

The Canadian CED Network



Place-Based Poverty Reduction

Annotated Bibliography

June 2008

PURPOSE

This annotated bibliography is a basic reading guide for those involved in the Place-Based Poverty Reduction project with the Canadian CED Network. It links the PBPR project to related concepts, practice and policy from Canada, the US and the UK. By no means comprehensive, the literature listed herein hopes to provide a framework for debate and discussion that readers are welcome to use as they deem necessary.

This project is funded by the Government of Canada's Social Development Partnerships Program. The opinions and interpretations in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

Published by:

© 2008 The Canadian CED Network

211-620 View St., Victoria, BC V8W 1J6

Telephone: (250) 386-9980 Toll free: (877) 202-2268

Fax: (250) 386-9984 Website: <http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca>

An electronic copy of this document is available our website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

“Social inclusion and CED: A literature Review”

Michael Toye and Jennifer Infanti, Canadian CED Network, 2004

“Comprehensive Community Initiatives”

Sherri Torjman and Eric Leviten-Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003

“Learning and Evaluation for Poverty Reduction”

Sherri Torjman and Eric Leviten-Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2004

“Are Outcomes the best Outcome”

Sherri Torjman, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 1999

“Building knowledge about community change: Moving beyond evaluations”

Patricia Auspos and Anne C. Kubisch, Aspen Institute: Roundtable on Community Change, 2004

“Community change: Theories, practice, evidence”

Edited by Karen Fulbright-Anderson and Patricia Auspos, Aspen Institute, 2006

“Chapter 1: Social capital and community building”

Andrea A. Anderson and Sharon Milligan, in “Community Change: Theory, Evidence, Practice”

“Chapter 4: Community change and Community Economic Development”

Hector Cordero Guzman and Patricia Auspos, in “Community Change: Theory, Evidence, Practice”

“Innovation and poverty reduction”

Sherri Torjman and Eric Leviten Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003

“Opportunities 2000: A community-based approach to poverty reduction”

Sherri Torjman, 1998

“Developmental Evaluation: Tracking learning”

Tamarack Institute

ANC Neighbourhood Vitality Framework

[“Theory of change” \(webpage\)](#)
Aspen Institute

[“New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives, Vol. 2: Theory, Measurement, and Analysis”](#)

Edited by Karen Fulbright-Anderson, Anne C. Kubisch and James P. Connell,
Aspen Institute

[What Counts: Social Accounting for Non-profits and Cooperatives](#)
Jack Quarter, Laurie Mook and Betty Jane Richmond, 2003

[“Poverty Reduction” \(webpage\)](#)
Tamarack Institute

Summary Information on two additional social enterprises using Sustainable Livelihoods and Social Return On Investment (SROI) Measurements

“Social Inclusion and CED: A Literature Review”

Michael Toye and Jennifer Infanti, Canadian CED Network, 2004

This paper outlines the way in which CED models contribute to social inclusion efforts in Canada both conceptually and operationally. As a document, it is a component of CCEDNet’s Pan Canadian Community Development Learning Network (2003-06), aimed at improving learning around community-based initiatives for social inclusion. For the first time, CED initiatives are observed through a social inclusion analysis.

Conceptually, this document describes social exclusion and underlines its significance in building on concepts of poverty due to the fact that it recognizes both a state of being and a process of marginalization. Indeed, it permits us to examine the linkages between, and to greater depth, causes of deprivation and in turn how this impacts communities and individuals. Lastly, analyses of social capital and determinants of health support our understanding of the complexity of factors that define social exclusion or need to be addressed to promote social inclusion.

In the operation of the concept, it is noted how differently social exclusion was debated ideologically, and in turn, how differently it was translated into policy frameworks in European countries, according to social or structural sources of exclusion or individually-conceptualized causes.

Social inclusion provides a constructive concept and tool to address poverty and social exclusion because it promotes a process for transformative change (goals and agenda). It is an outcome (a vision) and a process that requires community based strategies. Therefore, the social and economic objectives of CED and the political and practical aspects of social inclusion can be bridged through community initiatives for structural change.

Social inclusion highlights the paradox of development in our society – that while there exists wide groups of middle- and affluent-classes, many communities and groups of people have been left behind. Therefore, it permits us to see the relationship between the accumulation of power and wealth that is based on the exclusion of others. ‘Blame’ and thus responsibility rests therefore also in affluent classes – the ‘excluders’ – to promote inclusive and equitable development that benefits all of us.

Several recent Canadian initiatives that are comprehensive and transformative are also briefly described in this document and are examples of engaging in an understanding of and working towards social inclusion.

[Find It](#) :

http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/docs/pccdln/PCCDLN_20040803_LitReview-H.pdf

“Comprehensive Community Initiatives”

Sherry Torjman and Eric Leviten-Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003

Based on the experiences of the Vibrant Communities initiative, this document explains the key features of comprehensive community initiatives (CCI), discusses the significance of the approach, and several challenges and recommendations. CCIs broadly encompass the types of initiatives and organizations engaged in the PBPR initiative with CCEDNet.

CCIs are not new per se. However, today approaches to community transformation are much more strategic and are a response to the changing role of the government: an attempt to redress community development efforts and recognition of how much ‘place’ affects social and economic well-being. Poverty is a complex, interrelated issue within communities and require analyses and strategic planning and intervening that are equally interrelated to promote change a various levels. Community building is an important part of neighbourhood renewal - there is emphasis in CCI approaches on strengthening social and political capital and institutional capacity at the neighbourhood level in order to create local leadership. The broad goals and long term vision of CCI are two of many key features of CCI approaches that distinguish them from other types of community efforts. Other features include comprehensiveness, process and outcomes, holistic, developmental, long-term, inclusive, and multi-sectoral.

This document defines what we mean by ‘comprehensive’ and ‘community’ and emphasizes the value of theories of change as models for tracking strategic community initiatives and the necessity to embrace long-term initiatives over short term ones. The challenges that follow suit with CCI approaches are explored: traditional funding and evaluation frameworks need to be adapted to suit the comprehensive, long-term character of this approach. Suggestions provided around evaluations of these types of initiatives are especially useful in this document. Finally, the authors underline how evaluation within this approach should promote a broader shift from judgment to a philosophy of learning through evaluation and how communities are only able to affect what they can - external pressures often strongly influence initiative outcomes.

[Find It](#) :

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/55382041X.pdf>

Aussi disponible en français [Ici](#) :

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/553820487.pdf>

“Learning and Evaluation for Poverty Reduction”

Sherry Torjman and Eric Leviten-Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2004

Learning and evaluation are intrinsically linked and because they relate to CCI since they are about looking to new and better ways to approach complex problems, which in turn are difficult to assess and understand. This document provides key recommendations around community initiatives' planning and process of learning and evaluation. This includes the need for a shift from an attitude of judgment to one of learning and improvement, the need to create a project process and evaluation framework that can adapt and be improved, the need to adopt appropriate evaluation tools (i.e.: theories of change), and so on. The challenges and recommendations of evaluating comprehensive community projects - how do you quantify or measure community resilience?

The main messages contained here: Continuous evaluation is a component of learning, and should not occur simply at the end of the project. Evaluation processes for long term, complex poverty reduction projects like CCIs must match the complex efforts that are being assessed. The authors point out how it is fairly difficult to reduce poverty in the short term, but is entirely reasonable to solidify a pathway out of poverty over the long term. Benchmarks for progress should be measured against the community itself rather than other communities or Canadian/provincial standards. A unique, strategic approach is crucial. External pressures that negate the effects of some community initiatives need to be recognized. Initiatives should dedicate time to devise innovative ways to measure intangibles like social capital, increases in self-esteem, leadership, capacity building, etc.

[Find It](#) :

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/467ENG.pdf>

Aussi disponible en français [ici](#) :

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/467FRE.pdf>

“Are Outcomes the best Outcome”

Sherri Torjman, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 1999

Overall, this is a criticism of our obsession with ‘outcomes’ that accompanies the current obsession with accountability in private, public and voluntary sectors. The over-emphasis on the ‘bottom line’, on efficient and effective performance in the private sector is a trend which has spilled over into the voluntary/public sector. This represents an extra burden on voluntary sector because they are beholden to funding agencies and are constantly having to legitimize their needs; in addition, they have larger and larger demands due to downloading from public realms onto the voluntary and private sector.

This is a profile of Opportunities 2000, a key example of a CCI that had to attain a numeric, quantifiable goal but whose other numerous accomplishments were left unnoticed. Therefore the assessment of the project didn’t actually reflect ‘what happened’, or ‘the story’ of Opportunities 2000. The strict focus on quantifiable outcomes caused many problems: widespread perception of failure, inability to shift course or adapt the project.

The principal purpose and work of the project (build the capacity of the community to solve complex problems and ability sustain their efforts) was not matched by its emphasis on measuring outcomes, but rather can be reflected in measuring its process - process is an outcome in itself that requires qualitative as well as quantitative assessing. The lesson outlined here is that it needs to be judged by how much it enabled sustainable relationships and networks to be built within the community that can effectively tackle poverty and other problems.

“The primary role of community work, by contrast, is to build the problem-solving infrastructure that effectively mobilizes diverse sectors of the community to tackle complex issues. The role of the community-based organization is to *build social capital*” (14).

[Find It](#)

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/outcomes.pdf>

“Building knowledge about community change: Moving beyond evaluations”

Patricia Auspos and Anne C. Kubisch, Aspen Institute: Roundtable on Community Change, 2004

This paper documents what has been learned from UK and US CCIs experience evaluating their initiatives and identifying the evidence base for what it takes to improve livelihoods in poor communities. Although the context of these initiatives is different, there are several commonalities: 1) they are place based; 2) they are programmatically comprehensive; and 3) they operate according to community building principles. An opportunity to learn from 15 years of experience with CCIs, especially with regards to the dissimilarities between the UK and the US, re: contrasting social policy infrastructures - the US CCI scene is led by voluntary and private sectors while the UK has a strong central government role in social policy and research. Each context has lessons for the other.

This document comes out of a need to create more effective evaluation methods for learning, better practices and better policy: “a new paradigm for learning”. The authors claim there is a need for systematic comparison of CCI progress across multiple projects and multiple sites rather than the formal initiative-by-initiative evaluations: “It is possible to envision a more commonly determined, collective knowledge development enterprise than currently exists in all the stand-alone CCIs and stand-alone evaluations” (9). This is a call for research that immediately benefits practitioners and builds on a cumulative body of knowledge, and can be used as lessons for policy and practice around community change that can build community capacity to use information and engage in policy.

The author argues that we are handicapped by the idea that because every community is different, ‘what works’ and best practices differ and therefore few universal lessons can be extracted. We need to treat intentional community change intervening as a technical field rather than one of principles, values, philosophies; increase effectiveness of interventions that improve outcomes.

CCI features challenge traditional evaluation models. Often evaluation and best practices devised ad hoc by practitioners; very good detailed accounts of CCI’s but very few details about longer term outcomes and impacts; how effective was the CCI as an overall revitalization strategy. “A focus on outcomes—whether they are community building outcomes or programmatic outcomes—can supply needed discipline and clarity for both initiatives and evaluations” (15). A proven body of outcomes that result from CCIs can build our knowledge of community building and neighbourhood renewal.

“The aim of the chapter is to build the case that future evaluations should place less emphasis on showcasing the accomplishments of a particular

neighborhood, initiative, or foundation, and more emphasis on adding to the cumulative body of knowledge that can advance the field.” (20) The author emphasizes how individual evaluations of initiatives contribute to building a body of knowledge in the field. The key thesis of this document echoes the goals and objectives of the PBPR Learning Network: “Community-based approaches to improving outcomes for residents of poor neighborhoods have been shown to have great potential. In order for them to fulfill that potential, we need to learn how to do them better. Learning how to do them better will depend on improving the knowledge base about how to bring about community change, how to implement community change strategies, how to assess what is working and why, and, finally, how to ensure that all of the key actors make use of and apply that knowledge” (36). Nonetheless, in my opinion, it is useful to be skeptical of calls to create ‘a technical field’ in which principles are left to the wayside, especially in a context in which initiatives are each very complex and really respond the needs of a specific community – can these experiences be ‘technicalized’?

Find It :

<http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/BUILDINGKNOWELDGE.pdf>

“Community change: Theories, practice, evidence”

Edited by Karen Fulbright-Anderson and Patricia Auspos, Aspen Institute, 2006

This is a large volume available online and in hard copy by the Aspen Institute on community change. It is based on American experiences in this field but is nonetheless a useful piece of work in relation to the PBPR Learning Network due to the fact that it covers key areas broadly (like social capital) as well as specific ‘streams’ of interventions for community change more specifically (like economic development, CED and community change). Its first two chapters concern broad areas such as the significance of and relationship between social capital and community building before following chapters deal with specific models to promote community change and poverty reduction (employment strategies, CED, youth development, social services, safety and health, etc.) However it is acknowledged that these ‘streams’ often work synergistically and therefore the chapters are intended to complement one another.

This volume assumes that there is a heightened need for all those stakeholders involved in place-based initiatives and concerned with strengthening their communities to gain access to information about interventions and about factors that promote either positive or negative change towards community resilience (tools and techniques for measuring connections, outcomes, pathways of change as well as more and better research about what leads to long-term goals). “The volume provides exhaustive, interdisciplinary syntheses of basic research, evaluation reports, and other studies of place-based, community change efforts to improve conditions in urban neighborhoods” (4). Experiences in comprehensive community initiatives (CCI) in US cities form the basis of this study.

Two chapters are annotated below.

[Find It](#) (entire volume)

http://www.aspeninstitute.org/site/c.huLWJeMRKpH/b.2582301/k.B970/Community_Change_Theories_Practice_and_Evidence.htm

“Chapter 1: Social capital and community building”

Andrea A. Anderson and Sharon Milligan, in “Community Change: Theory, Evidence, Practice”

This chapter is a good overview of the definitions, implications and challenges of ‘social capital’ in relation to place-based initiatives to reduce poverty. Firstly, the authors ‘unpack’ the components of social capital and discuss the outcomes they are meant to incur. When re-assembled, these components form a model theory of change that explains how they work synergistically towards community renewal and strengthening. Measurement issues and the facilitation of developing social capital are discussed in suit.

Social capital relates to most strands of community strategies for change discussed in further chapters (employment, economic development (CED), etc.). Importantly however, the fact that social capital is a very fuzzy concept is taken into account here. There is no doubt that social capital development – its strength or weakness in a given community – has a strong impact on community well-being and resiliency. However, knowledge about social capital development is relatively weak due to the fact that it does not exist in a linear relationship to other components of resilient neighbourhoods. It is often represents both pre-conditions and outcomes. This chapter outlines the ‘main drivers in community social capital development’.

In my opinion, when we are referring to poverty reduction, social capital is by no means a concept or phenomenon that captures the deprivation, needs and interventions associated with the real material resource needs of low-income communities. However, it is well-known that the ability of low-income people to buffer the injustices of poverty depends on the degree of trust, cooperation, and social cohesion that exists between poor individuals, families and groups. How is social capital linked to place-based poverty reduction in your work? What are your challenges in using the concept of social capital to map local poverty and poverty reduction efforts (measurement, etc.)?

Find It :

<http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/Chapter1.pdf>

“Chapter 4: Community change and Community Economic Development”

Hector Cordero Guzman and Patricia Auspos, in “Community Change: Theory, Evidence, Practice”

This chapter ties well the social inclusion and community building principles of CED to a discussion of economic development as a strategy for community change. There is a tendency to talk about economic development and neighborhood social conditions as distinct entities rather than as interrelated aspects of neighborhood life. “A main operating assumption of Community Change Initiatives (CCIs) is that communities in general, and community-based organizations in particular, can improve economic opportunities and outcomes in their communities through community economic development” . CED can improve quality of economic life (through access to capital, increased entrepreneurial leadership, creation local employment opportunities, local access to goods and services, local ownership of neighbourhood resources, contact to the regional economy) and can jump-start community renewal, but CED initiatives suffer from high rates of failure. Local neighbourhood economic activity is not a self-contained unit and is subject to the arbitrary fluxes of regional and global market forces as well as top down policy and decision making – therefore there needs to be more than community residents and organizations active in the process to make it successful. ‘Community’ in CED is treated as both an input and an outcome (2).

“This chapter discusses several common approaches to community economic development, the expected community-level outcomes, and the extent to which expectations are supported by the empirical literature” (4). CED efforts need ways to measure changes in social capital and community capacity as they relate to economic development. This chapter presents a composite theory of change that synthesizes the multiple outcomes and pathways of change associated with each of the strategies discussed (strategies to increase asset accumulation and access to capital; strategies for improving the general business climate, including physical infrastructure improvements; strategies for assisting business development directly; strategies to link citywide economic development with employment opportunities for local residents). The theory of change shows how outputs and activities intersect and begin at any given point, they reinforce one another, shows how both strategies, if pursued differently would have considerably less effect. A CCI might combine targeted community building and economic development strategies to reinforce social and economic improvements in a particular neighbourhood.

This chapter sets out an array of possible strategies and expected outcomes that may be so-called “best practices” but that by no means apply to all communities uniformly and very much depend on the ‘local’ – however there are some CED strategies that will produce fairly likely outcomes, and some that will

fare better than others in meeting specific goals (creating employment, improve access to goods and services, etc.) It also outlines roles of community groups and residents in CED – this is where there is social return (capacity building, leadership building, resilience building) that goes beyond economic results: from planning and approval to networking, lobbying, implementation and monitoring.

Find It

<http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/Chapter4.pdf>

“Innovation and poverty reduction”

Sherri Torjman and Eric Leviten Reid, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2003

This paper describes both the problem with the ‘new innovation economy’ that characterizes the global era (that people can’t share the economic benefits of it, and new levels of poverty have been set in Canadian communities); as well as the solution – community approaches to reducing poverty through CED. That is, making the economic benefits of the innovation economy available to everyone. Already, communities are using CED to actively promote local poverty reduction due to unprecedented, rapid social and economic changes brought on by structural pressures of a hyper-globalized world.

The context of the industrialized economy shifting to knowledge-, information- and technology-based one from a resource-based one earlier in the century is discussed. Causes of increased marginalization listed are liberalized markets, increased corporate monopolization, and ensuing policy shifts which have resulted in increased polarization of wealthy and poor communities. CED in this context is an attempt for communities to fill the social and economic gaps in which they are marginalized – it combines social justice and economic vitality to create a sustainable, strong and well-off community

The Vibrant Communities project is a community approach to CED that presents new strategies and techniques for poverty reduction that is a response to the challenges of the ‘innovation economy’. While older CED models focused on a singular community development corporation per community, nowadays addressing regional nuances of poverty requires the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in the process, that is, it requires multi-organizational and multi-sectoral engagement in the process.

So, there are many similarities between cluster based strategies for innovation and community-based poverty reduction (learning as the underlying capacity of a community to respond to challenges, the role of social capital in collaborative processes, the need to involve a wide range of stakeholders, community as the principal site where innovation occurs) but they have different goals: economic growth and competitive edginess versus equitable socio-economic opportunities/ensuring that all community members are able to partake in the ‘new economy’ as they desire. It has been well documented how most moderate to low income people are left out of growing regional economic clusters, often builds social capital in the region but not social inclusion; often uneducated, less skilled people are left out of benefiting from the process at hand.

“In a variety of ways, community-based poverty reduction initiatives are seeking to open clusters to those who are excluded, link low-income individuals

and communities to opportunities in these clusters and adapt the principles of cluster-based innovation to better serve the needs of those left out” (15). Introducing the principle of equity into clustered economic development phenomenon (proponents of equity for regional economic devel should attempt to secure a place at the stakeholders table) – first practical step is for anti-poverty agents to build relationships with cluster councils and associations, through education, relationship building and advocacy community organizations can influence the employment of a triple bottom line in cluster development

This paper discusses the idea and strategies of ‘community based regionalism’ the idea that communities and neighbourhoods are affected by regional processes and decision making that can include or exclude them from economic development, therefore community organizations have started to get a seat at the table of regional-level decision making bodies, to create equity alliances with other community organizations. It also proposes strategies such as workforce intermediaries, the broadening of clusters both geographically and conceptually (not just high-tech and information industries) – ex.: creating clusters of old economy goods and services (used books in several once on the decline European towns) and ideas for initiatives that provide access to capital to poor would-be entrepreneurial groups/neighbourhoods to support their ‘taking advantage’ of the innovation economy

In sum, this is a key article on how promoting social justice and inclusiveness in the ‘new innovation economy’ can be achieved through broad-based CED initiatives.

[Find It :](#)

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/553820681.pdf>

Aussi disponible en français [ici](#) :

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/553820738.pdf>

Also see related work by the same authors, “Innovation and CED: What they can learn from each other” available in French and English [here](#)

<http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/32ENG.pdf>

“Opportunities 2000: A community-based approach to poverty reduction”

Sherri Torjman, 1998

This paper outlines the plans for Opportunities 2000, which sought to bring together many different CED projects under one common goal to reduce poverty in their region. Multi-sectoral and multi-organizational, this project has been heavily documented and its evaluation reports and other relevant information is generally available online, especially through Tamarack Institute and the Caledon Institute for Social Policy. “Opportunities 2000 is a good example of a new generation of projects that seek to empower organizations and disadvantaged individuals by building on their ideas, energy and other ‘community assets’ to reach the economic and social goals of low-income community members” (2). The aim of the Waterloo region project is to create partnerships for poverty reduction between 30 different multi-sectoral organizations – many ‘community-based poverty reduction’ projects utilize economic strategies that both help marginalized communities and individuals link into the mainstream economy (e.g., through job training), or set up parallel economic and social structures outside of the mainstream (e.g., alternative savings programs). Some initiatives focus on helping individuals within the community (e.g., microenterprise development), while other projects try to improve the economic, social and physical conditions of the community itself (e.g., comprehensive community-building strategies). “The program focuses primarily on setting up linking strategies for individuals while establishing a network of community support for these efforts” (3).

Some important distinctions: it was not intended as a substitute but a complementary initiative to social policies and was not supported by public/government funds but through philanthropic and private support. An example of one project projected in this paper was to create niche food market social enterprises through the local Food Bank: this includes training, business devl courses, income and future start-up loans for participants, involves information and knowledge sharing from local universities and colleges. Opportunities 2000 utilizes strategies that promote poverty reduction rather than poverty alleviation.

[Find It :](#)

<http://caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/382ENG.pdf>

“Developmental Evaluation: Tracking learning” (webpage) Tamarack Institute

Based on a telelearning session with Michael Quinn Patton, this brief introduction to developmental evaluation (DE) distinguishes it from formative and summative evaluation, arguing that initiatives will never reach a point of summative evaluation and that undue harm is committed by imposing one on an initiative process. Developmental evaluations recognize the adaptive and dynamic nature of complex, community initiatives. Summative evaluations often impose cookie-cutter outcomes on initiatives that let down the ‘team’ because they inevitably never reach precise projected outcomes. Developmental evaluations are described as useful for groups to get feedback periodically, reflect on this and then act on it. Outcomes in DE have the purpose of tracking ‘small’ decisions that were taken and how they resulted, as well as tracking the knowledge base and learning processes that drove how/what decisions were made/taken.

This brief document also provides distinctions on evidence and data, as well as the role of the evaluator in DEs. Internet links for further information and resources on developmental evaluation are listed.

Listen to the telelearning session led by Michael Quinn Patton [here](http://tamarackcommunity.ca/q3s61_CC4I5.html)
http://tamarackcommunity.ca/q3s61_CC4I5.html

Action for Neighbourhood Change Vitality Framework

United Way

This somewhat longer document (100+ pgs) discusses the learning and thinking of the Action for Neighbourhood Change initiative, a two year action research project focused on improving quality of life for communities through neighbourhood strengthening.

This ANC report, from pages 3 to 11, summarizes the place-based poverty reduction concept as well as the way in which it was implemented by the United Way.

It explains the renewed focus on the significance of 'place' in defining the quality of people's lives – how important the degree to which a neighbourhood is strong, healthy and safe is, in a rapidly changing, increasingly inequitable world. This document provides a good definition of the meaning and significance of 'place' in relation to quality of life and poverty reduction efforts. This project emerged out of questioning whether the appropriate evidence based framework of indicators and measurement methodologies existed in order to support decisions related to neighbourhood change and the measurement of impacts.

This framework is a culmination of most of ANC's work: a theory of change model, a methodology for profiling neighbourhoods and evaluating vitality, and a process for identifying and mapping the change context. The following chapters provide tools and instruments in each: 1) About neighbourhoods; 2) about theory of change; 3) mapping neighbourhood change assets; 4) about measurement; 5) the vitality index; 6) using the vitality index; and 7) resources relating to the index (i.e.: surveys, etc.)

No public release available yet. Please contact CCEDNet for more information on this document.

“Theory of change” (webpage)

Aspen Institute

This Aspen Institute website provides information and tools on theories of change (its background, application, utility, training, technical assistance, etc.)

[Find It](#) :

<http://www.theoryofchange.org/>

“New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives, Vol. 2: Theory, Measurement, and Analysis”

Edited by Karen Fulbright-Anderson, Anne C. Kubisch and James P. Connell, Aspen Institute

This volume introduces various evaluation themes relating to theory of change approaches, evaluation practitioner perspectives and measurement and analysis issues. Though the recommendations and experiences outlined herein are based on evaluations in a US community context (ex.: sites for data on neighbourhoods based on U.S. data sources), the chapters contain information that can likely be applied in a constructive way to Canadian collaborative, place-based initiatives. Readers may find the last chapter on establishing causality in evaluations of comprehensive community initiatives especially useful.

[Find It](#) :

[http://www.aspeninstitute.org/site/c.huLWJeMRKpH/b.613721/k.17D2/New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives Vol 2 Theory Measurement and Analysis.htm](http://www.aspeninstitute.org/site/c.huLWJeMRKpH/b.613721/k.17D2/New_Approaches_to_Evaluating_Community_Initiatives_Vol_2_Theory_Measurement_and_Analysis.htm)

What Counts: Social Accounting for Non-profits and Cooperatives

Jack Quarter, Laurie Mook and Betty Jane Richmond, 2003

Mook, Quarter and Richmond present an explanation and framework for accounting for 'expanded value-added' economic and social inputs and outputs of an organization. The traditional 'value-added' financial statement of an organization is a measure of wealth (profit) accrued for shareholders and owners. 'Social accounting' is a organizational measurement for non-profits, social enterprises, cooperatives and other 'dual-bottom lined' organizations that provides a broader, more complete picture of the social and economic impacts resulting from their work. This permits monetary accounting for both monetary and non-monetary inputs (ex.: the value-added of volunteer hours).

Available in libraries and book retailers.

Please also see similar online resources by the same authors.

"Measuring the value that your non-profit adds to the community" [click here](#)

http://www.nonprofitscan.ca/files/jyv/quarter_fs_english.pdf

"How to assign monetary value to volunteer contributions: A manual" [click here](#).

http://www.nonprofitscan.ca/Files/kdc-cdc/quarter_final_eng.pdf

"Poverty Reduction" (webpage)

Tamarack Institute

This brief webpage on poverty reduction clarifies important questions relating to our PBPR project: Why poverty reduction? What do we mean by poverty reduction? What is the difference between poverty reduction and poverty alleviation? What is the purpose of poverty reduction activities?

The language used in this article does not use the term 'community economic development' but the principles and practice of CED resonate strongly with poverty reduction as an idea and a concrete effort: poverty reduction focuses on building the access of low-income people to economic, social and political resources that can lift them out of deprived livelihoods as opposed to poverty alleviation, that is, making poverty more bearable (interventions such as food hampers, emergency shelters, etc.)

[Find It](#)

http://tamarackcommunity.ca/q3s61_CC4I5.html

Summary Information with links to two additional social enterprises using Sustainable Livelihoods and Social Return On Investment (SROI) Measurements

Atira Property Management Inc. (APMI) is a socially responsible for-profit property management company that is wholly-owned by Atira Women's Resource Society (AWRS). Formed in 1987, the society provides transition and second-stage housing as well as non-residential support programs for women and children impacted by violence in the Greater Vancouver region. All of the profits from APMI are donated to the society. APMI is dedicated to creating long term, quality employment for individuals with barriers to economic security and creates additional social impacts through the creation of related businesses, cross selling of products and services of other social enterprises and creating affordable home ownership and safe, affordable housing for AWRS and APMI employees.

In 2006 in a sample group of 14 employees of APMI (100% of whom were unemployed or underemployed before hire and 78% of whom were receiving government income assistance) there were the following successes: In terms of Social Return On Investment (SROI) the average change in societal contribution per participant or the difference between the direct societal 'cost' or 'benefit' contributed by the employee before versus after hire was \$8,904 (Annual Government Financial Assistance Before Hire - Annual Income Tax Paid Before Hire + Annual Income Tax Paid After Hire). Therefore **the total cost savings to society of the 14 people participating in the program was \$124,656** (the dollars saved that year by employing target group and eliminating or lessening government financial assistance).

Using the Sustainable Livelihoods framework the following outcomes occurred:

- Majority of target employees (with children) reported that since their employment at APMI, their lives and their children's have improved
- 78% do not need government income assistance after APMI employment
- 22% target employees were able to career ladder into better positions—within APMI, AWRS and to external employment opportunities

Information retrieved from <http://www.atira.bc.ca/index.htm> and http://www.socialcapitalpartners.ca/sroi_reports.asp

Inner City Development Inc. (ICD) is a social enterprise incorporated in 2002. ICD is a corporation providing construction, janitorial and property management services, primarily but not exclusively, to the non-profit sector in Winnipeg's inner city. The mission of Inner City Development is to provide quality full time

employment for inner city low income residents and quality services to inner city non-profit community organizations. ICD provides better-than-average sector wages and benefits and provides education and training, leading to skills and certification to its workers. It does this through the operation of Inner City Renovation Inc. (ICR). ICR is a general contractor and construction manager. It offers a complete range of services in the commercial and residential markets. Projects have ranged in size from a few thousand dollars to more than half a million dollars.

In 2005 in their sample group of 14 individuals (46% of whom had not finished high school and 50% of whom had criminal records) ICD had the following successes:

In terms of Social Return On Investment (SROI) the average change in societal contribution per participant or the difference between the direct societal 'cost' or 'benefit' contributed by the employee before versus after hire was \$9,700 (Annual Government Financial Assistance Before Hire - Annual Income Tax Paid Before Hire + Annual Income Tax Paid After Hire). Therefore **the total cost savings to society of the 14 people participating in the program was \$135,800** (the dollars saved that year by employing target group and eliminating or lessening government financial assistance).

Using the Sustainable Livelihoods framework the following outcomes occurred:

- Established multi-stakeholder partnership to deliver Canada's first company run savings/asset development program
- ICR target employee completed first year apprenticeship and earned one of the highest grades in the class
- Two target employees formally recognized by Aboriginal community at Elders ceremony
- Target employee able to be reunited with his children because of his now stable livelihood

Information retrieved from

<http://www.icdevelopment.ca/> and

http://www.socialcapitalpartners.ca/sroi_reports.asp