



Resources for Place-Based Initiatives

Sarah Gillespie and Peter Tatian

March 2015

In this brief, we review resources that provide more information and guidance on the major steps discussed in the Urban Institute brief “Six Steps to Success:” (1) define a set of indicators through which to measure and report results; (2) select target populations and establish baseline population counts and penetration rates; (3) align evidence-based programs to indicators and target populations; (4) inventory available data and decide what original data collection is necessary; (5) establish an appropriate data system; and (6) collect and report on indicators.

Steps 1 through 3

Ahsan, Nilofer. n.d. “Evidence-Based Practice: A Primer for Promise Neighborhoods.” Oakland, CA: The Promise Neighborhoods Institute at PolicyLink. <http://www.cssp.org/community/neighborhood-investment/other-resources/Evidence-Based-Practice-A-Primer-for-Promise-Neighborhoods.pdf>.

The authors provide questions and responses about evidence-based practice (EBP) to inform grant applicants in the Promise Neighborhood initiative process and others desiring a clear understanding of EBP. In addition to defining EBP and explaining the distinctions along the EBP continuum from “Research Informed” to “Demonstrated Ability to Replicate,” the authors address fit and adaptability, fidelity and capacity, scalability and sustainability to assist in determining suitability for an EBP within a given community. The authors include a glossary of terms and a directory of evidence-based practice databases with links to websites.

Ahsan, Nilofer. 2008. *Sustaining Neighborhood Change*. Washington, DC: *The Annie E. Casey Foundation*. <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-SustainingNeighborhoodChange-2009.pdf>.

This guide documents some of the research, lessons, and best practices from The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s work in its Making Connections initiative. It describes the crucial role neighborhood residents played in the community change effort; ways to cultivate, support, and measure resident

involvement and leadership; and examples of Authentic Demand strategies from Making Connections sites.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2013. *Community Change: Lessons from Making Connections*. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. <http://www.aecf.org/m/blogdoc/aecf-CommunityChangeLessonsLearnedFromMakingConnections-2013.pdf>.

This report offers a set of overarching lessons that emerged from the work of the Making Connections initiative, including recognizing and dealing with the complexity of place-based community change efforts, the importance of parents and resident engagement, using a data-driven approach and defining success.

Harlem Children's Zone. 2009. *Whatever It Takes: A White Paper on the Harlem Children's Zone*. Chicago: Harlem Children's Zone. <http://wac.adeef.edgecastcdn.net/80ADEF/hcz.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/HCZ-White-Paper.pdf>.

Local, state, national, and international leaders have long demonstrated an interest in the HCZ model. This is a detailed policy framework with suggestions for how to implement and fund programs based on our model. Key points in that framework are summarized here.

Harlem Children's Zone. 2010. *The Cradle through College Pipeline: Supporting Children's Development through Evidence-Based Practices*. Chicago: Harlem Children's Zone. <http://www.bpichicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/The-Cradle-through-College-Pipeline.pdf>.

This document is part of an effort to provide support in identifying existing best-practice models of the various community components incorporated in a complete pipeline. It contains a list of programs that have been shown to be effective via their participation in randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies.

Howard, Dan, and Nan Stone. 2009. *Realizing the Promise of Promise Neighborhoods*. Boston: The Bridgespan Group. <http://www.bridgespan.org/getattachment/0b6d059e-7f2b-4211-a919-fa2965d75e10/Realizing-the-Promise-of-Promise-Neighborhoods-Exe.aspx>.

This paper compiles five lessons Bridgespan has learned about the tradeoffs the leaders of the Promise Neighborhoods are destined to confront and the choices that can help to ensure those tradeoffs are made successfully—so that they really do begin to break the cycle of intergenerational poverty. These lessons are derived from Bridgespan's experience with nonprofit organizations around the country that are engaged in the hard work of changing lives and changing neighborhoods.

Jean Louis, Betina, Frank Farrow, Lisbeth Schorr, Judith Bell, and Kay Fernandez Smith. 2010. *Focusing on Results in Promise Neighborhoods: Recommendations for the Federal Initiative*. Harlem Children's Zone, PolicyLink, and The Center for the Study of Social Policy. <http://wac.adeef.edgecastcdn.net/80ADEF/hcz.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Focusing-on-Results-final-01-08-10.pdf>.

This framing document recommends that the central focus of Promise Neighborhoods be on achieving a core set of results for poor children and families. These overarching results should drive the planning, design, start-up activities, program implementation, and evaluation of the individual sites and the overall initiative. The paper describes the partnership between the organizations and research they commissioned Child Trends to conduct on the results for children and families that most contribute to

the overall goals of Promise Neighborhoods as well as the availability and usefulness of data to track progress against those results.

Kania John, and Mark Kramer. 2011. *Collective Impact*. CA: Stanford Social Innovation Review. http://www.ssireview.org/images/articles/2011_WI_Feature_Kania.pdf.

This paper profiles Strive, a nonprofit subsidiary of KnowledgeWorks. Strive has brought together local leaders to tackle the student achievement crisis and improve education throughout greater Cincinnati and northern Kentucky. Strive serves as a good example of collective impact, the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem.

Moore, Kristin Anderson, David Murphey, Carol Emig, Kathleen Hamilton, Alena Hadley, and Katie Sidorowicz. 2009. *Results and Indicators for Children: An Analysis to Inform Discussions About Promise Neighborhoods*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. <http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/2009-53PromiseNeighborhoods.pdf>.

This report explores the feasibility of producing a set of core indicators for Promise Neighborhoods that assess child well-being at the city or neighborhood level. The information in this report can inform efforts by the policy community to identify appropriate city- and neighborhood-level data that may figure in the design and evaluation of the Promise Neighborhoods initiative.

Tatian, Peter A., G. Thomas Kingsley, Joseph Parilla, and Rolf Pendall. 2012. *Building Successful Neighborhoods*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/publications/412557.html>.

This framing paper lays out strategies for neighborhood revitalization focusing on strengthening community-level and citywide institutions to support and reinforce success and regional strategies for equitable housing and community development.

Steps 4 through 6

Auspos, Patricia. 2012. *Developing and Using Data and Evidence to Improve Place-Based Work*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/images/rcc/Sept%202011%20Data%20Meeting%20Proceedings%20FINAL%206%206%2012.pdf>.

This paper summarizes discussion on the topics of design, management, and evaluation of place-based change efforts. It highlights the significance of the issue, the progress made to-date, and the challenges that remain.

Auspos, Patricia. 2012. *Using Neighborhood Survey Data to Understand Neighborhoods and Improve Practice in Comprehensive Place-Based Change Efforts*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/images/rcc/Using%20Neighborhood%20Survey%20Data%20FINAL%206%206%2012.pdf>.

This paper explores some of the ways neighborhood-based work could be enhanced if managers and evaluators had access to data that can simultaneously track individuals and families, documents community conditions and trends, and support analysis of their interaction. It is intended to provide readers with background information and illustrative examples to stimulate reflection and discussion about developing and using more policy-relevant and practice-relevant data in place-based work.

Auspos, Patricia and Anne C. Kubisch. 2012. *Performance Management in Complex, Place-Based Work*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change.
http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/images/rcc/Aspen_Performance_Management.pdf.

This paper reflects and distills the collective wisdom of a group of high-level practitioners, foundation staff, policy experts, and government staff from a variety of fields on what performance management entails, why it is useful, and how to do it well. It offers a definition of performance management and its core components, explores why it is particularly challenging in complex, place-based change efforts, discusses “good practice” lessons, and considers how performance management differs from evaluation.

Bernard, Chris and Elizabeth Pope. 2014. *Nonprofit Performance Management: Using Data to Measure and Improve Programs*. Portland, ME: Idealware.
http://www.idealware.org/sites/idealware.org/files/IDEALWARE_PERFORMANCE_MGMT_AUGUST8.pdf.

This report, based on a list of recommendations from 10 nonprofits of different sizes, missions and locations, discusses the tracking and measuring of data to be more effective. It compiles information from staffers who are involved in data and analyzes common themes, best practices, and useful patterns. It also relays advice these staffers had for other organizations for replicating successes and learning from mistakes. This report also describes seven of these organizations in a case study format.

Comey, Jennifer, Peter A. Tatian, Lesley Freiman, Mary Kopczynski Winkler, Christopher Hayes, Kaitlin Franks, and Reed Jordan. 2013. *Measuring Performance: A Guidance Document for Promise Neighborhoods on Collecting Data and Reporting Results*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
<http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412767-Measuring-Performance.pdf>.

This guidance document recommends data collection strategies and data-sharing structures to ensure Promise Neighborhoods can collect and report on measureable results. While this guidance document is written specifically for Promise Neighborhoods, these recommendations can be applied to other place-based initiatives.

Gillespie, Sarah. 2014. “Starting Small and Thinking Long-Term: Q&A with Performance Measurement and Evaluation Professionals.” Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
<http://www.urban.org/publications/413211.html>.

This brief details interviews with performance measurement professionals who have been navigating their positions and organizations within the Washington, DC, area for several years. They share lessons learned and tips for getting started and growing. From establishing their positions to getting buy-in from leadership and frontline staff to showing program impact, these performance measurement professionals were clear that organizations have to start small and think long-term.

Preskill, Hallie, Marcie Parkhurst, and Jennifer Splansky Juster. 2014. *Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact*. Washington, DC: FSG Collective Impact Forum. <http://www.fsg.org/tabid/191/ArticleId/1098/Default.aspx?srpush=true>.

This three-part guide offers detailed advice on how to plan for and implement effective performance measurement and evaluation activities in the context of collective impact.

Urban Institute. 2003–04. *Series on Outcome Management for Nonprofit Organizations*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/government/Nonprofit-Organizations.cfm>.

The Urban Institute prepared six outcome management guidebooks to assist nonprofit organizations in implementing the development or improvement of a process for tracking the outcomes of their work. The guides cover key steps, developing community wide outcome indicators, surveying clients, finding out what happens to former clients, analyzing outcome information, and using outcome information.

About the Authors



Sarah Gillespie is a research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where her research focuses on place-based initiatives and community development as well as technical assistance for performance measurement and evaluation. She manages technical assistance efforts to support implementation grantees of the US Department of Education's Promise Neighborhoods initiative and the national evaluation of the Administration for Children Youth and Families Partnership to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of Supportive Housing for Families in the Child Welfare System.



Peter Tatian is a senior fellow in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where he researches housing policy, neighborhood indicators, and community development. Tatian leads NeighborhoodInfo DC, a neighborhood data system and civic engagement tool for the District of Columbia, which is part of Urban's National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership. He also heads Urban's work providing technical assistance on data collection and use to grantees of the US Department of Education's Promise Neighborhoods initiative.



2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

This brief was funded by the Urban Institute. Funders do not determine research findings or influence scholars' conclusions. Urban scholars and experts are independent and empowered to share their evidence-based views and recommendations shaped by research.

Copyright © March 2015. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.