Assessment of evaluation strategies and tools for place management and community renewal projects

Martin Stewart-Weeks
martinsw@ozemail.com.au
The Albany Consulting Group

Abstract

This paper is based on a consulting project, undertaken for the Strengthening Communities Unit of the NSW Premier's Department, that looked at the range of evaluation tools and strategies being applied to place management and community renewal projects in Australia and internationally.   It sets the scene by reviewing the current fascination for "place" as the basis for a range of policy interventions designed to effect more or less radical community change and transformation.   It then presents findings from an assessment of a range of evaluation tools and reports focusing on place/renewal projects in Australia, the UK and the US. The paper reflects three consistent insights from the assessment:

> *Evidence suggests that the evaluation activity surrounding place management or community renewal projects in NSW, Australia and around the world is patchy and sometimes non-existent.*
> *The work that has been done reinforces the conclusion that it is hard (if not impossible in some circumstances) and riddled with methodological, political, institutional, and resource challenges that will not be resolved without a long-term investment of time and money.*
> *This difficulty is not unrelated to the fact that many projects do not have a clear logic that explains the assumed links between the initial problem or need, the type of intervention that is planned and the results it is supposed to produce.*

That somewhat daunting conclusion notwithstanding, the need to conduct evaluation more effectively is pressing. The danger is that, without good evaluation, the laudable policy objectives of place or community renewal may be subverted by spending too much money, spending money on projects that are actually making things worse or failing to back alternative projects that may be more effective.

The paper presents a number of frameworks that the assessment of existing evaluation tools and strategies suggests might make evaluation of such projects in the future easier and more effective. The frameworks include some early work on a set of core indicators that concentrate on six dimensions of successful place/renewal – change, capacity, governance, learning, cost-benefit and sustainability.

Key words

Community renewal, evaluation, place management, NSW Premier's Department

This paper presents an edited version of a report prepared for the NSW Premier's Department[1], summarizing the findings from a short research project to review evaluation tools and strategies for place management and community renewal projects.

1: Introduction

 Place management has emerged as a key part of the debate in NSW, and in some other States, about better ways to build and sustain stronger communities. It draws together several dimensions:

- Transforming the "silo" structures of government to create more integrated service and program delivery mechanisms that make more sense on the ground in particular communities
- Building greater trust in the mechanisms and processes of public governance and management
- Developing models for effective community development.

---

[1] *Assessment of evaluation strategies and tools for place management and community renewal projects*, Final Report, May 2002, The Albany Consulting Group

A major and detailed assessment of evaluation strategies in the context of CCI in the United States sets out as good a summary as we've found of the context for place or community renewal and the evaluation demands it brings.

> The current generation of efforts, referred to in this volume as "comprehensive community initiatives"…all have the goal of promoting positive change in individual, family and community circumstances in disadvantaged neighbourhoods by improving physical, economic and social conditions…Moreover, most CCIs operate on the premise that the devolution of authority and responsibility from higher-level auspices to the neighbourhood or community is a necessary aspect of the change process.[2]

The same analysis goes on to sketch in some of the reasons we've witnessed the emergence of these kinds of whole-of-place renewal initiatives. The convergence of these few key factors will resonate strongly in the NSW context:

- Fragmentation and categorization of services were limiting program success (in other words, the work and resources that come out of the siloed agencies often don't add up to coherent solutions that make sense to the people whose lives are not organized in those neat, vertical and often hermetically sealed definitions).
- Remediation was uncertain and expensive, so the shift to prevention made sense.
- Bricks and mortar physical changes in communities were only part of the problem (and therefore of the solution). They didn't sustain change.
- Coming from both ideological and pragmatic starting points, the trend has been to see "big government" solutions to complex and interconnected social problems as increasingly inappropriate, unworkable and expensive (or all three) Partnerships and smaller-scale, place or community focused strategies started to emerge as at least worth trying.

An outline of the project

The project we undertook for the NSW Premier's Department, the report from which provides the basis for this paper, analysed material from two main areas.

One is the evaluations themselves. We tracked down as many local and international examples of actual evaluation reports and strategies as we could to form the basis of the assessment process. The other material represented a mixture of research and other background writing on the topic of evaluating community renewal or place management projects. A list of evaluations and associated research material is included as Attachment 1 to this paper.

2: A summary of the assessment findings

Three insights emerge consistently from our analysis:

1   Evidence suggests that the evaluation activity surrounding place management or community renewal projects in NSW, Australia and around the world is patchy and sometimes non-existent.

2   The work that has been done reinforces the conclusion that it is hard (if not impossible in some circumstances) and riddled with methodological, political, institutional and resource challenges that will not be resolved without a long-term investment of time and money.

3   That somewhat daunting conclusion notwithstanding, the need to do evaluation more effectively is pressing. The danger is that, without good evaluation, the laudable policy objectives of place or community renewal may be subverted by spending too much money, spending money on projects that are actually making things worse or failing to back alternative projects that may be more effective.

An assessment framework

We started the project by developing an initial assessment framework. The framework provided a simple and consistent tool with which to review the evaluation strategies and tools we were going to look at. The framework looked like this:

A Context and expectations	1. What was the political, economic and policy context for the original project and investment? 1.1 Why is this place the target – rather than another?
	2. What are the "place" context and issues. 2.1 Is there any baseline data?

---

[2] *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, Aspen Institute, Volume 1: Concepts, Methods and Contexts.

	3. Is it clear what expectations drove the original investment in the place/community project?
	4. What assumptions/expectations has the project made about the purpose, scope and outcomes of place management?
B **WHAT**	1. What was the original project designed to achieve? 1.1 What were the intended outcomes and are they measurable? 1.2 Was there an internal monitoring system? Were there performance indicators developed?

	2. What is the evaluation trying to find out?
	  2.1 Did it happen
	  2.2 What evidence base is it using?

	3. What is the scope and focus of the evaluation? (Limits)
C **WHY**	Why is the evaluation being undertaken? What are you going to do with the information?
	Are all the stakeholders clear about the evaluation's purpose?
D **WHEN**	1. When in the project cycle is the evaluation being undertaken?
	2. How was the timing of evaluation activities determined?
	3. Has enough time been allowed to make sure the evaluation can be done properly?
E **HOW**	1. How is the evaluation being conducted?
	2. What research and other methods are being used? 2.1 Any benchmarking (temporal or lateral)?
	3. Are all stakeholders happy with the research and other methods being used for the evaluation?
	4. Are the research and related methods appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation?
	5. How are the findings analysed and reported?
F **WHO**	1. Who is conducting the evaluation?
	2. Who gets involved in the evaluation process – who does the process include or exclude?
	3. Who will determine whether or not the evaluation was adequate and effective?
	4. Who is told about the evaluation, including its design, conduct and presentation?
WHAT NEXT?	1. Is it clear what will happen as a result of the evaluation?
	2. Do stakeholders have a clear idea of the actions that will happen as a result of the evaluation?
	3. Is there a process in place to monitor what happens as a result of the evaluation?
H Evaluation outcomes	What happened/changed as a result of the evaluation?
	Who learned what from the evaluation and was that valuable?

Our study identified some common themes.

Understanding different motivations

One evaluation study noted that:

> Different approaches to community-level regeneration have very different goals, such as local economic development, job creation, community-building, empowerment, social inclusion and the each need to be measured appropriately. (Seyfang and Pearson 2000)

The conflicting and unresolved expectations of some key audiences (for example Ministers, funding agencies, the media) for quick results are inimical to both good evaluation and the longer-term change strategies of the original projects.

That, in turn, tends to blur the distinction between place management as a form of community regeneration and empowerment and place management as another form of issues management (eg the focus is on managing a issue of community safety and crime, so a "place" project is mounted whose primary task is to have a quick impact on whatever re determined to be the most important or visible indicators of the issue to be "fixed").

Theory of change: what do you think you are trying to achieve?

In the context of place management and community renewal, evaluation strategies should be clear about the assumed links between the type of intervention and the scope and nature of the results that intervention is trying to achieve.

Without that theory and the associated discipline of defining some of the starting propositions or assumptions on which the project is constructed, it becomes harder to answer the basic evaluation question – is it working? The obvious point is that answering that question depends on the way in which you choose to define "working". That's what the "theory of change" is meant to do.

The purpose of the theory of change approach is not to discount the ambition or reach of place and renewal projects. The purpose is to match that ambition with some clarity and rigour in the way it is articulated.

Accepting the GIGO principle: time, money and commitment

There is a well-understood rule of thumb for virtually any system or process designed to process inputs into some sort of outcome or end-product – you get out a result whose quality will match what you put in. The "garbage in-garbage out" theory is certainly true in this context.

The evaluations we looked at, and the wider commentary on evaluating community renewal projects, all reinforce the point that you get, in the end, what you pay for or what you are prepared to invest in the process. Time and money clearly remain the critical ingredients. You can't expect good evaluation outcomes if it is done "on the fly" and without sufficient investment of resources. Somewhere between 2% and 10% of overall project resources seems to be a rule of thumb for determining what "sufficient" might look like.

What if we did nothing?

One of the most important questions any good policy evaluation should be able to answer is "what would have happened if we hadn't done anything?" Partly, the focus is on what trends or changes were already present or likely to occur that might have delivered the same result, but without the expense of the program intervention. Partly, though, it is about trying to learn whether some other form of action – including the "do nothing" option – would make more policy sense.

All of the material we examined emphasised the importance of a good "counterfactual"[3] and the virtual impossibility of doing it well in many community renewal projects. They recognise that, from a public policy point of view, the issue often is not so much "did we achieve what we set out to achieve?" but rather "was the way we went about it effective or was there a cheaper, more effective way we could have got the same outcome?"

Involving the community

Involving the communities most directly implicated in a place or renewal projects in the evaluation of those projects is a fundamental principle.

It isn't always clear from the reports we looked at whether and to what extent the NSW place management evaluations have involved the affected community. Sometimes involvement might take the form of relatively formal consultation structures with community groups and associations. In some of the international projects, the evaluation process seems to have included large-scale efforts to include a wide range of community opinions.

---

[3] A counterfactual is another way of describing the "control" in an experiment. In the context of place or renewal projects, the counterfactual would consist of a community, similar in as many respects as possible to the one experiencing the intervention or place project, but which would not have a place project. The idea, as with the idea of a control group, is to understand what might have happened in the absence of the specific intervention being evaluated (and therefore an attempt to pinpoint exactly what difference, if any, the intervention caused).

In some of the UK evaluations we looked at, for example, community surveys with samples of 1000 or more are fairly common.

The "inclusion imperative" becomes much more important when the purpose is to do more than fix up some operational and service delivery problems. When the purpose is to advance more complex, interconnected results that link back to the "invisibles" like trust, connection and confidence, community participation has to be much more than token.

A common framework: baseline, impact and learning

A good summary of three common themes[4] in place or renewal evaluation is:

> Creating a <u>baseline measure</u> of the "status quo" and thus providing a reasonably reliable and credible starting point from which to make evaluative judgments about the next to factors.

> Using a range of tools and techniques to deliver insights about the program or <u>project's impact</u> on the problems it was designed to engage (however they are defined – hard, soft, output and outcome focused).

> Making sure that the evaluation contributes in some way to <u>learning</u> more about what works and what doesn't.

A good practice evaluation strategy is going to reflect the same three dimensions - measurement of impact (what has happened?), comparative performance assessment (does that make things better or worse than they were before?) and learning and project (what can we do with the knowledge and experience from this evaluation to make the program work better or share with others the same knowledge and experience and so save them time and money?).

Evaluation in a policy and planning framework

Evaluation is part of the connection between policy and practice. One of the interesting things about some of the evaluations we reviewed is the undercurrent of frustration in many of them about the lack of a clear and coherent policy framework into which the place or community renewal initiatives are designed to fit. A notable exception is the New Deal for Communities initiative in the United Kingdom, for example, is a manifestation of a distinct policy to use community renewal and place-based regeneration projects as a legitimate part of strategic policy ambitions in areas such as housing, employment, education, economic development and community services.

Long-term outcomes, short-term results

The NDC evaluation framework from the UK is probably the best example we came across of an explicit attempt to confront the difficulty of evaluating projects with long-term ambitions. In this case, some of the projects have 10-year horizons and very demanding renewal and transformational ambitions. But the evaluation framework specifically seeks feedback each year about the "steps along the way" projects and results whose cumulative effect is meant to drive that community towards those long-term outcomes.

Few of the other evaluations we looked at, including those in NSW, had grappled explicitly or especially well with this persistent evaluation challenge. Part of the problem is that, if there is not theory of change, supported by some version of an outcomes hierarchy, it's actually quite hard to determine what those "steps along the way" results are meant to be.

Holistic approach, holistic indicators?

There is often a frustrating distance between the rhetoric of holistic program and project strategies and performance indicators that remained firmly fixed on a financial bottom line.

Evaluating a microcredit scheme in the UK, the evaluators noted an atmosphere of "anticipation, excitement and confidence about the future. Participants are embarking upon self-employment as a route out of social exclusion, filled with self-determination, self-assurance, new skills, financial expertise and knowing where to go for help when they need it." The frustration emerges, though, as these rich and complex outcomes are crushed beneath the desire to create a single or at least simpler way to measure it's success. "In short, the programme delivers empowerment, as well as economic regeneration. But when all these positive, life-changing impacts are summed up in a 'bottom line' economic statement about loan repayments and numbers of jobs created, much of the true value of a community empowerment initiative like this is overlooked."

However, bottom line financial and other "hard" performance data are important and are often conspicuously absent from some evaluations.

---

[4] Adapted from the Full Circle evaluation report on the UK microcredit project

An Australian example of an approach to exactly the same set of challenges is the evaluation of the Area Assistance Scheme, which used a form of social cost-benefit analysis. The evaluation noted that traditional cost benefit analysis treats the "soft" benefits as "intangible", worthy perhaps of a paragraph at the end of the report. In a conference paper reflecting on the AAS evaluation, the report's author Alison Ziller argued that "long term social impacts on health and well being may be difficult to cost but far from being intangible, are of profound importance in the life of communities."[5]

According to the evaluation, this approach has some important benefits, including:

> It provided a simple, non-technical process for collecting information to which everyone can contribute

> It can be used in a small group process that can be highly inclusive and participative – it prompts people to talk about the costs and benefits as they see them and to share that with others

> It can be used to make sure that feedback and data gathering is not dominated by sectional interests of especially well-organised and strong voices

> People get to see the links between benefits and costs and to understand the way in which the inevitable complex trade-offs work that are at work in any process of community development.

> In some situations, it can build a consensus around the implications of the benefit cost analysis as the evidence comes in, is tracked and then presented for review and discussion.

Monitoring versus evaluation

The evaluation framework for the UK's New Deal for Communities regeneration projects makes a strong link between the evaluation process and the different kinds of data and experience that are (or should be) collected throughout the life of the project.

The best example we came across was the West 2000 evaluation. The evaluation, part of a large-scale adjustment program for rural and regional communities, spent a considerable amount of time building up a framework (presented as a series of tables in the report) that linked measures, output and outcome indicators with a detailed data collection and analysis strategy. The Windale project in the Hunter is making steps in this direction, but there had been no actual evaluation when we did our research and prepared the report.

Evidence that evaluation leads to change

The point of any evaluation is to make a decision or judgment. Should we do more, do less, do something different or do nothing at all? What does the evidence from the evaluation process suggest would be the best course of action? If there is no clear link between the findings and outcomes of an evaluation process and a specific decision or judgment, it is hard to resist the conclusion that it has been time, money and expertise wasted.

Many of the evaluation strategies and tools we reviewed couldn't provide that evidence. We have to acknowledge the fact that, given the constraints of our study, that doesn't mean in all cases that there in fact wasn't some link there. It's just that, from the material we've reviewed, the link so often isn't clear.

A note of skepticism

There is a danger that a legitimate enthusiasm for the potential benefits of a place management or area-based approach to community renewal can obscure some persistent dilemmas. Although adopting a place-based approach has much to commend it, we should avoid the temptation to place it on the pedestal of "panacea". One dilemma, for example, is whether participation is always a good thing. What if "participation" and community engagement turns out, in practical terms, to be little more than opportunities for the "usual suspects" and the "angry brigade" to grab the commanding heights of the renewal project and ensure that it remains the exclusive preserve of a small and perhaps unrepresentative group?
What if, as the "people before structures" critique of some aspects of the UK Government's New Deal for Communities methodology claims, the commitment to participation allows the search for genuine change and transformation to become bogged in committees and aimless process? And what if the desire for participation places unreasonable burdens on voluntary organisations and those who are less interested in meetings and consultation and more interested in getting the problems fixed?[6]

---

[5] Improving Community Infrastructure, Address to the 2001 CPO Training Conference, Alison Ziller
[6] These comments reflect an exchange of personal correspondence with Tim Clark from the University of Birmingham in the UK based on his response to an earlier draft of this report.

A second dilemma is highlighted in a study of an urban regeneration project in the London borough of Stepney. The study looked at the links between the renewal project and a series of housing and on-housing outcomes. The study notes that, while the specific initiative to refurbish the public housing estates recorded some significant improvements, not least in the dramatic decrease in reported incidence of ill-health, wider issues of inequality make it difficult to sustain some of those gains. It is possible, in other words, to see demonstrable improvements from the place-based renewal project in and around Stepney, but some would argue there are larger forces driving developments likely to result in an overall deterioration in the very same indicators the place-project is trying to impact. (Ambrose, undated)

A third dilemma is that "place" is only one coordinating mechanism for public policy and service delivery (others being function and client/customer for example) and, like the others, brings with it a fair share of challenges. Issues of conflict between legitimate objectives, rationing scarce resources (money, skills, institutional attention etc) and the requirement for accountability all have to be factored into the place/renewal framework.

2.5 What would "good practice" look like?

Evaluation in this context is important for three reasons:

> It lifts confidence that the underlying policy framework for community renewal is working and creating the intended value.

> It helps all stakeholders to learn more about what works, how it works and why it works.

> It creates a solid base of information about performance (quantitative and qualitative information about results, what has actually happened etc).

As well as the theory of change material, and informing that discussion in the first place, a 'good practice' evaluation will access whatever has been collated as the most up-to-date information about the place or community. There will be both context and "baseline" information that offers some insight into the starting point for the project itself. The context and baseline data will make a point of drawing on the wit and wisdom of the people and communities most directly affected. They can provide much of the data and might even be involved in collecting and analyzing some of it, offering right from the start a kind of "DIY" dimension to the process that already sends a signal that the place or renewal project is not something simply happening *to* them, but *with* and *for* them.

Based on the theory of change and the various parts of the baseline data, the evaluation itself will then be subject to some basic thinking about purpose, scope, style and outcomes. In other words, reflecting the theory of change for the overall project, what is the "theory of evaluation" that is driving this particular type of evaluation? How does the evaluation match, reflect and in some way reinforce the overall theory of change?

The evaluation plan will include some key elements such as:

> Continuing monitoring strategies that make sure key performance information is collected as the program move forward – how will that be done, how will the data be stored, what use will be made of the data both for "interim" assessments and as part of the overall evaluation process?

> What specific data collection tools and techniques will be used – surveys, focus groups, interviews, maybe even the use of online communication strategies.

> The evaluation's overall timeline and budget will also have to be determined, inevitably something of a trade-off between what ought to be allowed and what can be provided in terms of the external time and budget constraints that will impinge.

The monitoring and evaluation strategy will then start to roll out. Data will be collected, surveys will be undertaken and so on. Depending on the scope and complexity of the project, interim assessments and reports will be produced, circulated and discussed. That process in turn has to have at least some capacity to inform the original design and purpose of the project. There has to be, in other words, a feedback loop right back to the beginning. The challenge always with these kinds of projects is to determine a process by which what we find out as we go forward can be used to change the project itself, including its underlying theory of change (so-called 'double-loop learning').

Formal and summative evaluations will then start to develop as the project gets towards the end. Tools and techniques will be varied and will match the project's ambitions and progress.

People will need to see clearly what has emerged from the evaluation. They (that is, the stakeholder interests) need a chance to review and comment on those findings. Where the evaluation is then used to inform immediate

project or wider policy decisions, that link should be as transparent as possible. It's a simple and intuitive proposition – those most closely involved and affected need some reassurance that the investment in evaluation has been worth it. Did something happen and is there some link between the evaluation and what happens next?

There should be some form of "evaluate the evaluation" that can quickly pull together what has been learned from the process and how it has contributed to the overall place or renewal project.

An evaluation process that reflects at least many of these dimensions is likely to be one that is seen as credible and useful. Doing it properly sends a powerful message that the original project is itself seen as serious and significant, serious enough to warrant the investment of time, effort and money. It's also clear, just reviewing the outline, that none of it is easy or simple.

2.6 Applying the framework in NSW

As part of our study, we indicated ways in which the framework we evolved could be adopted as the basis for place and renewal projects into the future. The approach to designing, managing and evaluating place management and community renewal projects would include these elements:

> An expectation that funding for projects would not be forthcoming without a "theory of change" framework that explains how the proponents expect what they plan to do to impact on what they want to change. In other words, the good practice framework should have a noticeable impact on good program/project design (the "start before you start" approach).

> Project plans should increasingly reflect the 8-element structure or "logic" that has formed the basis of this study. There is no reason why the place management and community renewal policy in NSW shouldn't mandate this kind of framework as the common basis on which these kinds of initiatives will now be constructed.

> We'd expect to see a proportion of project funding, perhaps around 5-10% as a rough rule-of-thumb, dedicated to monitoring and evaluation, starting with some of the baseline studies and research that will create a benchmark against which to test and track change over time.

> We might expect the Premier's Department to assume responsibility for many of the information exchange and "consulting" functions that will help individual place/renewal projects. It should be able to offer advice about the best way to set about a place/renewal project – what to look for, what to be clear about before you start etc. It should be able quickly to access the best learning from other projects and put people in touch with others who've been confronting similar challenges and may have good insights to offer about what works best in what situations. It will be responsible for building up the whole-of-government knowledge system about the design, conduct and evaluation of place management projects.

One of the challenges the good practice framework lays down for NSW is how to determine indicators of performance that can be used consistently across the State in place or renewal projects. This was one of the questions that came out of the workshop that debated an earlier version of this report.

Thos indicators would help to answer some central questions:

> In any place or renewal project, what are the core dimensions that we would expect any good evaluation of that project to cover?

> For each of those dimensions, is it possible to describe the kind of evidence we would expect to see in order to make a judgement about the project's performance on that particular dimension?

> How would you go about measuring that performance?

As an illustrative framework only, we developed a framework around 6 dimensions:

Change

Capacity

Governance

Learning

Cost-benefit

Sustainability.

What we're suggesting is that, in taking the results of this project further, the Premier's Department takes this basic framework and starts to add some of the detail. In particular, it should be able to identify a range of specific indicators that could help emerging place projects when it comes to the "change" dimension.

Attachment 1

LIST OF EVALUATION AND ASSOCIATED RESEARCH REPORTS
Evaluation studies/reports

NSW/Australia

Evaluation of Kings Cross Place Management pilot

Evaluation of Cabramatta Place Management pilot

Evaluation of Redfern/Waterloo

Evaluation of Tom Uren Square project

Evaluation of Moree Place Management Project

Progress report on Windale (Hunter Valley)

Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program – Bruce Judd, Bill Randolph, Christopher Carmichael Final Report April 2001 (NSW Housing)

City of Salisbury and SA Housing Trust: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

The WEST 2000 Rural Partnership Program – an Independent Evaluation: Final Report (September 2001)

NSW Government Action Plan on youth and community issues in Canterbury-Bankstown (Achievements/Impacts Summary, December 2000)

Evaluation of Community Renewal Program: Issues, Scope and Methodology, Queensland Department of Housing, October 2000

Evaluation of the Area Assistance Scheme (Australia Street Company) – extracts.

NSW Premier's Department Strategic Projects Division Evaluation Manual (January 2001)

International

Prove It! (Evaluation of Barclays SiteSavers, UK)

Evaluation of New Deal for Communities, UK (Dept of Environment, Transport and the Regions)

Neighbourhood Plans: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission (USA)

Interim Evaluation of the Regeneration of the former coalfields in England (Number 33, 2000)

An evaluation of Phase 2 of the Safer Cities Program (UK): Partnerships in Community Safety (Number 29, 2000)

Final Evaluation (summary) of the Enterprise Zones, UK (Urban Research Summary No 4, 1995)

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions

Running and sustaining Renewal Areas – Good Practice Guide (www.housing.dtlr.gov.uk/research/renewal/guidance)

Peter Ambrose

Some way short of holism: United Kingdom urban regeneration and non-housing outcomes

http://www.housing.qld.gov.au/nhc2001/pdf/ambrose_peter_11.pdf

Research/reports

James P Connell et al (editors) *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, Aspen Roundtable, 1995/1998. Volume 1: Concepts, Methods and Contexts. Volume 2: Theory, Measurement and Analysis. The study, in one of the chapters in Volume 2, notes that the Roundtable on which the book is based is developing an

annotated catalogue of outcome measures, drawn from current and past CCI evaluations and other complex initiatives. We can try and locate that catalogue and see how much additional light it can throw on the issues we have been covering.

The role of community housing in strengthening communities: Community Renewal Initiatives Project Final Report (NSW Housing)

A framework for evaluating neighbourhood renewal – lessons learnt from New South Wales and Victoria. Paper to National Housing Conference (Brisbane, October 2001) by Bill Randolph and Bruce Judd.

Hughes, Phillip and Black, Alan *The identification and analysis of indicators of community strength and outcomes*, (Department of Family and Community Services, Occasional Paper No 3, February 2001).

Seyfang, Gill and Pearson, Ruth (2000) *Community Regeneration and Community Finance: beyond the bottom line,* Town and Country Planning Vol 69:11 pp326-328

Seyfang, Gill (1999) *Making it count: valuing and evaluating community economic development*, in Community Economic Development, edited by G.Haughton (Regional Studies Association, London) pp125-138, 244-247 **

Robinson G Hollister and Jennifer Hill (1995), *Problems in the evaluation of Community Wide Initiatives,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York (www.epn.org.sage.rsholl.html)

Czerwinski, Stanley 7 (1997) The Federal Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community Program: Testimony from the US General Accounting Office to the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, October 1997.