

**Business case for community action – Evidence Review Summary of Findings
Local Government Association**

January 2016

1. Introduction

This document provides a summary of the findings from an evidence review into community action and related concepts, and sets out the key learning for local government. It also provides details of the most relevant and useful articles and documents for Councils that are looking to invest in, or scale up different types of community action initiatives.¹

2. Evidence review – purpose and approach

The Kings Fund Information and Knowledge Service was commissioned to carry-out a literature search as part of the 'business case for community action' project. The purpose of the search was to inform guidance for Councils on the different concepts and learning underpinning successful community action, and the tools and techniques being used to measure and evaluate impact.

The search used a wide range of search terms across a number of different sources of evidence, including health and social care databases, social sciences / social welfare, economics, public administration and relevant grey literature (including trade and mainstream press). A full report of the literature search which lists the articles and publications identified is available as a separate document.

3. Summary of findings

The review identified a large number of relevant articles, grouped into nine main themes. Relevant articles in the mainstream and professional press were also identified.

¹ The highlight articles identified in this report are selected from the full evidence review undertaken as part of this research. Their selection is based on their relevance to local government in relation to community action, and to further illustrate the findings set out in our report to the LGA. We have not assessed the accuracy or quality of individual third party research articles and publications, nor does Apteligen warrant their use within particular local government contexts.

Theme	Number of articles identified
1. Community empowerment	23
2. Community resilience and social networks	28
3. Co-creation and co-production	72
4. Citizen and community involvement	95
5. Social, community and collective action	49
6. Time banking	18
7. The Big Society	16
8. Total place, devolution and other place-based approaches	27
9. Social return on investment, evaluation and measurement	98
10. Press coverage	66
Total	492

Table 1: Summary of main themes in the evidence and the number of articles identified

Overview

Community action and involvement in public services has increasingly gained traction as a popular concept following the economic recession. The drive for greater community involvement has various benefits: greater user satisfaction in services; creating more resilient and self-sufficient societal structures; and potential cost savings and efficiency in public services. The body of research on community action in public services covers a vast array of concepts involving and including community/user involvement and engagement; community empowerment; co-production, co-creation and collaboration in service design and delivery; how social networks and personal relationships contribute to community resilience; and the evaluation and assessment of these processes. The results of this literature search have been organised thematically to broadly reflect these issues and recent models of delivery, such as the Big Society or place-based services.

Community empowerment

The concepts of ‘community empowerment’ and ‘community resilience’, as explored in the literature, are intertwined; in enabling communities to take greater responsibility and be more involved in designing, delivering and shaping services, local government can help to create stronger communities. Community empowerment may refer to abstract power (e.g. decision-making such as community-led service design) or more tangible forms (e.g. support for communities to buy or manage assets).

Community resilience

The concept of ‘resilience’ refers to communities which have stronger social networks and enhanced capacity to solve local problems and issues independently. In the literature, resilience is a quality that is nurtured through strong social networks and links fostering a stronger sense of social responsibility leading to greater social action. The strategies identified to encourage greater resilience include policy-making which prioritises peoples’ personal relationships and social networks; greater user involvement; and user governance. The scenario in which community resilience is most demonstrable is following natural disasters and in areas of great deprivation and for this reason, much of the case study literature tends to focus on community resilience in these settings.

Involvement, collaboration and partnership

User involvement is cited as one of the tools with which community resilience can be developed but it is also a way of building more personalised services which focus on user outcomes. The concept of co-production or co-creation, particularly in relation to health and social care, has been a driver for a shift towards outcomes-based commissioning. In commissioning with user outcomes in mind, the user journey, user choice and user experience are all at the forefront of the decision making process. In order to design services that more closely reflect user needs, user involvement and input is paramount in order to understand user needs. With this in mind, the various policy drives towards whole-area approaches (of which Total Place and Our Place were examples) encompass many of the concepts already mentioned (such as user-centred service design) and marries them with a more localised focus. A whole-area approach argues for greater localised power in order to tailor services for local populations. Whilst Total Place as a policy concept is no longer current other initiatives have gained popularity in its stead, such as the ongoing interest in regional devolution following Greater Manchester's devolution.

Community action

David Cameron's 'Big Society' concept invoked the ideas of community resilience, social action and community involvement in order to deliver services and create a stronger society. Where the Big Society as an experiment has been deemed as an unsuccessful one, community action as a concept still has currency in relation to policy-making ideals. Where user involvement promotes greater user choice and satisfaction, it also changes the relationship between the service user and provider. Collaborating in the delivery and design of services puts the user in a more active position and this reconsideration of the user as a passive consumer of services is key to the concept of social or community action. Community action recognises that people and communities in themselves are assets and that utilising these assets could broaden the potential of existing public services. Additionally, harnessing communities and people as assets provides rich and valuable insight into the particular needs of a local population.

Measurement and assessment

The measurement, evaluation and assessment of initiatives that drive a community action agenda required the development of new tools. One of the most popular approaches is based on an economic evaluative approach, the return on investment (ROI) analysis. Whilst ROI is not directly applicable to public services, the social return on investment (SROI) approach takes a broader definition of 'value' to calculate a quantifiable impact of a particular intervention or initiative. SROI is one of a variety of social accounting methods used to calculate the social and environmental impact of public services, others including social accounting and audit (SAA), social enterprise balanced scorecard (SEBS), impact reporting and investment standards (IRIS), global impact investment ratings system (GIIRS) and the LGA's community empowerment business case tool.

Outside of impact measurement, the other forms of evaluation that appear in the literature are measures of concepts already mentioned (e.g. measurement of community empowerment or community resilience).

4. What the evidence tells us about measurement tools & methods available to quantify or value community action

- Social return on investment (SROI) is by far the most prominent measurement tool covered in the literature, and can be / has been applied in a wide range of different settings. It is likely to be the technique that most Councils have considered using or have tried using in the past
- Other tools include: social cost-benefit analysis, well-being valuation, social accounting and audit, and various qualitative research methods – applying these may require more specialist knowledge and expertise than would normally be available within some Councils
- Different tools serve different purposes: some are about measuring performance and monitoring or supporting implementation, some are focused on making the case for investment, and some provide guidance on reporting impact to funders and other stakeholders
- Much of the literature uses interventions and examples from the third sector – which can sometimes have less direct relevance for Councils
- A number of existing guidance tools / packs exist around measurement of community action, in particular those produced by New Philanthropy Capital (NPC), New Economics Foundation and Nesta (see highlights below) – we will need to ensure that this project complements existing guidance where it is useful and relevant for local government.

Selected highlight articles include (see full report for abstracts and descriptions):

Making the case for community investment

Hedley, Sarah, Keen, Sarah, Lumley, Tris, Ogain, Eibhlin Ni, Thomas, Jane and Williams, Mathilde, (2010). Talking about results, London: New Philanthropy Capital.

<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/talking-about-results/>

Kersley, H. and Shaheen, F., (2011). Improving services for young people: an economic perspective, London: New Economics Foundation.

http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/c001655a17a776e886_gkm6bpycu.pdf

Rickey, Benedict, Ogain, Eibhlin Ni and Lumley, Tris, (2011). A journey to greater impact: six charities that learned to measure better, London: New Philanthropy Capital.

<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/a-journey-to-greater-impact/>

Steed, S., (2011). Small slices of a bigger pie: attribution in SROI, London: New Economics Foundation.

http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/86c098b42b969e12c6_wam6i8ux8.pdf

Measuring and demonstrating value (including specific valuation techniques):

Arvidson, Malin, Lyon, Fergus, McKay, Stephen and Moro, Domenico, (2010). The ambitions and challenges of SROI, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/research/economic-social-impact/social-return-on-investment.aspx>

Fujiwara, D., Campbell, R., Great Britain, Department for Work and Pensions, Great Britain and Treasury, (2011). Valuation techniques for social cost-benefit analysis stated preference, revealed preference and subjective well-being approaches: a discussion of the current issues, London: HM Treasury. http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/greenbook_valuationtechniques.pdf

Goodspeed, T., Lawlow, E., Neitzert, E. and Nicholls, J., (2009). A guide to social return on investment, London: Cabinet Office. http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/cat_view/29-the-guide-to-social-return-on-investment

Heady, Lucy and Keen, Sarah, (2010). SROI for funders, London: New Philanthropy Capital. <http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/sroi-for-funders/>

Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. Committee on Valuing Community-Based, Non-Clinical Prevention Programs and Lawrence, R.S., (2012). An integrated framework for assessing the value of community-based prevention., Washington DC: National Academies Press. http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13487

Lane, M.D. and Casile, M., (2011). Angels on the head of a pin. Social Enterprise Journal, 7(3), pp.238–258.

Leykin, D., Lahad, M., Cohen, O., Goldberg, A. and Aharonson-Daniel, L., (2013). Conjoint community resiliency assessment measure-28/10 items (CCRAM28 and CCRAM10): a self-report tool for assessing community resilience. American Journal of Community Psychology, 52(3), pp.313–323.

Liberato, S.C., Brimblecombe, J. and Ritchie, J., (2011). Measuring capacity building in communities : a review of the literature. BMC Public Health, 11((850):). <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/11/850>

Marcus, Gaia and Tidey, Jimmy, (2015). Community mirror: a data-driven method for ‘below the radar’ research, London: NESTA. <http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/community-mirror-data-driven-method-below-radar-research>

McLoughlin, J., Kaminski, J., Sodagar, B., Khan, S., Harris, R., Arnaudo, G. and Brearty, S.M., (2009). A strategic approach to social impact measurement of social enterprises: the SIMPLE methodology. Social Enterprise Journal, 5(2), pp.154–178.

Pfefferbaum, R.L., Pfefferbaum, B., Nitiéma, P., Houston, J.B. and Van Horn, R.L., (2015). Assessing community resilience. American Behavioral Scientist, 59(2), pp.181–199.

Social Value International, (2015). The principles of social value, Liverpool: Social Value International http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/718-principles-of-social-value

Social Value UK, (2015a). SROI and HACT's Social Value Bank linkages paper, Liverpool: Social Value UK.

http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/675-sroi-and-hact-social-value-bank-linkages-paper

Social Value UK, (2015b). What is the relationship between collective impact and SROI?, Liverpool: Social Value UK.

http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/715-sroi-and-collective-impact

Social Value UK, (2013a). GIIRS and SROI: what is the relationship?, Liverpool: Social Value UK.

http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/441-sroi-and-giirs

Social Value UK, (2011). What is the relationship between IRIS and SROI?, Liverpool: Social Value UK.

http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/104-iris-and-sroi

SROI Network, (2010d). The relationship between social return on investment (SROI) and social accounting and audit (SAA), Liverpool: SROI Network.

http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/101-sroi-and-san

UK examples of community action

Jones, C., Edwards, R.T. and Windle, G., (2014). Social return on investment analysis of an art group for people with dementia. *The Lancet*, 384, p.S43.

Pritchard, David, Ogain, Eibhlin Ni and Lumley, Tris, (2012). *Making an impact: impact measurement among charities and social enterprises in the UK*, London: New Philanthropy Capital.

<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/making-an-impact/>

[USA example] Scharlach, A.E., (2015). Estimating the value of volunteer-assisted community-based aging services: a case example. *Home Health Care Services Quarterly*, 34(1), pp.46–65.

Taylor, Matthew and McLean, Sam, (2013). *Citizen Power Peterborough: impact and learning*, London: RSA.

<https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/citizen-power-peterborough-impact-and-learning/>

Existing resource packs that are relevant for this project

Nicholls, J., Mackenzie, S. and Somers, A., (2007). *Measuring real value: a DIY guide to social return on investment*, London: New Economics Foundation.

http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/cf0968d3256d6bfffcc_cim6bsty5.pdf

Ógáin, Eibhlín Ní, (2015). *Impact measurement in impact investing: learning from practice*, London: NESTA.

<http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/impact-measurement-impact-investing>

Ogain, Eibhlin Ni, Hedley, Sarah and Lumley, Tris, (2013). *Mapping outcomes for social investment*, London: New Philanthropy Capital.

<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/mapping-outcomes-for-social-investment>

Scholten, Peter, Nicholls, Jeremy, Olson, Sara and Galimidi, Brett, (2006). Social return on investment: a guide to SROI analysis, Amsterdam: Lenthe.
http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/459-social-return-on-investment-a-guide-to-sroi-analysis

SROI Network, (2010c). Social return on investment in community empowerment: the connections between Social Return on Investment and the Community Empowerment Business Case Tool, London: Local Government Association.
http://socialvalueuk.org/publications/publications/doc_download/102-making-the-case-for-community-empowerment-sroi

Wilson, D. and Frederick Bull, M., (2013). SROI in practice: the Wooden Canal Boat Society. Social Enterprise Journal, 9(3), pp.315–325.

Wood, Claudia and Leighton, Daniel, (2010). Measuring social value: the gap between policy and practice, London: Demos.
<http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/measuring-social-value>
 [It also investigates the range of frameworks available for measuring social value and assesses progress made towards using these frameworks, particularly the Social Return on Investment (SROI) model currently being promoted by Government]

Impact measurement in the third sector

Arvidson, M., Battye, F. and Salisbury, D., (2014). The social return on investment in community befriending. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 27(3), pp.225–240.

Cordery, C. and Sinclair, R., (2013). Measuring performance in the third sector. Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management, 10(3/4), pp.196–212.

Gibbon, J. and Dey, C., (2011). Developments in social impact measurement in the third sector: scaling up or dumbing down? Social and Environmental Accountability Journal, 31(1), pp.63–72.

Harlock, Jenny, (2013). Impact measurement practice in the UK third sector: a review of emerging evidence, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/research/economic-social-impact/impact-measurement-practice-in-the-uk-third-sector.aspx>

Joy, Iona, (2014). Smart money: understanding the impact of social investment: what NPC has learned so far, London: New Philanthropy Capital. <http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/smart-money/>

Nevill, Camilla and Lumley, Tris, (2011). Impact measurement in the youth justice sector, London: New Philanthropy Capital. <http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/measuring-together/>

5. What the evidence tells us about empowering communities

- There are a number of practical examples of community empowerment cited in the literature, many drawing on UK experiences
- The most notable barriers to effective community empowerment are identified, and they include: issues of community capacity, institutional capacity, organisational cultures and regulatory frameworks
- Productive working between local government and the voluntary and community sector is considered an important driver of building stronger and more empowered communities
- Digital technology is also considered to play an important role in connecting and supporting people
- Studies support the notion that happiness and well-being are products of citizen control and influence, giving local government the confidence to drive forward initiatives to empower communities
- The right organisational culture is a key success factor for effective neighbourhood working, and for building shared expectations between local government and communities.

Selected highlight articles include (see full report for abstracts and descriptions):

Adamson, Dave, (2010). Community empowerment: identifying the barriers to 'purposeful' citizen participation. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 30(3/4), pp.114–126.

Buonfino, Alessandra, Mulgan, Geoff, Ali, Rushanara and Hewes, Sarah, (2010). *Cohesive communities*, London: Young Foundation.

<http://youngfoundation.org/publications/cohesive-communities/>

Dobson, Julian, (2011). *Community assets: emerging learning, challenges and questions*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/community-assets-learning-challenges-questions>

Francis, Rob, (2012). *Unlocking local capacity: why active citizens need active councils*, London: Office for Public Management. <http://www.opm.co.uk/publications/unlocking-local-capacity>

Hothi, Mandeep, (2012). *Local 2.0: How digital technology empowers local communities*, London: Young Foundation.

<http://youngfoundation.org/publications/local-2-0-how-digital-technology-empowers-local-communities/>

Partington, J. and Totten, M., (2012). Community sports projects and effective community empowerment: a case study in Rochdale. , 17(1), pp.29–46.

Rosenberg, Jonathan, (2012). Social housing, community empowerment and well-being: part two – measuring the benefits of empowerment through community ownership. *Housing, Care and Support*, 15(1), pp.24–33.

Young Foundation, (2010). *What is an empowering authority? Community empowerment and organisational culture*, London: Young Foundation. <http://youngfoundation.org/publications/what-is-an-empowering-authority-community-empowerment-and-organisational-culture>

6. What the evidence tells us about social networks and building community resilience

- Much of the literature on community resilience is presented within a context of disaster response, and the role that local networks play in reducing the negative impacts of crisis events. The role of social networks is also considered important for providing informal care and support for more vulnerable members of a community
- An important learning from the existing research is that agencies need to shift towards a more asset-based approach, by recognising that those with support needs, or those living in poverty, should be seen as important assets to their community
- Local government should allow sufficient staff time and resources to support the development of effective community and personal networks – these take time to form and provide an essential building block for greater community resilience.

Selected highlight articles include (see full report for abstracts and descriptions):

Allen, M., Spandler, H. and Prendergast, Y., (2015). Landscapes of helping : kindness in neighbourhoods and communities., York: JRF.

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/landscapes-helping-kindliness-full.pdf>

Anderson, S., Brownlie, J. and Milne, E.J., (2015). Understanding everyday care and support., York: JRF. <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/liveable-lives-study.pdf>

Towell, David and Gillespie, John, (2011). Creating stronger and more inclusive communities which value everyone's right to contribute: some lessons for positive action in the context of austerity, London: New Economics Foundation.

http://www.neweconomics.org/page/-/files/Creating_Stronger_and_More_Inclusive_Communities.pdf

IPPR North, Urban Forum, Oxfam and Church Action on Poverty, (2011). Community assets first: the implications of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach for the Coalition agenda, Manchester: IPPR North.

<http://www.ippr.org/publications/community-assets-first-the-implications-of-the-sustainable-livelihoods-approach-for-the-coalition-agenda>

Kraglund-Gauthier, W.L., Folinsbee, S., Quigley, B.A. and Grégoire, H., (2009). Re-conceptualizing health and learning in terms of community resilience and enterprise. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 3(4), pp.405–414.

Landau, J., (2007). Enhancing resilience: families and communities as agents for change. *Family Process*, 46(3), pp.351–365.

Norman, Will, (2012). *Adapting to change: the role of community resilience*, London: The Young Foundation.

<http://youngfoundation.org/publications/adapting-to-change-the-role-of-community-resilience/>

Poortinga, W., (2012). Community resilience and health: the role of bonding, bridging, and linking aspects of social capital. *Health and Place*, 18(2), pp.286–295.

Stark, A. and Taylor, M., (2014). Citizen participation, community resilience and crisis-management policy. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 49(2), pp.300–315.

Walker, Andrew, Johnston, Andy and Carr-West, Jonathan, (2015). *Project resilience: an outline for future research*, London: LGiU. <http://www.lgiu.org.uk/report/project-resilience/>

7. What the evidence tells us about co-creation and co-production

- There is a considerable body of evidence about co-production and co-creation in public services, set within a wide range of contexts and with varying interpretations
- However, there is a clear emphasis on co-production within the context of improving the quality of health and social care services, and within wider collective action programmes
- Definitions of co-production are wide-ranging, although they all centre on concepts of joint planning and joint delivery in order to improve outcomes for citizens
- Building social capital and social networks are seen as two of the more important enablers for co-production in public services
- Despite its extensive coverage in the literature for over two decades, there remain many organisational, cultural and policy barriers to effective co-production, and these are described by a number of the authors highlighted below.

Selected highlight articles include (see full report for abstracts and descriptions):

Alakeson, Vidhya, Bunnin, Antonia and Miller, Clive, (2013). *Coproduction of health and wellbeing outcomes: the new paradigm*, London: Office for Public Management.
<http://www.opm.co.uk/publications/coproduction-of-health-and-wellbeing-outcomes-the-new-paradigm-for-effective-health-and-social-care/>

Blood, I. and Pannell, J., (2012). *Building mutual support and social capital in retirement communities*, London: Housing LIN.
http://www.housinglin.org.uk/library/Resources/Housing/Support_materials/Viewpoints/Viewpoint_23_Mutual_Support.pdf

Bovaird, T. and Loeffler, E., (2012). From engagement to co-production: the contribution of users and communities to outcomes and public value. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(4), pp.1119–1138.

Cepiku, D. and Giordano, F., (2014). Co-production in developing countries: insights from the community health workers experience. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), pp.317–340.

Denham-Vaughan, S. and Clark, M., (2012). Care clusters in mental health and co-production of care – towards a more lay friendly set of cluster descriptions. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*, 16(2), pp.79–83.

Ewert, B. and Evers, A., (2014). An ambiguous concept: on the meanings of co-production for health care users and user organizations? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(2), pp.425–442.

Fledderus, J., Brandsen, T. and Honingh, M.E., (2015). User co-production of public service delivery: An uncertainty approach. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30(2), pp.145–164.

Francis, Rob, (2015). *Our place guide to co-design*, London: Office for Public Management.
<http://www.opm.co.uk/publications/our-place-guide-to-co-design>

Hampson, Martha, Baeck, Peter and Langford, Katherine, (2013). *By us, for us: the power of co-design and co-delivery*, London: NESTA.
<http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/us-us-power-co-design-and-co-delivery>

Loeffler, Elke, Taylor-Gooby, David, Bovaird, Tony, Hine-Hughes, Frankie and Wilkes, Laura, (2012). *Making health and social care personal and local: moving from mass production to co-production*, London: LGiU.
<http://www.lgiu.org.uk/report/making-social-care-personal-and-local-moving-from-mass-production-to-co-production/>

Munoz, S.-A., Farmer, J., Warburton, J. and Hall, J., (2014). Involving rural older people in service co-production: Is there an untapped pool of potential participants? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, pp.212–222.

Van Eijk, C.J.A. and Steen, T.P.S., (2014). Why people co-produce: analysing citizens' perceptions on co-planning engagement in health care services. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), pp.358–382.

NHS Alliance, National Voices and Turning Point eds , (2011). *Raising the bar: driving co-production through clinical commissioning*, Retford: NHS Alliance.
http://www.nationalvoices.org.uk/sites/www.nationalvoices.org.uk/files/co-production_report_130611_-_final_final.pdf

OECD ed , (2011). *Together for better public services: partnering with citizens and civil society*, Paris: OECD.
http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/together-for-better-public-services-partnering-with-citizens-and-civil-society_9789264118843-en

Pestoff, V., (2014). Collective action and the sustainability of co-production. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), pp.383–401.

Slay, J. and Stephens, L., (2013). *Co-production in mental health: a literature review*, London: New Economics Foundation.
http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/ca0975b7cd88125c3e_ywm6bp3l1.pdf

Slay, J. and Penny, J., (2014). *Commissioning for outcomes and co-production: a practical guide for local authorities*, London: New Economics Foundation.
http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/974bfd0fd635a9ffcd_j2m6b04bs.pdf

Social Care Institute for Excellence ed , (2013). *Co-production in social care: what is it and how to do it*, London: SCIE.
<http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/guides/guide51/introduction.asp>

Voorberg, W.H., Bekkers, V.J.J.M. and Tummers, L.G., (2014). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, pp.1–25.

8. What the evidence tells us about wider citizen involvement

- The evidence in relation to wider citizen and community involvement covers similar concepts and issues highlighted in earlier themes, with a particular emphasis on the nature of the relationship between agencies and citizens
- Practical applications within the field of health and social care features heavily in the literature
- The following articles cover some of the more recent practical ideas and models for shifting public policy and service delivery towards greater participation and involvement.

Selected highlight articles include (see full report for abstracts and descriptions):

Bland, Jessica, Khan, Halima, Loder, John, Symons, Tom and Westlake, Stian, (2015). *The NHS in 2030: a people-powered and knowledge-powered health system*, London: NESTA.

<http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/nhs-2030-people-powered-and-knowledge-powered-health-system>

Caiston-Arendar, Lucia, (2010). *Why do some people get involved? How to encourage local activism and help communities to self-organise*, London: Young Foundation.

<http://youngfoundation.org/publications/why-do-some-people-get-involved-how-to-encourage-local-activism-and-help-communities-to-self-organise>

Carr-West, Jonathan ed , (2013). *Connected localism: a blueprint for better public services and more powerful communities*, London: LGiU.

<http://www.lgiu.org.uk/report/connected-localism/>

Carr-West, Jonathan and Greenhalgh, Lizzie, (2014). *People-shaped places: how Lambeth let residents redesign the neighbourhood*, London: LGiU.

<http://www.lgiu.org.uk/report/people-shaped-places-how-lambeth-let-residents-redesign-the-neighbourhood/>

Griffiths, Simon, Kippin, Henry and Shafique, Atif, (2014). *The future of public services: roundtable events summary RSA 2020 Public Services in partnership with Collaborate and the support of the ESRC*, London: Collaborate.

<http://collaboratei.com/2014/06/the-future-of-public-services-2/>

Muir, Rick and Parker, Imogen, (2014). *Many to many: how the relational state will transform public services*, London: IPPR.

<http://www.ippr.org/publications/many-to-many-how-the-relational-state-will-transform-public-services>

Norris, Emma and McLean, Sam, (2011). *The civic commons: a model for social action*, London: RSA.

<https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/the-civic-commons-a-model-for-social-action-emma-norris-and-sam-mclean-february-2011-the-civic-commons-a-model-for-social-action/>

Phillimore, Jenny, McCabe, Angus and Third Sector Research Centre, (2015). Luck, passion, networks and skills: the recipe for action below the radar?, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/research/below-the-radar/luck-passion-networks-and-skills.aspx>

Public Health England, NHS England and South, Jane, (2015). A guide to community-centred approaches for health and wellbeing: full report, London: Public Health England.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-and-wellbeing-a-guide-to-community-centred-approaches>

Roberts, Carys, (2015). Next-generation social care: the role of e-marketplaces in empowering care users and transforming services, London: IPPR.

<http://www.ippr.org/publications/next-gen-social-care-the-role-of-e-marketplaces>

Wilkes, Laura and Carr-West, Jonathan, (2013). The Big Lunch: feeding community spirit, London: LGiU.

<http://www.lgiu.org.uk/report/the-big-lunch-feeding-community-spirit/>

9. Useful resources on collaborating with whole communities

Coote, A., (2015). People, planet, power: towards a new social settlement, London: New Economics Foundation.

http://www.neweconomics.org/page/-/publications/New%20Social%20Settlement_06.02.15_WEB.pdf

Kippin, Henry, (2015). Collaborative capacity in public service delivery: towards a framework for practice, Singapore: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.

<http://collaboratei.com/2015/05/collaborative-capacity-in-public-service-delivery-towards-a-framework-for-practice/>

Kippin, Henry, Adebowale, Victor, Cameron, Daniel, Unwin, Julia and Parston, Greg, (2014). The collaborative citizen: report 2014, London: Collaborate.

<http://collaboratei.com/2014/04/the-collaborative-citizen-1st-edition/>

Tims, Charlie and Mean, Melissa, (2005). People make places: growing the public life of cities, London: Demos. <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/peoplemakeplacesbook>

Warwick-Booth, L., (2014). Using community-based research within regeneration: the role of the researcher within community-based approaches - exploring experiences within Objective 1 South Yorkshire. Community Work and Family, 17(1), pp.79–95.

Woolrych, R. and Sixsmith, J., (2013). Mobilising community participation and engagement: the perspective of regeneration professionals. Journal of Urban Regeneration & Renewal, 6(3), pp.309–231.