**Inclusive Wellbeing Economies Workshop – Maturity Matrix**

This is a high-level self-assessment tool that will allow you to consider where you are against some fundamental principles of inclusive wellbeing economies. It is not exhaustive and does not specifically and definitively outline ‘what good looks like’, as this will differ from place to place depending on local context. There are some pointers under each criteria to guide your thinking.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Statement | Rating  These statements are all quite high level so try to think of all of the aspects that could influence upon them when answering. Try to come to a consensus. | Notes / reflections  Why have you rated yourself in the way you have? What are the contributing factors? What would need to change for you to rate yourself higher? |
| **Strategy and Policy** | | |
| Key strategies and policies in your place reference the need for more inclusive economies and consider how economic policy and decision-making impact on health and ecological equity and wellbeing.  *Notes: Are any key economic strategies framed around inclusive economies? Do they commit to working towards inclusive wellbeing economies? Are there links between economic and health strategies that emphasise how they are linked? Are inclusive wellbeing economies referenced in other key docs, e.g., visions, values, priorities?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| We consistently assess the impact of our strategies and policies on health and ecological wellbeing, in relation to both current and future generations.  *Notes: This could be through health impact assessments, environmental impact assessments or both. Consider what weight any tools used have in the decision-making process and how the outputs of these tools are used. Do the tools consider the impacts on future generations as well as the current ones?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| **Leadership and Purpose** | | |
| Key leaders and decision-makers understand the need for inclusive wellbeing economies and advocate for this publicly. Brave leadership allows us to innovate and test new ideas and ways of working in ‘safe to fail’ environments.  *Notes: Consider how this statement holds against a range of leaders and decision-makers, i.e., what is the general consensus? Brave leadership involves being willing to take risks, explore different ways of doing things and sharing power with local people and communities.* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| There is a shared understanding of and commitment to the need to move towards more inclusive economies in our place, that support better health and ecological equity and wellbeing.  *Notes: How broadly is this understanding shared? Are there any outliers, who are they and what influence do they have? Is this understanding codified in a vision / values statement or something similar?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| **Partnerships** | | |
| There are well-established partnerships around inclusive wellbeing economies in our place, that include a diverse range of stakeholders.  *Notes: Stakeholders should include local / combined authority, health and social care, voluntary sector, local businesses, other anchors, local residents. How long have these partnerships been in place and what is the strength of the relationships developed? Are these partnerships formalised via structure and governance, which connects stakeholders to each other and to decision-makers?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| We have systems and processes in place that allow people impacted by our work on inclusive wellbeing economies (including local residents and communities) meaningful opportunities to engage with and feed into this work.  *Notes: Are the systems and processes embedded as part of a wider approach to resident and community engagement? Are they consistently applied? Do they allow for authentic and meaningful involvement where those engaged have genuine opportunities to impact upon and influence work and outcomes? To what extent do they share power and allow residents and communities to take ownership of the work and outcomes?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| **Data and Evidence** | | |
| We have a set of metrics and indicators that allows us to measure our progress towards more inclusive economies and which is used consistently by all partners. We report publicly on progress on a regular basis.  *Notes: How broad are your indicators, i.e., do they allow you to measure a wide range of useful outputs or are they narrower? How have you decided on the indicators that you’re using – do they measure what matters to local people as well as organisations? How robust and reliable are the indicators you’re using? Are they updated on a frequency that is useful to you and allows you to maintain an accurate picture of trends over time?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| We map local assets and resources and use this to help inform our work on inclusive wellbeing economies.  *Notes: How recent is your asset mapping? Is it repeated or updated on a regular basis? How thorough is it? Does it include the full range of assets, e.g., tangible and relational - organisations, people, resources, relationships, structures, etc. How does it influence your work and vice versa?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| **Delivery** | | |
| Services promote the role of employment in improving health and wellbeing and we have a range of joined-up support in place to facilitate inclusive access to ‘good work’ for everyone in our place.  *Notes: What does your local work and health / employment support ecosystem look like? Is the offer clear and joined up? Are there good links between health and employment services, with offers dovetailing together? Do you have fair work charters, workplace wellbeing programmes, etc? Is there a focus on ‘good quality work’ as part of your offer? Do you have an enhanced offer for those most impacted by inequalities and furthest away from the labour market?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| Local residents have access to opportunities to learn and develop skills and employers have access to local people with the skills they need.  *Notes: How does your local skills offer align with work and health at a local level? Is your offer informed by the needs of local employers and businesses? Do you have an enhanced offer for marginalised communities or those most impacted by inequalities?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| Local services are underpinned by circular economy principles.  *Notes: These principles are: -*   * *eliminate waste / pollution* * *circulate products and materials* * *regenerative of nature*   *To what extent are these principles embedded in your local place? Do you have examples of good practice, and how mainstream are they? Is there a shared commitment at place towards environmental sustainability? If so, how does this connect to your work on inclusive wellbeing economies? What support is available to those who want to adopt circular economy principles?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| We have community wealth building work being delivered at place and/or our work is informed by CWB principles that allow wealth and resources to be circulated and retained in local economies.  *Notes: CWB principles [[1]](#footnote-1) are: -*   * *plural ownership of the economy* * *making financial power work for local places* * *fair employment / just labour markets* * *progressive procurement of goods / services* * *socially productive use of land and assets*   *To what extent are these principles embedded in your local place and how mainstream are they? Do you have local CWB programmes? What support is available to those who want to adopt CWB principles? To what extent do local people benefit from local economic activity? To what extent is local wealth retained within local communities? Where is the balance in your local place between supporting local businesses (especially those that generate and circulate wealth within their local places) and attracting inward investment from out of area?* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |
| We have structures and processes in place to bring together and support the work of local anchor institutions, i.e., large organisations that are unlikely to relocate, have a significant stake in their local area and have sizeable assets that can be used to support their local community’s health and wellbeing and tackle health inequalities.  *Notes: Do local anchors collaborate and work together to add value? Do you have local anchor networks, possibly at a range of levels, e.g., large anchors as opposed to smaller community anchors? Do you have programmes of support for anchors that allow them to generate social value in their local places? Do local anchors have programmes of work around any of the following: -*   * *Employment* * *Professional skills and development* * *Procurement* * *Housing, estates and land use* * *Sustainability* | 1. Completely disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree, nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Completely agree |  |

1. <https://cles.org.uk/what-is-community-wealth-building/the-principles-of-community-wealth-building/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)