions lead to chronic inequities across a city, placing a long-term stress on both affected communities and the larger city itself. In addition, the lack of trust and goodwill between various community groups can lead to civil unrest, the effects of which impact the city’s overall well-being. By overlooking the importance of building social cohesion, cities expose themselves to greater vulnerability to existing shocks, in addition to opening themselves up to new stresses. To truly build urban resilience, cities must embrace tactics and initiatives that work to enhance social cohesion at all levels – between individuals, within and across communities, and city-wide.
From our perspective, social cohesion is integral to building resilience for two major reasons:

1. **It can be leveraged or ‘activated’ during times of crisis.** For example, community members can turn to each other for help during an extreme weather event. This could contribute immensely toward minimizing the loss of life and damage to property, and will also play a key role in quickly building back and returning to normalcy following the shock event. In this way, social cohesion represents a latent resource that can be utilized.

   The role of social cohesion became obvious during the great Chicago heat wave of 1995. A devastating hot weather system caused the energy grid to fail, hospitals to fill up, and the city’s response systems to buckle. In a single week, 739 Chicagoans lost their lives, mostly in the city’s most segregated, impoverished, and run-down neighborhoods. Yet three of the ten neighborhoods with the lowest death rates were predominantly poor communities that, demographically speaking, should have been far deadlier than they were. These places were characterized by a social infrastructure that encouraged local social life and contact between neighbors, making them far less likely to have multiple deaths during the crisis.

2. **It builds trust and goodwill across different identities, reducing the risk of manmade crises such as violent crimes or civil unrest.** When social networks cross key lines of cleavage in society, like race, class, gender, and more – a concept known as bridging – there’s more likely to be a stronger sense of social cohesion. In this way, social cohesion prioritizes trust and collective action over societal discord. Community engagement in decision-making also plays a crucial role by empowering everyday people to chart the direction of their future, together.

   Athens, a city facing the dual challenge of slow economic recovery and a large influx of migrants, has pursued a number of activities to proactively integrate its migrant and refugee populations into the urban fabric. Schools Open to the Neighborhood is one such example, providing space in school premises during after-school hours and on weekends to host activities accessible to all residents. Cooking lessons that engage women’s networks and cook recipes from all over the world have proven to be a particularly successful activity to build relationships among Athenians old and new, serving to defuse tensions in an otherwise challenging environment.
Why measure social cohesion?

One of the reasons why it’s hard to discuss social cohesion is because it’s often incredibly difficult to measure what exactly has changed over time. We embarked on this project because of our belief that social cohesion is critical for the overall resilience of a community and city; however, without evidence of how and why social cohesion matters, it becomes increasingly difficult to build momentum for this work. Measurement, whether through simple numbers or in-depth stories, allows us to ask ourselves: “Are we doing what we set out to do? And are we having the impact and success that we set out to have?”

What follows is a summary of the motivation for measuring social cohesion that we heard through the Network Review.

1 Capturing the early impact of an initiative or investment. Community development and resilience building are often the work of a generation, and approaches can take years, if not decades, to bear fruit, and impact can get lost. The ability to measure indicators of social cohesion can demonstrate early progress towards intended long-term goals.

2 Driving investment towards social cohesion-building. To determine if a project will have a good return on investment, a potential financial sponsor often needs to see the numbers. Data on social cohesion, and the story it tells, can be an important fundraising tool for community and city leaders.

3 Engaging partners. With a bank of data-based evidence at their disposal, communities can better engage their city leadership and policy-makers in initiating meaningful change. This in itself builds community capacity and strength, but it also opens the door for the city to act as a multiplier and to use the data as a foundation for scaling interventions to neighborhoods across the city.

4 Prioritizing projects and budgeting processes. Often operating at a small scale and separate from municipal efforts, the learnings and contributions of community-led work can too easily be lost at the city level. Access to data from these efforts, however, can give a city a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by their constituents, and how to redirect resources and projects toward effective solutions.

5 Informing program design, optimization and implementation. Data collection plays a vital inward-facing role in helping community and city leaders build out a program that best serves its beneficiaries. It helps them identify what they want to accomplish and how they’ll do it in a way that’s different from ‘business as usual.’ Ongoing tracking throughout implementation promotes learning and course-correction, as needed.

“The data we collected from participants at the suppers really helped inform programmatic development, including, for example, how we design big suppers for 25 people or more, which is a core component of our program. We are much better equipped to design these now that we have a better understanding of our participants’ demographics and interests.”

- Jennifer Bailey, FAITH MATTERS NETWORK + THE PEOPLE’S Supper
“Yes, we track metrics. But the process of tracking is sometimes more important than the actual numbers. It’s tough because many funders want to see data on attendance, GPA, graduation rates - but they don’t care much about trust, reciprocity, confidence or generosity. These things are anecdotal, but aren’t necessarily resulting in major funds.”

- Jahmai Cole, MY BLOCK, MY HOOD, MY CITY

Questions for reflection:

What is your primary motivation for measuring social cohesion?

What is the most important reason for tracking progress and success - to demonstrate success for future replication, a learning opportunity, a mayoral priority, something else?
Parenting doesn’t end once your children become teenagers, and in many cases, this can be a lonely time of parenting, when natural communities disappear and expert advice is hard to find. Since 2012, Grown & Flown has built an online community of over 112,000 parents of young adults aged 15-25. A corresponding website and newsletter offers a wealth of information and personal parenting stories.

High-level engagement tools on Facebook (i.e. measuring the number of posts, comments, and reactions in the group; where members are located; what content has gotten the most engagement) have helped Grown & Flown’s administrators curate content based on members’ needs. For example, engagement data on posts related to financial aid for college have demonstrated the need to bring in experts and start meaningful conversations on that topic. Grown & Flown took this a step further by conducting a 10-minute survey (which received over 5,000 responses) to capture their members’ priorities, interests and frustrations. This evidence-base has been critical for programmatic and content decision-making.

Other engagement data from Facebook allows Grown & Flown’s leaders to track the size of their active community (numbering over 50,000 daily, and more than 90,000 in a 28-day period) – though a group this size poses a challenge for understanding the many ways in which individuals connect with each other both online and in person. One step in this direction has been to ask new members to share basic demographic information. For example, knowing that a true success for Grown & Flown is the ability to facilitate conversations among people who normally do not speak to each other, they used the demographic information to confirm that members fall along the full political spectrum, yet are still there to engage with and support one another. A remaining challenge is to generate data that can help the group administrators foster these same type of connections offline. As Lisa Heffernan, Co-Founder of Grown & Flown, described, “We hear a lot of stories about how members self-organize to meet up at a coffee shop or at someone’s home. But it’s always after the fact, through a photo they post. We’d love to have tools that allow us to more proactively promote these real life meet-ups, for example through geo-targeting data, so that other members can join.”
Measurement Takeaways
FROM NETWORK REVIEW
The power of a metric is that it allows for a shared understanding of the change a community or group aims to see through their work. While this list is not comprehensive, our Network Review revealed that 100RC member cities and Facebook Community Leaders are most commonly tracking the following indicators for measuring social cohesion. As social cohesion is a multifaceted and complex concept, we recommend that efforts to measure social cohesion include a combination of these metrics, rather than choosing a single one.

### Measurement inspiration

**Trust, Reciprocity, and Organized Altruism**

Trust is a key indicator for social cohesion and measuring the level of bonding between individuals in a community. Trust may lead to reciprocity, the willingness of individuals to help each other out or sacrifice for other members of a group.

- **Measurement inspiration**
  - **In a questionnaire or survey, ask questions along the lines of:**
    - “Would neighbors in your community help each other?”
    - “On a scale of 1-10, how family friendly is your neighborhood?”
    - “How willing would you be to let your neighbor to pick up your mail for you? To come into your house?”
    - “So-and-so group of people can be trusted: all the time, most of the time, or never?”
  - **Observe and measure actions that show some level of trust with other members of the group:**
    - Have they shared job leads?
    - Have they facilitated social connections, within or outside of the group?
    - Have group members done favors for each other, or sacrificed time or resources for each other?
    - Have they bridged connections across meaningful social/economic/political lines?
Participation and Collaboration

Participation is another key indicator, measuring the levels of engagement and investment by individuals in their community. Similarly, collaboration is a key indicator, measuring how willing individuals are to work with one another for the mutual benefit of the entire group.

Measurement inspiration

Observe and measure actions that show how individuals engage with the group or their community:

- How has participation by group/community members grown?
- Do you have access to physical space or convening areas that allow members of the community to congregate with each other?
- How many new (or previously silent) voices are taking part in group discussions? How are they being heard?
- What kinds of efforts related to volunteering or activism are underway?

Use digital communications to observe and measure actions:

- Track number of posts by group members
- Number of page likes
- See which pages of your organization are receiving first-time visits following a specific event
- Track references to a certain subject, in both public posts and private messages, over time

Measurement in Action

Cali: Mi Comunidad es Escuela

Mi Comunidad es Escuela (My School, My Community) is a flagship initiative underway in the city of Cali, Colombia, aiming to transform both the quality of education and the physical infrastructure of the municipal school system. Encompassing more than improved test scores, education quality here refers to a holistic effort to strengthen Cali's citizenry, at a time where much of the country's population remains divided along lines drawn during a civil war spanning more than four decades. Schools form an integral part of community – and city data shows that those schools which see involvement by the larger community are outperforming others. Schools therefore represent a critical point of entry for the city's efforts to reduce poverty, violence, and overall vulnerability. To get there, this program intentionally built buy-in and support from across the entire apparatus of municipality, including the Department of Education, Department of Sports & Recreation, Department of Culture, and more, in addition to local partnerships with civil society and universities.

A number of indicators were considered for the Cali measurement framework – such as international standards for measuring the quality of education, including school management and administration, relationships and school climate, and learning and skill development – as well as traditional indicators like school desertion, retention, student
advancement or regression, etc. As a proxy for social cohesion, Cali looked to measure the amount of ownership the school’s surrounding community takes in educational activities. A city fund was created and a challenge put out to Cali’s communities for participatory project proposals that would transform at least one aspect of school life. Participation greatly exceeded expectations: all schools active in My School, My Community submitted proposals. The resulting high quality, unified nature of the proposals demonstrated clear evidence of the communities coming together, signifying that the process of submitting a proposal in itself served as a vehicle for building social cohesion.

Since then, the city has begun monitoring the schools on a case-by-case basis, measuring indicators like the number of families attending events in the community, number of parents setting foot in the school building, how schools are being opened to community use. These are complemented by a standardized survey for students developed by the National University of Colombia, which tracks safety in the school environment, respect and tolerance in the student-teacher relationship, and their home environment. Criteria have also been developed to measure changes in community action that is either consultative (i.e. moving the group peacefully from a state of disagreement to a decision) or participatory (i.e. increasing the rate of engagement and involvement of individual community members in group activities).

My Community, My School is showing early signs of success, yet faces three principal measurement challenges. The first is that the team was unable to collect solid baseline data to which to compare results, and has instead sought to estimate change over time through other data sources. Secondly, they’re aware of the selection bias inherent in their data, given they purposefully targeted the most vulnerable schools, rather than randomly selecting schools across the city. And finally, as with many initiatives, the team wants more time to fully capture the changes linked to this program, but with the upcoming political election cycles, must instead rely on short-term indicators.

### 3: Heterogeneity of the group

True social cohesion is not just a measure of individuals forming strong, trusting relationships with each other, but rather a measure of their ability to form meaningful bonds with individuals outside of manufactured political, ethnic, economic, and other socially-enforced demographic lines. Measuring the heterogeneity of a group will provide an indicator of how much people are willing to trust and interact with members outside of their identities, and is a key measure of the ability of individuals to bond and bridge outside socially-enforced identities.

#### Measurement inspiration

**Observe and measure demographics and actions:**

- Multi-year evaluation of children uniting across different socioeconomic backgrounds
- Integration of different communities (e.g. different religious groups participating in a football tournament, multiple ethnic cultural associations taking part in a town festival, etc.)

**In a questionnaire or survey, ask questions along the lines of:**

- How often do you interact with members of other ethnic/racial/socioeconomic/political groups in-person? Online?
- What percent of the social media accounts you follow belong to someone who is from a different ethnic/racial/socioeconomic/political group?
Respect, Tolerance, and Love

All three of these qualities are requirements for equity and trust in one another, and are key elements of individuals’ ability to bond with one another. Respect, tolerance, and love are required conditions that ensure that community groups work toward better outcomes for all, and not just for specific members of the group. This helps ensure that all individuals are treated justly, and are included in the goals of the larger community.

Relationships

Measuring the strength and existence of relationships (between individuals, between group participants and leaders, between governments and citizens, etc.) leads to an understanding of how much people are willing to rely on one another, how much they trust each other, and how much collaboration can occur between participants/individuals.

Safety

The level of safety felt by individuals within a larger group can serve as a measure for how much they feel like they belong to that group, a core component of social cohesion. The feeling of safety can also be an indicator of how much respect and trust individuals have towards one another.

Measurement inspiration

In a questionnaire or survey, ask questions along the lines of:

Do you feel respected by authorities in your community? Do you respect them?

When you return home at the end of the day, does someone ask you about your day?

Measurement inspiration

Observe and measure actions that demonstrate the strength of relationships:

Interactions across income and racial lines

The strength of friendships and how much friends can be relied upon for social support

Ways in which members relate to one another

Behavioral changes

Measurement inspiration

Leverage existing data on relationships in a new way:

Conduct a social network analysis of local groups or organizations working on the same subject; determine links, nodes, levels of quality.
Unrest (or lack thereof)

The lack of disruption or unrest during times of change, when different groups are forced to interact, is a key indicator of the strength of the community and the trust they have in each other.

Measurement inspiration

Leverage existing data on social cohesion in a new way:
Overlay maps of unrest with a map that shows the presence of a community organization, and track correlations

Observe and measure actions related to unrest:
How do “receiving communities” react when their everyday lives are perceived as being disrupted?

Questions for reflection:

Which kinds of metrics best align with the change you hope to create through your work?

Who will measure your key metrics? When is the best time to involve this person or agency?

What level of evidence will be needed to convince or demonstrate to key stakeholders that you have made progress—rigorous data, a powerful story, both? What type of data is most critical to these stakeholders?
Common approaches to measuring social cohesion

How are leaders actually collecting the data and information they need to track their successes and address their shortcomings? The Network Review revealed a variety of approaches to measuring social cohesion, depending on the project or community’s purpose, scale, and resources, which we outline below.

(Please see Appendix A for additional resources.)

Two underlying principles nevertheless became clear: first, there was a sense of agreement that a mixed-method approach is ideal, especially when you can combine quantitative and qualitative data together for a richer understanding of the scale and depth of a project’s impacts. And secondly, leaders emphasized the importance of participatory approaches to the development of a measurement framework, where group or community members actively engage in the process of defining success. They would ideally play a large role in the data collection and analysis process as well, as a means to promote shared ownership of the project.
Soliciting information through questionnaires and surveys

This is the most common measurement approach, especially for large populations and communities. Examples include door-to-door in-person surveys, pop-up surveys online, pre-post surveys in a workshop or event, and emailed surveys.

Pros

• Can be flexible in content and length, depending on its purpose. An extensive survey may contain a mix of multiple choice and open-ended questions, as opposed to a 2-question pop-up survey that serves as a lean and light-touch way to quickly obtain data.

• Can be administered through a variety of media (i.e. in-person, online, social media, through email or standard mail, or a combination of these).

• Allows for standardization across a group or population.

• Can often enable quick and inexpensive analysis if using quantitative data.

Cons

• Risk of bias that comes with self-reporting, when respondents desire to answer questions in an appealing manner (unless you use multiple questions throughout the survey that address the same issue).

• Can be resource and time-intensive depending on the scale of the community being measured.
Measuring data and information that is shared voluntarily

Rather than soliciting responses at predetermined times, such as through a survey, some projects measure the type and frequency of information that is shared by community members as issues arise or become relevant. For example, we’ve seen this within online groups that have a shout-out feature, where members share something that another person in the group has done for them. This enables quantifying and understanding these interactions among community members.

Pros

- Flexible for people to share or participate on their own schedule.
- The self-generated nature promotes engagement.

Cons

- Requires enough buy-in or motivation for community members to proactively share.
- Solicits responses from those who want to share, as opposed to a more representative sample of the full group.
- Inconsistent frequency of responses
Observing and measuring actions

Instead of asking questions about behaviors, the behavior itself can be measured. For example, measure if and how community members have taken some kind of action that shows trust or care for others (i.e. whether group members have learned about job leads from other members). Or, we heard examples of online groups that aim to track the occurrence of first-time conversations between diverse members, such as those from different political or religious backgrounds, as well as the number of times they use certain terms or vocabulary that were emphasized in the program.

Pros

• Measuring real behavioral changes, outcomes and impact more directly and more convincingly than a survey.

Cons

• Often more labor-intensive and time consuming, meaning greater financial resources are typically needed.

“Getting access to the right data is always a challenge. Happily, there wasn’t much question about this being important work, but more about how to get at it, especially when thinking about concepts like community and social cohesion. We ended up casting a wide net and getting really creative in what data we used for those important, but hard-to-measure topics.”

- Victoria Lawson, CUNY ISLG
### Using qualitative data for storytelling

The importance of qualitative data, often gathered through interviews or focus group discussions, was emphasized throughout the Network Review as an incredibly powerful way to bring the numbers to life. These narratives were often used to produce short stories, documentaries, reports, or other creative storytelling to describe, in their own words, the change experienced by a person or community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Delivers first-person narratives about one’s journey.</td>
<td>• Lack of anonymity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storytelling can serve as a means to motivate each other in a group setting.</td>
<td>• Smaller sample size makes it more difficult to generalize responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages discussion; when informal and flexible in nature, the conversation can be more in-depth and go in the direction that is most interesting and relevant to the group.</td>
<td>• Requires a skilled researcher or interviewer, as well as creative communications ability, to execute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There’s so much compelling, anecdotal evidence of the power of our Federations that often gets lost when trying to translate it into quantifiable terms.”

- Skye Dobson

SDI

### Leverage existing data in a new way

Existing city or community data (e.g. national surveys) can be analyzed in a new, innovative way, or combined with new data sets for new insights (e.g. index). For example, combining large population surveys conducted by the federal government with specific-purpose surveys, such as those focused on health or housing, can provide a new perspective on a community’s needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Avoids the challenges and costs of new data collection.</td>
<td>• Requires flexibility in data needs, given that you are limited to data that has already been collected and is often intended for other purposes, rather than data to fit your exact needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Equality Indicators is a tool developed by the CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) to help cities understand the disparities faced by disadvantaged populations within a city and how they change over time. As of July 2019, six US cities have developed and implemented local tools, utilizing this data to gain an accurate, data-informed understanding of the levels of equality and equity across key domains. Collecting annual data allow cities to establish baseline indicators for the social well-being of their cities, increase stakeholder alignment over the level of disparities in the city, and track progress over time. Using this tool, cities such as Oakland, Dallas, Tulsa, and Pittsburgh are able to track key social equity indicators over multiple areas such as housing, education, community, and justice. While equity and social cohesion are not one and the same, many of the equality indicators frameworks identify metrics around community and neighborhood, which may be a useful resource for developing social cohesion metrics.
Common challenges to measuring social cohesion

The Network Review surfaced a handful of common challenges that our city and community partners face when trying to measure the impact of their work. Many of these challenges will be familiar to anyone responsible for developing a measurement plan, regardless of the area of focus, while others seem to be amplified when applied to social cohesion measurement.

“It’s a really big challenge to measure social cohesion, but it also holds tremendous value. Projects that are having a lot of impact may otherwise get lost if they don’t have a way to measure what they’re doing.”

- Vivian Argueta
Chief Resilience Officer for the City of Cali, Colombia
Defining social cohesion or community.

These are abstract concepts that may vary greatly by population or project. This means that it’s often difficult to deconstruct and define them in a way that’s truthful with what’s happening on the ground across diverse settings, or to develop a consistent measurement approach that works across contexts. There is also risk of using a narrow definition of cohesion that doesn’t actually reflect the values of the broader society.

Navigating conflicting outcomes.

Related to definitions, there is a valid value difference about what kind of social cohesion behaviors we want to see. For example, social cohesion could be documented as trust in and collaboration with city government – or it could be occupying City Hall through protest. Social cohesion can also conflict with what is considered ‘advantage,’ so sometimes those neighborhoods that are very disadvantaged are most tightly knit together. This speaks to the need for a clear definition of what you’re measuring.

Determining attribution.

This is an age-old measurement challenge, and one that city and community leaders felt was particularly difficult when it comes to social cohesion: how to link concrete actions to improved social cohesion, knowing that many other factors will also affect this outcome?

Identifying owners and maintaining accountability.

At the city level, it can be difficult to determine who “owns” the problem of social cohesion, given that the work is often highly dispersed through wider governance. It may also become difficult to align data with the decision-maker, especially when using broad indicators or indices. Many of our city partners, in particular, are asking themselves, “Who is the data for and who needs to act in order to make a change?”

Ensuring measurement (in particular, digital data collection) doesn’t interfere with authentic community engagement and community building.

For many communities, measurement is a way to begin a conversation. But with a focus on digital data, the collection, reflection, and learning are now happening in a centralized place, away from the community members. In this scenario, you have inherently taken the learning process away from the community and have limited the community’s access to the information. We also heard concerns that an online pop-up survey, such as on Facebook, can present a design challenge, in that you don’t want the questions to interfere with the group or their trust.

“Identifying the community is a real challenge. From the perspective of a national government, a city government may be part of its community. For City Hall, the community is composed of NGOs. For NGOs, the community is out there in neighborhoods. The community is always shifting away from who you are.”

- Peter Levine
TUFTS UNIVERSITY’S TISCH COLLEGE OF CIVIC LIFE
Ensuring longitudinal design and sufficient time needed to capture real change.

A huge limitation of a single data collection moment, for example a survey or interview, is that it won’t capture change over time, which is the ultimate goal with measurement. A related challenge is that many project timelines and budgets do not allow sufficient time to prove causal relationships and impact, as social cohesion and community-building work often takes years, if not generations. Evaluators are then forced to become comfortable instead with patterns and correlations.

“At Welcoming America, we primarily measured social cohesion by polling individuals before and after dialogues held in the city, to assess how individuals’ perceptions of refugees changed. But we wanted to go further than that to demonstrate community change, so we shifted our thinking.

Polling is really expensive and time intensive. It felt like a thermometer, versus being able to understand the long-term and permanent effects of our work. We became interested in measuring the structures that are in place, as a means to measuring the systems that advance social cohesion.”

- David Lubell
WELCOMING AMERICA
Planning for baseline.

Often measurement is considered after the fact, which means that you miss out on an opportunity to measure what has changed since the start of an intervention. Evaluators are often forced to derive lessons from existing resources or extrapolate from proxy data.

Ensuring a representative sample.

Many leaders acknowledged the difficulty of ensuring survey respondents, whether from a Facebook group or a larger community, represent the broader community. For them, it took additional time and outreach to seek out underrepresented members to overcome survey bias.

Gaining access to data.

It’s often difficult to gain access to the data needed to accurately measure change. Related, it’s difficult to find good metrics, especially if you don’t have the resources to collect new data specific to your project. This speaks to the importance of engaging partners early in measurement planning.

Securing funding for and prioritizing measurement.

We commonly heard the ever-present challenge of making the time and securing the resources to build and execute on a measurement plan, particularly when it feels like it’s competing with project implementation. For example, do you spend the extra money on a monitoring and evaluation plan or on reaching additional program participants?

“Our toughest challenge was that philanthropy and the city most often invest in the most direct or obvious solutions – those that look good on paper, are easier to understand or maybe appear ‘sexier’ – but rarely take the time to analyze the ecosystem around a problem and figure out the right order to solve things, so the more indirect solutions are usually left to someone else.”

- Roy Munin

MADE IN JERUSALEM
“Are there more affordable and efficient ways of measuring social cohesion than fielding regular surveys of representative samples in each community? I think that is a real challenge. That said, there are opportunities to use administrative data to assess social capital – say the number of library patrons, the number of people who call 311, nonprofit tax return data, or big data from social media”

- Peter Levine
TUFTS UNIVERSITY’S TISCH COLLEGE OF CIVIC LIFE
Common success factors for measuring social cohesion

Despite the diverse areas of focus and scales of intervention across leaders, the Network Review revealed some common priorities and considerations for successfully measuring social cohesion.

1 Social cohesion evolves over time. Build an approach to measurement and tools that can adapt as the project or program adapts. If needed, start small. Iterate and create space for learning as you progress.

(Please see Appendix B for additional guidance.)

Montréal: Centre-Sud LOCAL SOUP

Montréal has long been recognized for its tradition of mutual aid. A key initiative of Montréal’s Resilient City Strategy seeks to pivot that widespread value toward the development of social capital among Montrealers, as a means to strengthen community resilience. A central component of this involves developing social capital indicators adapted to the Montréal context, and integrating them into a quality of life index under development by the city. Currently underway are four pilot projects, data from which will contribute to the social capital indicators. One of these projects is LOCAL SOUP, an idea adapted from the city of Detroit, where community members meet monthly to support participatory democracy, local initiatives, and the region’s urban agriculture. For a $5 voluntary contribution, participants receive soup and a chance to vote for a proposed citizen-led community project. Four project proposals are presented and discussed among the participants (regular Montrealers, community groups, and political representatives). The winning project receives the money raised from the night, as well as initial buy-in from community members in the audience.

The city’s resilience team has partnered with the Corporation de développement communautaire (CDC) Centre-Sud, coordinator of the LOCAL SOUP in Montréal’s Centre-Sud neighborhood, the École nationale d’administration de Montréal.
Have a clear definition of which aspects and qualities of social cohesion you’re measuring. This will make for a clearer measurement plan and can help to ensure the definition aligns with the values of the broader society.

“Real power lies with the person who defines social cohesion. You can have a very cohesive group of people who are dangerously exclusive. So you have to ask yourself, ‘Whose version of good are you offering to promulgate through measurement? Who is making this decision?’”

— Beck Dawson, Chief Resilience Officer for the City of Sydney, Australia
3 Engage the community and target audiences early in the development of your measurement plan. Empower the community to be active participants in developing what they want to measure, why it’s important to them, how to ensure accountability, and how they want to use the data. Bring in local officials to co-create the measurement framework. Self-generated and owned data is the most powerful.

“Engage the community early in the development of your measurement plan. Empower the community to be active participants in developing what they want to measure, why it’s important to them, how to ensure accountability, and how they want to use the data. Bring in local officials to co-create the measurement framework. Self-generated and owned data is the most powerful.”

- Christian Delachet, WANTED COMMUNITY

4 Consider having a dedicated data partner, especially if you are undertaking a more robust approach to measurement. Look to partner with local universities, nonprofits, or even your city government for support from researchers, grad students, interns, etc.

“Our center’s data is being used by other community and youth groups. Our hope, though, is to transfer the data to the city so they can be a multiplier and diffuser of this work. To hand it off to the city so they can use the data to transform their work.”

- Marie-Christine Therrien, ÉCOLE NATIONALE D’ADMINISTRATION PUBLIQUE

5 Build data collection and assessment into program delivery. Be opportunistic and collect data from participants during your activities (e.g. collect information as part of the event RSVP or at some point during the activity itself). It’s better to be proactive than to count on people sharing information on their own, at a later time.

“Build data collection and assessment into program delivery. Be opportunistic and collect data from participants during your activities (e.g. collect information as part of the event RSVP or at some point during the activity itself). It’s better to be proactive than to count on people sharing information on their own, at a later time.”

- Marie-Christine Therrien, ÉCOLE NATIONALE D’ADMINISTRATION PUBLIQUE
The People’s Supper

The People’s Supper, a collaborative project led by The Dinner Party, Faith Matters Network, and Hollaback!, uses shared meals to build trust and connection among people of different identities and perspectives. At its core, The People’s Supper is about building relationships and social cohesion. It began in January 2017 as a way for communities to find common footing following the 2016 US elections, and has powered more than 1,500 suppers across the country.

Early on, most meals occurred in people’s homes, which meant The People’s Supper took a fairly qualitative approach to measurement, relying on relationships with hosts to gauge feedback on what worked and what didn’t. As they work more and more with institutional partners, the team has begun to get a better handle on measurement practices. Leading up to the 2018 midterm elections, a series of large, bipartisan suppers in purple states proved to be an important turning point. To RSVP, participants were required to provide demographic information (e.g. identification as liberal or conservative, gender, race, faith). Of survey respondents, 93% reported feeling more connected to others, and 80% felt a rise in empathy toward people who are different from them.

6 Be strategic in thinking about your level of measurement. Depending on your learning priorities and the story you hope to tell, it may be more appropriate to apply your analysis to the level of the individual, group, or larger community.

Levels of measurement

Conversations conducted as part of the Network Review showed that community leaders and resilience practitioners measure change in social cohesion and social capital along 3 levels of impact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of measurement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The individuals       | • What does individual participation look like?  
                        | • How do individual members of the group or community respond?  
                        | • How are community entrepreneurs impacted by their work? |
| The group             | • How is trust-building happening at the group level?  
                        | • How is organizational capacity strengthened? |
| The larger community  | • How have interpersonal relationships within the community changed?  
                        | • What level of trust does the community have in institutions? |
7 Use a mixed-method approach that combines quantitative and qualitative data together for a richer understanding of the scale and depth of a project’s successes and challenges. (See Appendix A for further examples of common approaches to measurement.)

8 Plan ahead for measurement. Tracking progress over time doesn’t necessarily have to be a huge or expensive undertaking (e.g. you can rely on proxy data or use existing data), but it does have to be intentionally built into project design and delivery. This allows for early identification of partners and alignment with funder or key stakeholder priorities.
A Path Forward
An unprecedented number of people will call cities home as the world becomes more urban over the next decades. So much of the urban landscape has yet to be built in order to accommodate these new residents. As urban leaders plan for the future, one thing must be top of mind: cities are nothing without the people who inhabit them. And a city with strong social cohesion, that is inclusive of all groups, and that prioritizes social equity, will be most prepared for the challenges of the future, both known and unknown.

Evidence from cities worldwide reveals that by building communities founded on trust, respect, and engagement, we can ensure that our cities and societies are less fragmented, more stable, adaptive, resilient, and overall better prepared for and capable of building back stronger after major shocks. The process can be driven by city leadership and policy, or defined by a collection of face-to-face and digital efforts led by an active civil society. Essential to this work in either case is the ability to understand and capture the impact of building stronger and more cohesive communities. A measurement framework that allows us to clearly assess this impact will play a critical role in catalyzing the support and resources needed to advance cohesive and resilient societies.

The definitions of social cohesion vary based on context, and many different measurement approaches are available. This handbook brings many of them to fore, and has in the process sought to foster a global conversation involving various practitioners across thematic and geographic sectors. The information in the preceding pages represent a compendium of monitoring and evaluation practices in use by these pioneers. We invite you – practitioners from all corners of the resilience, community entrepreneurship, and social impact fields – to adapt and scale their learnings as you innovative methodologies that will capture the value of community-building.

With this handbook, we hope to continue the tough work of measuring and advancing social cohesion efforts as part of our future of fostering greater urban resilience. We are confident that through the collaboration of Chief Resilience Officers, community leaders, and academic partners, we can jointly lay the groundwork for developing further measurement tools and partnerships required for the future success of cities.
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## Appendix A: Additional Reading

There is an abundance of literature on social cohesion and measurement. What follows are the resources that we found to be particularly useful during our Network Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Publisher/University/Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Publishing Year</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development under Conditions of Inequality and Distrust: Social Cohesion in Latin America</td>
<td>Marco Ferroni, Mercedes Mateo and Mark Payne</td>
<td>Discussion paper</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
<td>This discussion paper provides a detailed review of how social cohesion is defined by major actors and players in the international space. After a detailed discussion centered around the role social cohesion plays in economic and institutional development, the authors adapt the concept to the Latin American context, and develop an index to measure social cohesion and explore the linkages between the level of social cohesion and development outcomes. The paper presents evidence of a positive correlation between social cohesion and economic growth, and discusses the significance of these findings and potential policy implications.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ifpri.org/publication/development-under-conditions-inequality-and-distrust">http://www.ifpri.org/publication/development-under-conditions-inequality-and-distrust</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Measures of Civic Engagement</td>
<td>The Center for Information &amp; Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>The Center for Information &amp; Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)</td>
<td>In their website, CIRCLE provides examples of survey questions that measure civic engagement, as well as working papers written by the CIRCLE team that explore indicators and measures of civic engagement and trust. While this work does not encompass the entirety of social cohesion indicators, CIRCLE's resources serve as a useful guide for understanding how best to construct questions intended to measure trust, participation, community engagement, and social capital.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td><a href="https://civicyouth.org/tools-for-practice/survey-measures-of-civic-engagement/">https://civicyouth.org/tools-for-practice/survey-measures-of-civic-engagement/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives on Global Development 2012: Social Cohesion in a Shifting World</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>In this report, the OECD looks at social cohesion through the lenses of social inclusion, social capital, and social mobility, and explores the definition and importance of social cohesion in the context of economic mobility and growth. The report provides recommendations for policy-makers on building social cohesion through fiscal policy, employment and social protection, education, gender equality, migration programs, civic participation, and better data.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td><a href="https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/perspectives-on-global-development-2012_persp_glob_dev-2012-en#page1">https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/perspectives-on-global-development-2012_persp_glob_dev-2012-en#page1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community</td>
<td>Robert D. Putnam</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Simon &amp; Schuster</td>
<td>&quot;In this groundbreaking book, Putnam provides data-driven evidence of the decline in social capital, and how social structures - such as the PTA, church, or political parties - have begin to disintegrate. Putnam closes by arguing for the need for Americans to once again reconnect with each other, and provides some recommendations on how they can begin to do so. Putnam summarizes key definitions and indicators of social capital from his reasearch in a related article, Social Capital: Measurement and consequences, published in the Canadian Journal of Policy Research from 2001.&quot;</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td><a href="http://bowlingalone.com/">http://bowlingalone.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Publisher/University/Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Publishing Year</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital and Information Technology</td>
<td>Marleen Huysman and Volker Wulf</td>
<td>Book/Collection of Essays</td>
<td>The MIT Press</td>
<td>This collection of thirteen essays explores how the concept of social capital can be applied to information technology and knowledge management. Written by a multi-disciplinary team consisting of computer scientists, sociologists, economics, and communication specialists, these essays look at the intersection of information technology and social capital, thinking about online relationship building, internet-based communities, and more general ideas of civic and personal communities.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td><a href="https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/social-capital-and-information-technology">https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/social-capital-and-information-technology</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital and the Cities: Advice</td>
<td>Xavier de Souza Briggs</td>
<td>Scholarly Article</td>
<td>National Civic Review</td>
<td>In this paper, Briggs provides a detailed definition of social capital, and lays out the various purposes it serves and benefits it provides. He presents two case studies that illustrate the benefits of building social capital, its intricacies, and the strategic considerations behind how city planners can best work to build social capital in long-lasting and sustainable ways.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td><a href="https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ncr.4100860204">https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ncr.4100860204</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion, Institutions, and Growth</td>
<td>William Easterly</td>
<td>Working Paper</td>
<td>Center for Global Development</td>
<td>In this working paper, William Easterly argues that indicators for social cohesion are in turn indicators of institutional quality, which ultimately determines economic growth collapse, endemic poverty, civil conflict, and other markers of development and growth. Easterly provides a definition of social cohesion centered around the ability of people to work together across economic and social divides during times of crises, provides direct and indirect measures for social cohesion, and provides evidence that increased social cohesion strengthens institutions, which in turn leads to higher growth.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td><a href="https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0343.2006.00165.x">https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0343.2006.00165.x</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement and Social Cohesion:</td>
<td>Kenneth Prewitt, Christopher D. Mackie and Herman Habermann (Eds.)</td>
<td>Panel Report</td>
<td>National Research Council (USA)</td>
<td>This report summarizes the findings and recommendations by a panel of experts gathered by the Committee on National Statistics (in the US) “to identify measurement approaches that can lead to improved understanding of civic engagement, social cohesion, and social capital -- and their potential role in explaining the functioning of society.” The panel provides recommendations on the definitions of key terms, the feasibility and specifications of relevant indicators, and the relationship between these indicators and select social trends, while also assessing the relative merits of various approaches to data collection (e.g. surveys vs. administrative records). The report focuses on the US context, but would be useful to other government agencies exploring how to improve understanding of social cohesion to inform public policy -- especially those with a robust federal statistical system (e.g. national census surveys).</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nap.edu/catalog/18831/civic-engagement-and-social-cohesion-measuring-dimensions-of-social-capital">https://www.nap.edu/catalog/18831/civic-engagement-and-social-cohesion-measuring-dimensions-of-social-capital</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Publisher/University/Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Publishing Year</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Geography of Social Capital in America</td>
<td>United States Congress, Joint Economic Committee</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>United States Congress, Joint Economic Committee</td>
<td>This report describes a new social capital index created to address the challenge that US policymakers and researchers lack high-quality, contemporary measures of social capital to inform public policy solutions. It provides background information on prior efforts to measure social capital, including shortcomings of those efforts, and details the construction of the new index (including measurement approaches, indicators and application). It presents maps summarizing the geographic distribution of social capital in the US, and establishes that the index is related to a range of social, economic, and demographic indicators.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/publication/3235700414/1/the-geography-of-social-capital-in-america#endnote-022-backlink">https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/publication/3235700414/1/the-geography-of-social-capital-in-america#endnote-022-backlink</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Social Cohesion Index for the Arab Region</td>
<td>Charles Harb</td>
<td>Scholarly Article</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme Regional Bureau for Arab States</td>
<td>This article provides a comprehensive and concise literature review on social cohesion. Then it provides an understanding of social cohesion in the MENA region and develops its own framework to analyze it, using specific components.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322570041_Developing_a_Social_Cohesion_Index_for_the_Arab_Region">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322570041_Developing_a_Social_Cohesion_Index_for_the_Arab_Region</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerted Development of Social Cohesion Indicators. Methodological Guide</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td>Methodological guide</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td>This report is a major breakthrough in the analysis and measurement of social cohesion, and has been highly reviewed since its publication. Part I explains different approaches to social cohesion, from its early days. Part II explains how to understand social cohesion from different perspectives, as well as how to assess and measure it. Part III and IV show their methodological approach and sets of variables, and provide specific data types and sources to be used in analyses.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><a href="https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/socialpolicies/socialcohesiondev/source/GUIDE_en.pdf">https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/socialpolicies/socialcohesiondev/source/GUIDE_en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining and Measuring Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Jane Jenson</td>
<td>Scholarly Article</td>
<td>United Nations Research Institute for Social Development</td>
<td>Complete literature review on social cohesion, analyzing it as inclusion and social capital and in relation to institutions and governance. It then develops a list of indicators for the multidimensional measurement of social cohesion.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td><a href="https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/151856/Jenson%20ebook.pdf">https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/151856/Jenson%20ebook.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital belongings: The intersection of social cohesion, connectivity and digital media</td>
<td>Jay Marlowe, Allen Bartley and Francis Collins</td>
<td>Scholarly Article</td>
<td>The University of Auckland</td>
<td>This document focuses on the intersection of social cohesion with digital technologies in the context of ethnic minorities in New Zealand. The literature review sheds light on theoretical approaches on how digital technologies can enhance or undermine social cohesion.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1468796816654174">https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1468796816654174</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaces for the People: How Social Infrastructure can Help Fight Inequality, Polarization, and the Decline of Civic Life</td>
<td>Eric Klinenberg</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Penguin Random House</td>
<td>The book shows how social infrastructure helps solve some societal changes, including those that lead to polarization. The premise behind this is that democratic societies do not only rest on shared values but on shared spaces where connections are formed.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/557044/palaces-for-the-people-by-eric-klinenberg/9781524761165/">https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/557044/palaces-for-the-people-by-eric-klinenberg/9781524761165/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Social Capital: A guide for organizations (available only in French)</td>
<td>Catherine Perras and Julie-Maude Normandin</td>
<td>Methodological guide</td>
<td>Cité-ID Living Lab</td>
<td>This guide presents guidelines for organizations interested in measuring social capital. It proposes a method that each organization can adapt to its context and needs. The guide includes definitions of the concept of social capital and measurement tools and reasons why organizations may find them interesting. A large portion is devoted to a proposed method to measure social capital, including some questions that are helpful that form the base of the questionnaires of the methodology.</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="http://cite-id.com/documents/atelier-mesurer-le-capital-social-guide-destin%C3%A9-%C3%A0-lux-organisations/Guide-de-mesure-du-capital-social.pdf">http://cite-id.com/documents/atelier-mesurer-le-capital-social-guide-destin%C3%A9-%C3%A0-lux-organisations/Guide-de-mesure-du-capital-social.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Integrating Monitoring & Evaluation into Resilience Planning

The goal of this handbook wasn’t to provide an "M&E 101" for our readers. However, given the shared interest in measurement, we offer the following guidance with the hope that it may prompt additional thinking about how to integrate measurement into your projects and investments.

### Guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E purpose</th>
<th>Why important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Motivation:</strong> What is the most important reason for developing a plan for tracking progress and success?</td>
<td>It’s important to align on the primary purpose of your measurement before you get into the details of the plan. For example: demonstration for future replication, learning opportunity, mayoral priority, funding opportunity, etc. This will set the parameters and direction of your measurement work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders &amp; Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Constituents:</strong> Who cares most about this issue, goal or project? What will success look like for them?</td>
<td>It’s necessary to identify early on whose buy-in is critical for success. This could be political or financial leaders who you hope to sponsor the project or goal; it could be the intended beneficiaries of the work; or perhaps the internal project team. This will inform what metrics you track and use in your communication and reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level &amp; Type of Evidence:</strong> What level of evidence will be needed to convince or demonstrate to key stakeholders (such as those identified above) that you have made progress on this issue? What type of data is most critical to these stakeholders?</td>
<td>Sometimes funders or political actors need rigorous evidence produced by research institutions, while others, what’s needed is a good human story. Related, you may find that a key constituent requires the use of very particular data. It will be important to identify this early on and design the project and M&amp;E plan accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline:</strong> Is there a political, financial, or other timeline to keep in mind when considering when you hope to demonstrate success? How often will you need to measure progress? Is there mandatory reporting to keep in mind?</td>
<td>You want to ensure that any key metrics you will be tracking are in alignment with the expectations from key stakeholders and the broader context. E.g. if the mayor has re-elections in 2 years, you may want to ensure you have a mix of short and medium-term metrics that can signal early success to correspond with the political timeline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Partners & Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Partners &amp; Systems</th>
<th>Why important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Partners:</strong> What partners should you bring into early conversations to support decisions around existing/new data or data systems? Who will measure your key metrics, and can you use this as an opportunity to work across silos? When is the best time to involve this person or agency? Who will be responsible for identifying challenges and course-correcting?</td>
<td>Some cities have found it helpful to ensure academic or research institutions or staff from their data agencies are involved in the early stages of project design. This ties into the question above around the level of data rigor needed to convince key stakeholders. If high rigor, there is often more urgency to involve partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source:</strong> Where will the data come from? Are there existing data that will speak to this work, or will you need to collect new data? Do you have baseline data on where the city currently is, to inform change over time?</td>
<td>For both data source and system, it’s critical to leverage (and not duplicate, unless needed) the existing data infrastructures of your city or program. Be sure to consider existing (and often mandatory reporting processes that you may need to feed into. This is an opportunity to work across silos, and/or create new cross-department teams, as needed, to meet your M&amp;E needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data System:</strong> Is there an existing data tracking or collecting system that you can leverage for this work, or will you need to develop a new system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resilience Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience Metrics</th>
<th>Why important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Benefits:</strong> Can you begin to articulate the multiple benefits you want to achieve from this work?</td>
<td>It’s often useful to provide as much detail as possible on the multiple benefits you hope to achieve – such as details on who you hope to benefit from the work, by when, etc. Consider SMART criteria (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound). That way, once implementation begins, you have a shared vision of ‘success’ that can guide the cross-agency work, especially as projects or goals are often being led by agencies outside of the Resilience Office. These specifics also help to position the work and people involved to ensure resilience is maintained throughout implementation vs. resorting to business as usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Metrics:</strong> What are the qualities of success that you can build into the work early on? For example, can you specify resilience for whom and by when?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communications Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications Partners</th>
<th>Why important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicating Success:</strong> What partners are needed to report and communicate on your success?</td>
<td>Identifying this early on will help to ensure alignment between project or goal data and the intended audience of your communications and reporting plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting System &amp; Timeline:</strong> How will you report progress and success back to your key stakeholders? Are there existing reporting systems to leverage? How often do you need to report back on progress and success? Does this align with your proposed timeline for data collection?</td>
<td>This ensures that you take into consideration any existing or mandatory reporting systems as you build your measurement plan. E.g. many funders require a particular type and frequency of reports. It also ensures an alignment between your data collection and your communications plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>