

31 January 2023

The Treasury, Australian Government Measuring What Matters Consultation

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Measuring What Matters Consultation – The Australian Social Progress Index (SPI) by the Centre for Social Impact

The Centre for Social Impact welcomes the opportunity to provide advice on approaches and key indicators for inclusion in an Australian wellbeing framework. Measuring and reporting wellbeing is a socially and politically important activity for a holistic understanding of Australia's capacity for development. As noted by Treasury, there is a need to consider social and environmental outcomes such as education, shelter, and healthcare that will ultimately improve the ability for people to participate and grow the Australian economy¹.

While there are established processes for regularly updating and monitoring economic metrics in Australia – such as Gross Domestic and State Products, unemployment and underemployment – indicators of wellbeing that demonstrate the impact of Australian policy and program outcomes are much less frequent and inconsistent in their measurement.

Since 2018, CSI UNSW has partnered with the global not-for-profit, the Social Progress Imperative. In an Australian first, we developed a non-economic metric to understand growth, known as the <u>Australian Social Progress Index</u>. A summary of the SPI and its potential for application is included on page 3. We also identify where there are current gaps in data and measurement that limit our understandings of equitable progress in Australia, and suggest indicators should be considered a government priority for measurement.

As the SPI is based on a global methodology and framework, it is well positioned to be used as a metric alongside GDP as an established measure of progress nationally and in global comparisons. . Its design principles are focused on outcome indicators that can be addressed through change in policy or program implementation. The focus of the Index is demonstrating whether Government policy is creating its intended impact. Indicators provide an indication of the ability for Australians to have their basic human needs and foundations of wellbeing met and having the opportunity for inclusion and growth.

Internationally, Paraguay has adopted the SPI as a metric of national performance, and subsequent government strategies have been aligned with SPI indicators. The European Commission is utilising the SPI across 240 European regions and is targeted towards assessing regional strengths and weaknesses on social and environmental outcomes that are aligned with the EU cohesion policy. Locally, the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham has been used to determine the allocation of resources to directly address issues such as domestic violence, homelessness, and fuel poverty.

Given the substantial alignment between the Australian Social Progress Index and the Measuring What Matters statement, CSI strongly welcomes the opportunity to work with Treasury to identify

¹ Department of Treasury (2022), Statement 4: Measuring What Matters. In *Budget Paper No. 1*, Australian Government: Canberra.









opportunities for the Australian Social Progress Index to be part of an inclusive metric for the Federal Government's approach to measuring holistic progress.

There is an opportunity for CSI to deliver an annually updated Australian Social Progress Index. In a partnership with Government, we would be able to offer more in-depth analysis and increase geographical granularity that can help guide both Treasury and social service decision making.

We hope to be of assistance in this process, including meeting once the consultation period closes, or participating on relevant committees and reference groups as the Statement is drafted and refined in 2023.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Megan Weier

Senior Research Fellow, Centre for Social Impact

Arminé Nalbandian

CEO, Centre for Social Impact

Professor Danielle Logue

Director, UNSW Centre for Social Impact

Centre for Social Impact

The Centre for Social Impact (CSI) is a national research and education centre dedicated to catalysing social change for a better world. CSI is built on the foundation of four of Australia's leading universities: UNSW Sydney, The University of Western Australia, Swinburne University of Technology and Flinders University. Our research develops and brings together knowledge to understand current social challenges and opportunities; our postgraduate and undergraduate education develops social impact leaders; and we aim to catalyse change by drawing on these foundations and translating knowledge, creating leaders, developing usable resources, and reaching across traditional divides to facilitate collaborations.









Australian Social Progress Index – a complementary metric to GDP What it is

An Australian first, the <u>Australian Social Progress Index</u> (ASPI) is a rigorous and inclusive index that compares how States and Territories compare on social progress *relative to one another*. The Index is produced in partnership with global not-for-profit the <u>Social Progress Imperative</u>. The global Index methodology and framework was developed in collaboration with a team of scholars led by Professor Michael E. Porter of Harvard Business School. The Index is being used for agenda setting, policymaking, prioritizing resource mobilization and measuring impact by national and city leaders across:

- <u>Latin America</u> (Paraguay, Peru, Brazil, Colombia, Bogota, Mexico and Costa Rica);
- India;
- South Africa;
- the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (United Kingdom); and
- the <u>European Commission's</u> Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy.²

The Social Progress Index follows a conceptual framework that defines social progress as well as its key elements (see Figure 1). It is defined as the "capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential."



Figure 1: Social Progress Index framework and guiding questions

² Further information on subnational SPI Insights and their application to local policy can be viewed at https://www.socialprogress.org/global-index-2022overview, or alternatively by contacting Franklin Murillo, Global Insights and Partnerships Director — <a href="mainting-frankling









The ASPI has been calculated for the years 2015-2021 at the State and Territory level. It has the capacity to be updated annually, and to be calculated at a more granular jurisdictional level, subject to data availability.

What it offers

- A holistic understanding of growth it only includes social and environmental indicators, so that SPI scores can be used as complementary data alongside economic metrics
- It is outcomes focused indicators are selected based on demonstrating the *impact* of policy or program implementation
- Scores and rankings are an indication of how well a jurisdiction is positioned to support the
 basic human needs, foundations of wellbeing and opportunities of communities rather
 than being a score of how socially 'progressive' individuals are as a political ideology
- It is actionable indicators included are selected based on their capacity to be addressed through changes in policy or program, and scores can be used to identify where there are areas of greatest social need (e.g., housing, education, healthcare) within a jurisdiction
- It has been designed to align with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals providing a way to report on progress against a large set of goals

Why it is needed

- It demonstrates the non-economic impacts of growth, and can be used as a wealth/health check
- Lower or poor scores can indicate difficulties with capacity, accessibility, or appropriateness
 of services in the jurisdiction
- · It provides a distinct, but complementary, metric for understanding progressive growth
- It can help with diagnosing where there are places of stubborn or intractable disadvantage
- It discourages 'silos' of social issues for social progress to improve overall, all the included factors must show improvement
- It encourages collaboration housing issues are also issues of personal safety, health, and personal rights. By providing a common language of social progress, multiple sectors can communicate and advocate for shared impact

The Centre for Social Impact is well positioned to advise on appropriate indicators for a wellbeing framework, based on extensive consultation with academics, public service, community sector, and industry, as well as an extensive review of currently available public data sources that can be used to understand social outcomes. In reviewing more than 450 potential data sources and suggested indicators, CSI was guided by the following criteria for data inclusion:

- Exclusively social or environmental indicators
- Measures outcomes, not inputs
- Relevant to all jurisdictions
- Can be influenced through change in policy or program administration³

Additionally, the data sources themselves needed to be robust and current:

- Data collected using reputable and transparent methods
- Collected in the last 1-2 years
- Covers 95-100% of included geographic regions

³ The full methodology, including data sources considered and reasons for exclusion, can be accessed <u>here</u>.









The 53 indicators and data sources included in the most recent iteration of the ASPI are included in Appendix A. These indicators have been selected based on their ability to answer fundamental questions about access to medical care, shelter, and education, as well the policy contexts that enable personal rights, inclusiveness, environmental quality.

Considerations for optimal wellbeing data

A key challenge for appropriately measuring wellbeing is ensuring that data is collected consistently, regularly, and with sufficient granularity. Key issues that we have needed to consider in the creation of the Index are outlined below. Broadly, these issues related to inconsistent data definition and collection, a lack of sufficient demographic sampling to understand social equity, and prioritising outcomes measurement over output reporting.

- There are multiple innovative methods of measuring wellbeing, social cohesion, and disaster resilience, either directly or through proxy measures. While there are multiple population surveys (such as the Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia survey, and the Australian Bureau of Statistics' General Social Survey), the frequency and granularity of the collection restricts how meaningfully results can be interpreted beyond a general population estimate.
- There is limited quality data that is collected consistently across States and Territories that
 can be used to inform overall national wellbeing data. A national wellbeing reporting
 framework may assist jurisdictions in measuring and reporting social outcomes consistently
 to inform a nation-wide assessment of wellbeing.
- The wellbeing indicators should be defined and measured through an equity lens. Reporting
 indicators such as 'feeling safe at night', at a general population level, is less meaningful than
 purposively surveying and reporting for social groups more likely to be impacted by the
 indicator (such as gender or racial identity).
- Charities and not-for-profits who deliver social services and programs have high levels of
 expertise in measuring wellbeing and social outcomes for their clients. Treasury should
 consult with these organisations to determine the most commonly used indicators to ensure
 a bottom-up identification of wellbeing indicators. CSI has been working with the sector
 since 2018 to develop an innovative online platform to support rigorous and consistent
 outcomes measurement in the for-purpose sector (see below for overview).
- Treasury, and Government's, role in contributing to individual wellbeing is through the
 making and implementing of policy and social programs. Indicators that are identified as part
 of the wellbeing framework should be able to demonstrate how government initiatives
 produce positive social and wellbeing outcomes.

Amplify Online

<u>Amplify Online</u> is an online platform designed to help organisations measure their outcomes, add to the evidence base in their area, and ultimately understand their social impact. Since 2018, the CSI UNSW team have undertaken a process of evaluating whether commonly used social indicators are fit for purpose by being:

- Validated
- Reliable
- Short and easy to measure
- Appropriate for its target audience









Able to be compared to national data

The Amplify Online platform consists primarily of the tools Indicator Engine (launched April 2021) and Yardstick (launching early 2023). Indicator Engine allows organisations to search for the outcomes they wish to achieve with their programs or through their organisational mission and find appropriate indicators and tools to measure them with validity and reliability. It will also provide a surveying platform that will allow organisations to implement the surveys with their clients with capacity to provide data visualisations for their outcomes. This data will then be fed into Yardstick, which will allow organisations to benchmark their progress with national data, but also as compared to other programs and strategies across Australia that are aiming for similar outcomes.

Benefits of these online tools include:

- » A simplified one-stop shop for organisations to begin or support their ongoing outcomes measurement journey
- » Knowledge that they are using appropriate, valid and reliable tools to measure their outcomes
- » Opportunity to see the areas in which they are creating positive change, as compared to national benchmarks
- » Align their outcomes to official outcomes frameworks provided by funders

An opportunity to review and collaborate with other organisations who are aiming to achieve similar or complementary outcomes through their programs.









APPENDIX A: AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX INDICATOR DEFINITIONS AND SOURCES

| Dimension/component | Indicator Name | Definition | Source |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Basic Human Needs | | | |
| Nutrition and Basic Medical Care | Infant mortality | The number of deaths of children under one year of age in a specified period per 1,000 live births in the same period. | ABS Deaths and Infant Mortality Rates |
| | Pnenumococcal prevalence | Notification rate of Pneumococcal, per 100,000 | Department of Health National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System |
| | Rotavirus prevalence | Notification rate of rotavirus, per 100,000 | |
| | Premature mortality (<75) | Potential years of life lost, per 100 000 of the population aged 1-64 | ABS Deaths Register and Rates |
| | Indigenous mortality rates | Rate ratio between Indigenous and non-Indigenous standardised death rates, per 100,000 people | |
| Water and Sanitation | Waterborne diseases - Shingellosis | Notification rates per 100,000 of shingellosis | Department of Health National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System |
| | Waterborne diseases - Cryptosporidiosis | Notification rates per 100,000 of cryptosporidiosis | |
| | Waterborne diseases - Salmonella | Notification rates per 100,000 of salmonella | |
| | Water interruption | Average frequency of unplanned interruptions - water (no per 1000 properties) (averaged over providers) | Bureau of Meteorology Urban National Performance Report |
| Shelter | Social housing tenancy | Rate of people living in social housing, per 10,000 of the population | AIHW National Housing Assistance Data Repository |
| | Accommodation provision | Proportion of clients of Specialist Housing Services with identified need for accommodation provision who received short, medium or long-term accommodation | AIHW Specialist Homelessness Services |







| The Austr | alian Social Progress Index | AMPLIFY)) Social Impact | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Greatest need for social housing | Proportion of households on public housing waiting list with greatest need status | AIHW National Housing Assistance Data Repository |
| | Rental affordability | Rental affordability index score for metropolitan areas | Rental Affordability Index |
| Personal Safety | Perceived safety at home at night | Perceptions of safety at home at night Index score | Federal Productivity Commission Report on Government Services |
| | Physical assaults | Rate of persons who experienced physical assault in last 12 months (per 10,000) | ABS Crime Victimisation Survey |
| | Acts to cause injury | Offender rate of recorded acts intended to cause injury | ABS Recorded Crime |
| | Youth crime rates | Offender rate of all recorded crime committed by youth | |
| | Youth justice supervision | Rate of 10-17 year olds under community and detention supervision on an average day (per 10,000) | AIHW Youth Justice in Australia |
| Foundations of Wellbe | ing | | |
| Access to Basic Knowledge | NAPLAN Numeracy Year 9 | Proportion of population achieving below the national minimum standard for writing | NAPLAN |
| | NAPLAN Reading Year 9 - Indigenous | Difference in Proportion of population achieving below the national minimum standard for reading - Indigenous cf non-Indigenous | |
| | High school student retention rates | Apparent retention rates for students, Year 7/8 - Year 11 | ACARA National report on Schooling in Australia |
| | Access to early childhood education | Proportion of children aged 4-5 enrolled in preschool program (%) | ABS Children enrolled in preschool program |
| | | | |









| | Gap in Indigenous student attendance rate | Gap in student attendance rate years 1-10 - Indigenous to non- Indigenous students | ACARA National report on school attendance |
|--|---|--|---|
| Access to Information and Communications | Digital access | Digital access score in Digital inclusion index | Digital Inclusion Index |
| | Digital affordability | Digital affordability score in Digital inclusion index | |
| | Digital ability | Digital ability score in Digital inclusion index | |
| | Registered library users | Total number of registered or active members as a percentage of the population (need to calculate as %) | NSLA Annual Australian Public Library Statistics |
| Health and Wellness | Community mental health treatment | Patient rate per 1,000 population receiving community mental health care | AIHW Mental Health Services |
| | Suicide | Standardised death rate due to self-harm (suicide) | ABS Causes of Death |
| | Respiratory mortality | Age-standardised death rate due to respiratory disease | |
| | Diabetes mortality | Age-standardised death rate due to diabetes | |
| | Cancer mortality | Age-standardised death rate due to cancer-neoplasms | |
| | Cardiovascular mortality | Age-standardised death rate due to diseases of the circulatory system | |
| Environmental Quality | PM10 concentrations | Median 24 hour concentrations of PM10, averaged across monitoring stations | State Environment agencies |
| | PM2.5 concentrations | Median 24 hour concentrations of PM2.5 measured using continuous BAM method, averaged across monitoring stations | |
| | Environmental crime | Offender rate for property damage and environmental pollution | ABS Recorded Crime |









| CO2 per capita | Greenhouse gas emissions per capita (t CO2-e per person) | Department of Climate, Energy the |
|----------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | Environment and Water National |
| | | Greenhouse Accounts |

| Opportunity | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Personal Rights | Voter registration | Proportion of eligible adults enrolled to vote (%) | Australian Electoral Commission enrolment statistics |
| | Police integrity | Police integrity - total proportion in agreement with 'police treat people fairly and equally' (%) | Federal Productivity Commission Report on Government Services |
| | Male sexual assault and related offences | Offender rate of recorded sexual assualt and related offences by males | ABS Recorded Crime |
| | Teen pregnancy | Rate of 15-19 year old women who gave birth (per 1,000) | ABS Births and Deaths Statistics |
| Personal Freedom and Choice | Child abuse substantiations - Indigenous disparity | Rate ratio of Indigenous to non-Indigenous children aged 0-17 who were the subjects of substantiations of notifications received | AIHW Child Protection Australia |
| | Out of home care - Indigenous disparity | Rate ratio of Indigenous to non-Indigenous children in out of home care (per 1,000) | |
| | Public transport safety | Perceptions of safety on public transport at night Index score | Federal Productivity Commission Report on Government Services |
| | Women seeking homelessness services FDV | Rate ratio of women to men seeking homelessness services due to family and domestic violence | AIHW Specialist Homelessness Services |
| Inclusiveness | Gender pay gap | Female total cash earnings, expressed as a percentage of men's total cash earnings. | ABS Average Weekly Earnings |







The Australian Social Progress Index Gender employment underutilisation The difference between women's and men's underutilisation **ABS Labour Force Survey** rate, expressed as a ratio of female to male underutilisation Volunteering Proportion of people who reporting volunteering for more than half an hour a week Satisfaction with connection to Proportion of people who are satisfied with feeling part of the community community Access to Advanced Post high school enrolment Proportion of the population aged 15-64 who are attending Survey of Education and Work, ABS higher education, TAFE or other institution/organisation (not Education secondary) (%) Educational attainment per population Proportion of population 20-64 with post-school qualification Proportion of 15-24 year olds who are not fully or partially NEET engaged in employment or study Gender parity in higher education Proportion of women with a bachelor degree or above as a ratio to men with a bachelor degree or above aged 20-64 achievement





