Presentation of selected results of the EU-SPI case study
Western Greece

Measuring social progress in European regions and cities

Brussels, 9 October 2019

Prof. Lena J. Tsipouri

A few reminders about the RWG before responding to the questions to be addressed

Among the poorest European regions

Suffered from long-term decline (relative to the nation)

A vibrant HEI/RTO community

Social situation strongly influenced by illegal migration, Roma population, temporary legal immigration in the agricultural sector

EU Regional Social Progress Index

EU Regional Social Progress Index   55.29 ●   238/272

GDP PPP per capita (2011)   €14,900   238/272

Dytiki Ellada

Basic Human Needs ●
Score 67.51   **Rank** 223

Nutrition and Basic Medical Care ●
Score 76.87   **Rank** 216

Mortality rate before age 65 ●
Infant mortality ●
Unmet medical needs ●
Insufficient food ●

Water and Sanitation ●
Score 82.54   **Rank** 157

Satisfaction with water quality ●
Lack of toilet in dwelling ●
Uncollected sewage ●
Sewage treatment ●

Shelter ●
Score 52.17   **Rank** 211

Burdensome cost of housing ●
Satisfaction with housing ●
Overcrowding ●
Lack of adequate heating ●

Personal Safety ●
Score 60.70   **Rank** 262

Homicide rate ●
Safety at night ○
Traffic deaths ●

Foundations of Wellbeing ●
Score 52.95   **Rank** 237

Access to Basic Knowledge ●
Score 65.22   **Rank** 193

Secondary enrolment rate ●
Lower secondary completion only ●
Early school leaving ●

Access to Information and Communications ●
Score 35.77   **Rank** 265

Internet at home ●
Broadband at home ●
Online interaction
  with public authorities ●

Health and Wellness ●
Score 71.78   **Rank** 157

Life expectancy ●
General health status ●
Premature deaths from cancer ●
Premature deaths from heart disease ●
Unmet dental needs ●
Satisfaction with air quality ●

Environmental Quality ●
Score 43.28   **Rank** 158

Air pollution-pm10 ●
Air pollution-pm2.5 ●
Air pollution-ozone ●
Pollution, grime or other
  environmental problems ●
Protected land (Natura 2000) ●

Opportunity ●
Score 46.43   **Rank** 242

Personal Rights ●
Score 31.28   **Rank** 232

Trust in the political system ●
Trust in the legal system ●
Trust in the police ●
Quality and accountability of
  government services ●

Personal Freedom and Choice ●
Score 52.26   **Rank** 247

Freedom over life choices ●
Teenage pregnancy ●
Young people not in education,
  employment or training ●
Corruption ●

Tolerance and Inclusion ●
Score 46.25   **Rank** 266

Impartiality of government services ●
Tolerance for immigrants ●
Tolerance for minorities ●
Attitudes toward people with disabilities ●
Tolerance for homosexuals ●
Gender gap ●
Community safety net ●

Access to Advanced Education ●
Score 58.26   **Rank** 160

Tertiary education attainment ●
Tertiary enrolment ●
Lifelong learning ●

● Underperforming   ○ Less than one point under neutral   ● Neutral   ○ Less than one point over neutral   ● Overperforming   ○ No data

Outline

Do the results of the tested indicator frameworks translate reality at the regional level?

Are the tested indicators useful in monitoring social policies?

Can the results help to improve (regional) policy making and multilevel-governance?

Should other criteria or factors be added to these indicators?

How can the different policy levels interrelate to influence / improve social progress?

How should the existing measurement of social progress be strengthened in order to ensure its more useful uptake by the regional governments?

Do the results of the tested indicator frameworks translate reality at the regional level?

Methodology

Check indicators one-by-one in a focus group of policy makers; refinement with individuals (including experts) if need be

Results RWG

By and large the framework reflects reality; reservations were expressed on

➢ Environmental measurements there are problems because there are not enough measuring instruments (aggregation of city data for the whole region)

➢ Using national averages when regional data is missing is misleading

➢ Perception indicators

Yes, but

➤ They will be a lot more useful when time series will be available

➤ Additional (tailor-made or not??) criteria are needed to select among them to prioritise policies

Examples of criteria used in the RWG (work in progress)

1. Distance from average EU or average national score
2. Path dependence as a constraint for action
3. GDP: Some indicators are very closely connected to GDP
4. Administrative level of responsibility
5. Availability/size of budget for intervention at the regional level

Are the tested indicators useful in monitoring social policies?

Can the results help to improve (regional) policy making and multilevel-governance?

Yes, significantly

➢ For regional policy making it is an instrument to help prioritise regional policy interventions; it stimulates the selection of criteria for prioritization

➢ For areas where the region lacks autonomy it is a justification to

   ❖ Leverage national funding for indicator improvement

   ❖ Join forces with other regions in the same Member State for addressing similar problems (RWG example: Life-long-learning)

   ❖ Join forces with other regions globally for addressing similar problems (RWG example: illegal migration)

➢ For areas where the region applies for international support or collaboration it is a good justification (e.g. Interreg, Urbact, H2020)

Should other criteria or factors be added to these indicators?

YES and some others may be removed

Examples from the RWG

- Tolerance and care for animals
- Quality of secondary education not levels
- Cost/quality of ICT access not only access itself
- Young unmarried mothers, teenage alcoholism or drug addiction
- Support for people with disabilities
- Cultural indicators
- Ways to integrate inequality???

How can the different policy levels interrelate to influence / improve social progress?

Significant differences between Member States

National policies: check the areas where all regions lag behind (use distance to EU average)

EU policies: check against other benchmarks (does global regional make sense?)

How should the existing measurement of social progress be strengthened in order to ensure its more useful uptake by the regional governments?

There are doubts on the value of perception indicators

Perception indicators should ideally be matched with objective ones (e.g. trust in the legal system substituted or complemented with *time elapsing to final court decisions* and/or *reversal or court decisions by appeal courts*)

Double check (statistical tests) indicators with potential strong correlation, same root causes (

Thank you for your attention

tsipouri@econ.uoa.gr