! "#$%&'(#$&)*$+,#$-.$+/0&)$1#&'2"$3)*45&2-/$!--',$4)$+/0&)$6'&))4)7$6-'458$&)*$9#54,4-):;&<4)7

! "#"$%&'$"()*+

,-."/0'1(/12%&/(34 5'678"#%980'"1)* 9/4 :'6(#"%;'<<"/<8$$)*%&/(34 &8-#%='#>'$1($?

@$'0"/1'AB%C(##"D"%E($F($)*%G-'#F'$D%H"1"8/67%I1A8J#'17<"$A+*%E($F($%,67((#%(3%!BD'"$"%8$F%K/(.'68#%5"F'6'$"?



Presentation overview

0 ! 123453

0 * 464789:%7;;8179:

0 !:7879348<63<96%1=%>8?72%:47@3:%<2A<97318%311@6
B.C634D73<9%84E<4F%;783%GH

0 +I#%311@6%<2%3:4%;1@<9C%72A%A49<6<12JD7K<2L%;819466
B.C634D73<9%84E<4F%;783%MH

0 !764%63>AC%457D;@4N%.1>3:F78K0%"12A12

0 *4=@493<126%72A%2453%634;6

Context:
Defining urban health indicator (UHI) tools

U H I (UHI) T

01%2344526738%39%: <<1=>%<51:;=5 %1?3;6%6@5%A@>:7214%;=?18%58B7=38<586C:%
2386=7?;6738%63%@;<18%@5146@%18D%E544?578FC%

GH7853%56%14IJ%KLMNJ%AI%KO%

E

I	E -	E -	O	S
P%39%A53A45%E@3%47B5%E76@78%1%@149				

The San Francisco Indicator
home
about
indicators
resources
About the San Francisco Indicator Project
The San Francisco Indicator Project is a neighborhood-level data
system that measures how San Francisco performs in
of a healthy, equitable community. The goal of this
support collaboration,
social and physical
THE
SAN FRANCIS
INDICAT
Environment
Transportation
Community
Education
Housing
Economy

The San Francisco Indicator Project

home about indicators resources

Tree canopy

Descriptive Title

Geographic Unit of Analysis

San Francisco Tree Canopy (2013)


Walk Score
Go
Favorites
Very Walkable
86
Excellent Transit
80
Very Bikeable
78

d
C e :d
Va e d ca

Potential value at multiple stages of the policy process



[1]Royal Town Planning Institute [2]Shelter

Proposed benefits of indicators

inform policies and decisions

monitor policy impact over time

compare performance with local, regional, national or international levels

determine targets for improvement

show performance publicly (accountability/performance management)

support funding bids or allocations

serve as an ‘early warning’ of potential issues

involve the public in prioritisation and definition of policy goals

(Christakopoulou et al., 2001; Corburn and Cohen, 2012; Kingsley and Pettit, 2011; Lawrence, 2008; Rothenberg

Con e :

Indica or in he policd proce

CLICK TO EDIT RUNNING TITLE STYLE

Research aim and objectives

Aim: (012345%6378%849:;%65:2<6%=;>=?:<34@%:45%8@5>%<3%143A3<5%65:2<6%=;%849:;%12:;;=;B%132=?C%:;>%>5?=@=3;DA:E=;BF%%

Objectives:

GF

Methodology – Mixed methods

Explanatory sequential design

فواکه و خضار

CLICK TO EDIT RUNNING TITLE STYLE

CLICK TO EDIT RUNNING TITLE STYLE

!"#$%&'()$*+(,-.$/)012(-3&$-33,4$56778$1)012(-3&49



CLICK O EDI R NNING I LE LE

CLICK O EDI R NNING I LE LE



C a UHI b a a ca c a d c a UHI . N.B. M da a 9/145 UHI : 7 d d a da b ca a d 2 d d a a ca .

Complexity in the UHI tool methodologies





UHI ools in planning polic and decision-making (par B)

Systematic Review Part B – Early Results



P	Y	A	M	R
,	2015			
,	2014	.		
,				


Social

Case study: Southwark, London



Image: Southwark Council

0

! "# ! $%& ' %( ) #&%* + , , # , - %&#&" (%. &/ " (

What do you think?

References

! " # $ % & ' (% !) *) + $