

(Working) Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

TITLE 1	2
TITLE 2	19
TITLE 3	22
TITLE 4	24

The reviewed articles are coded in this document as follow:

- Very good
- Good
- Not so good\unsure

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

1. TITLE 1

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Chamberlain, Paul. (2008). Place-Based Poverty Reduction Initiative: How Community Economic Development is Reducing Poverty in Canada and How It could be Doing More: Final Report. Ottawa, ON, Canada: Canadian CED Network http://site.ebrary.com/lib/sfu/Doc?id=10398194&ppg=4</p> <p>Executive Summary: The gap between the rich and the poor in Canada has widened dramatically over the last two decades and the depth and duration of poverty has increased. Children, women, lone parents, older adults, recent immigrants and racialized groups are all disproportionately affected. Increasingly governments at all levels are beginning to develop policies and look for strategies to reduce poverty. Community Economic Development (CED) is an approach that is working effectively to reduce poverty in many different communities across the country. CED is proven to build wealth, create jobs, foster innovation and productivity, and improve social well-being. Through holistic, participatory development, CED enables communities to reduce poverty and become attractive places to live and work. The Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCEDNet) is a national, member-driven organization representing hundreds of CED organizations and practitioners across Canada. CCEDNet promotes CED as an economic development model that integrates social, economic and environmental goals that build wealth and reduce poverty. CCEDNet's Place-Based Poverty Reduction initiative brought together four partner organizations from diverse communities to document and promote innovative locally-based CED approaches to poverty reduction and the quantitative and qualitative methodologies that assess the impact of this work on the lives of individuals and their communities. It also brought together a broader learning network of individuals and organizations across the country to inform and share this work. Finally, the effective poverty-reduction strategies, practices and tools of CED organizations explored in the initiative are being disseminated at CCEDNet's national conference, as well as through regional events and webbased tools. The core communities we worked with were diverse - urban and rural, northern and southern, Anglophone and</p>	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>The Cradle through College Pipeline: Supporting Children's Development through Evidence-Based Practices: A Document from the Harlem Children's Zone</p> <p>Preface Introduction to the Harlem Children's Zone For over 35 years, Harlem Children's Zone ® (HCZ ®) has been committed to helping disadvantaged and at-risk children secure educational and economic opportunities. The HCZ mission is rooted in the belief that the cycle of poverty can be broken by the coupling of a critical mass of engaged, effective families with the provision of readily accessible early and progressive intervention in children's development. This combination is absolutely essential to help youth achieve the educational and economic opportunities that would otherwise be denied to them. In the fall of 2000, under the leadership of Geoffrey Canada, HCZ launched the Harlem Children's Zone Project – a place-based initiative that has been called —one of the most ambitious social-policy experiments of our time by <i>the New York Times</i> (Paul Tough, June 2004). HCZ believes that the success of the HCZ Project is intrinsically linked to the establishment of and adherence to a core set of principles that are necessary to create change:</p> <p><i>Serve an entire neighborhood comprehensively and at scale.</i> Engaging an entire neighborhood (1) reaches children in numbers significant enough to affect the culture of a community; (2) transforms the physical and social environments that impact the children's development; and (3) creates programs at a scale large enough to meet the local need.</p> <p><i>Create a pipeline of support.</i> Developing excellent, accessible programs and schools and linking them to one another so that they provide uninterrupted support for children's healthy growth, starting with pre-natal programs for parents and finishing when young people graduate from college. The pipeline should be surrounded by additional wrap-around programs that support families and the larger community.</p> <p><i>Build community among residents, institutions, and stakeholders, who help to create the environment necessary for children's healthy development.</i></p> <p><i>Evaluate program outcomes and create a feedback loop that cycles data back to management for use in improving and refining program offerings.</i></p> <p><i>Cultivate a culture of success rooted in passion, accountability, leadership, and teamwork.</i></p> <p>These principles are at the core of HCZ's success; we expect that communities seeking to create a youth-centered, neighborhood-based</p>	<p>"Different communities have different needs, resources, and existing services. They are affected in different ways by diverse national, state, and local policies; funding opportunities; and local cultures and mores. It would be inappropriate for us to recommend the same set of programs for such varied communities. The key is to take the HCZ principles and use them to create a new project in a new community, not to replicate HCZ's specific programs."</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Chokie, M., & Partridge, M.D .(2008). Low-Income Dynamics in Canadian Communities: A Place-Based Approach. Growth and Change 39(2)</p> <p>Abstract: Canadian poverty rates have persisted at disappointingly high levels despite almost 15 years of continuous economic growth. The problem is exacerbated by some communities and neighborhoods having exceedingly high poverty, including very high rates for vulnerable demographic groups, such as aboriginals and recent immigrants. We investigate low-income rates (poverty rates) for 2,400 Canadian “communities” over the 1981–2001 period. By focusing on communities, we fill a void in the related Canadian literature, which tends to focus on individuals, case studies, or more aggregate measures, such as provinces. Our approach allows us to assess the role of place-based policies. Particular attention is given to communities with differing shares of aboriginal Canadians and recent immigrants. One novel feature is our analysis of both “short-term” and “long-term” causes of differential community poverty rates. The results suggest that community low-income rates are more affected by initial economic conditions in the short term, with certain demographic factors becoming relatively more important in the long run.</p>	<p>“place-based causes, such as weak local labor markets, household-level studies may provide an incomplete picture of potential solutions. For example, microanalysis may indicate that increasing a disadvantaged individual’s education may sufficiently increase their earnings to lift them above the poverty threshold.</p> <p>However, Osberg (2000) notes that this may have no net impact on the overall regional poverty rate, as it may push another person down in the job queue and into poverty. Thus, individual- and community-level assessments may draw differing conclusions. Likewise, a case study of a province or of an urban area, such as Winnipeg, may provide needed context, but analysts are always interested in whether case studies generalize more broadly. Therefore, this study focuses on the relationship between household LICO rates at the community level with corresponding economic, demographic, and geographic attributes. The plight of off-reserve aboriginal population and recent immigrants will also be highlighted.”</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Stoney, C., & Elgersma, S. (2007). Neighbourhood Planning through Community Engagement: The Implications for Place Based Governance and Outcomes. Canadian Political Science Association</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The paper focuses on Canada’s renewed interest in community engagement, its impact on local governance and potential for urban renewal. Drawing on research funded by the federal government of Canada, the paper examines the issues raised by the recent adoption of a neighbourhood planning initiative (NPI) by the City of Ottawa. The NPI is intended to improve the physical and social quality of life for the citizens of Ottawa by establishing a methodology for a more inclusive and integrated approach to neighbourhood development. Based on the principles and initiatives of ‘community-based planning’ and ‘collaborative community building’ set out in Ottawa’s ‘2020’ growth plans, the NPI is an attempt to put these principles into practice and to develop best practices in neighbourhood planning. The approach is intended to build on local knowledge and better reflect the needs, priorities and concerns of local citizens. At the community level, local groups are being brought together in a systematic attempt to enhance local input into neighbourhood development and improve the dialogue between citizens and city staff on a broad range of issues. Currently being piloted in two wards, one urban (Hintonburg) and the other rural (Vars), it is intended that, if it proves effective, the NPI will be used city-wide to develop neighbourhoods – beginning with those seen to be in most ‘distress’ in terms of poverty, crime, infrastructure and so on.</p> <p>In addition to engaging more closely with the community, City departments responsible for urban planning and delivering local services are to increase inter-departmental collaboration in an effort to develop a more coherent, place-sensitive approach towards neighbourhoods. To this end, multi-functional teams have been formed to integrate discrete jurisdictions such as land use planning, physical infrastructure planning and social service plans so that the planning process incorporates physical, social and economic considerations. For the first time in the City’s history, departments such as Public Works and Services (PWS), Planning and Growth Management (PGM) and Community and Protective Services (CPS) have been</p>	<p>“Building the community: Capacity development, local ownership, and the participation of ‘primary stakeholders or ‘beneficiaries’ are regarded as essential measures to ensuring the long term success of decentralization and other public sector reforms (Pearce and Mawson, 2003).”</p> <p>“Underpinning this driver is the premise that by ‘enabling capacity’, communities will be able to actively engage with their own problems and address more of their own needs (Sullivan, 2003).”</p> <p>“This capacity might contribute to what Robert Putnam refers to as ‘social capital’ or the social networks, norms and organizations shaping the individual and collective well-being of society (Putnam, 2000).”</p> <p>“Horizontal Management: Also referred to as silo-busting or systems-thinking, this initiative is rooted in holistic beliefs that focus on dealing with a person, organization, or community as a whole, in an integrated way, rather than addressing specific issues and problems with separate solutions and strategies. For others, it is a more practical issue of coordination that focuses on the streamlining of</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Bradford, N. (2005). Place-based Public Policy: Towards a New Urban and Community Agenda for Canada CPRN Research Associate in Cities and Communities Executive Summary: Recently there has been growing awareness of the importance of cities, large and small, as strategic spaces in the age of globalization. They are the places where today's major public policy challenges are being played out. Countries that invest in their cities and communities are likely to be at the forefront of progressive change in the 21st century. This Research Report explores ideas and options for a new approach to urban and community policy in Canada. The analysis builds on the growing body of research demonstrating how "place matters" to the quality of life for all citizens and to the prosperity of nations. Economic geographers studying innovation emphasize qualities of the "local milieu" that are crucial for knowledge-intensive production. Scholars examining social inclusion reveal the barriers individual and families face in moving forward when their neighbourhoods limit access to quality services and networks. Environmental analysts stress that urban centres are where major ecological stresses converge, and that decisions taken locally about land use, transportation, and development are crucial for sustainability. All this research reveals the difference "place quality" makes to public policy outcomes. But what measures and mechanisms are required to act on this knowledge? How can governments at all levels reposition themselves to meet the challenges converging in urban areas? This Research Report calls for a place-based public policy framework. In so doing, it takes a broader view than is often the case in assessing the problems and prospects of cities. An urban perspective concentrates on physical infrastructures and the powers available to municipalities. A community perspective focuses on social infrastructures and the networks for democratic participation. The place-based framework recognizes the importance of both perspectives, and seeks their integration through a mix of public policies responding to the needs of cities of all sizes and locations. Part 1 of the Research Report surveys a range of urban policy and community development literatures to identify four key elements of the place-based framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tapping Local Knowledge. The attention now being paid 	<p>Tacit knowledge:"informal practices, know-how, imaginative ideas, and so forth"</p> <p>"The point is not to substitute experiential or tacit knowledge for technical expertise, but rather to maximize the synergy and complementarity among the different policy inputs. Place-based policy targets specific neighbourhoods or communities for integrated interventions that respond to location-specific challenges, and engage fully the ideas and resources of residents. The aim is both better government policy and more community capacity. In political terms, the place becomes a locus for the mobilization of collective action, generating a community of meaning and practice for those living there."</p> <p>"Successfully targeted programs generate new understandings of how sectoral policies work on the ground, and with appropriate feedback mechanisms, can better focus the urban lens for</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Sridharan, S. (2011). Evaluating Place Based Initiatives: Challenges, Recent Trends and Basic Questions in Planning the Evaluation. Policy Horizons Canada: Ottawa</p> <p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>By surveying place-based evaluators, the paper documents common approaches including Theory of Change, developmental evaluation, and participatory evaluation. Emerging methods cited include observational studies, network analysis, respondent-driven sampling and system dynamics. Establishing the timeline for expected outcomes is one evaluation technique that is also recommended to address the challenge of longer-term outcomes that cannot be documented with the current evaluation cycle. The paper also proposes ten top questions that evaluators should ask before designing an evaluation of a place-based approach.</p> <p>Intro:</p> <p>Place-based Initiatives attempt to coordinate existing institutions serving the community to reconfigure services in more logical fashion to confront social problems with comprehensive treatment of services (Dunn, 2010, 2011; Hess, 1999; Weitzman et al., 2002; Weitzman and Silver, 2003). Leveraging existing resources and programs is the primary operational principle for the survival and growth of place-based initiatives (Gray et al., 1997). Place-based initiatives typically seek to obtain greater leverage of existing resources through systems reform. Place-based initiatives have been implemented in a number of neighborhood-based programs. They have been defined as “a holistic approach to neighborhood revitalization with physical, economic, and social program components integrated with community building operating principles” (Meyer et al., 2000). The focus of such initiatives is on consensus-building using evidence-based practices to guide the planning and implementation; there is a more limited emphasis on seeing conflicts of interest</p>	<p>Methodological challenges in evaluation: “Vague initial theories of change, multiple levels of intervention, defining contexts and mechanism, changes in definition of place-based over time, clarifying the relevance of place, problems of a limited sphere of direct control, the anticipate timeline of impact problem, the attribution/ contribution of problem, the generalization of the problem”</p>

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
Dreier, Peter, John Mollenkopf, and Todd Swanstrom. 2001. Place Matters: Metropolitcs for the Twenty-first Century. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Hays, R. A., & Kogle, A.M. (2007). Neighbourhood attachment, Social Capital, and Political Participation: A case study of low and Moderate Income Residents of Waterloo, Iowa. Journal of Urban Affairs. 29 (2): 181-205</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>This case study examines the importance of neighborhood identity and engagement in place-based social networks within the neighborhood in fostering and stimulating neighborhood-based participation in the urban political process. Scholars concerned with civic engagement have argued that there is a strong link between the informal ties known as “social capital” and citizen engagement in the larger community. If this linkage can be shown to exist in the neighborhood setting, then it can provide guidance to both scholars and practitioners in utilizing informal, place-based networks to empower disadvantaged neighborhoods. Evidence presented in this essay, based on interviews with a representative sample of neighborhood residents in the small industrial city of Waterloo, Iowa, suggests that strong informal networks of social capital exist within neighborhoods, but that persons who are more strongly engaged in these networks are not necessarily more involved in the efforts of formal neighborhood associations. However, individuals who are involved in these formal associations are much more likely to be connected to the local and national political systems through voting and other forms of participation.</p>	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Price, H. (2011). A Seat at the Table: Place-Based Urban Policy and Community Engagement. Harvard Journal Of African American Public Policy, 1765-73.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Public participation has been defined as “the practice of consulting and involving members of the public in the agenda-setting, decision-making, and policy-forming activities of organizations or institutions responsible for policy development”(Rowe and Frewer 2004). While this civic engagement strategy has been employed in the United States to empower underrepresented communities in a variety of settings, this organizing approach has proven to be especially effective in enhancing the capacity for the public to communicate its priorities to policy makers (Putnam 1995). In urban revitalization initiatives, this strategy also plays a key role in local governance structures, which Robert J. Chaskin and Clark M. Peters identify as “formal mechanisms to engage citizens and to facilitate coordination and collaboration among service providers, community development practitioners, businesses, and local government” (1997). In the context of antipoverty initiatives, these structures leverage social capital in low-income neighborhoods and allow citizens to influence the policies that impact their well-being. In practice, this often entails the deployment of surveys and focus groups targeting neighborhood residents. It also involves the incorporation of these stakeholders into the long-term deliberative process that guides the community-based efforts.</p> <p>While federal social programs often call for extensive needs assessments that require resident engagement, community involvement tends to decline after initial outreach activities. Primarily operating in minority communities, these antipoverty initiatives are hampered by lapses in communication that result in dissonance regarding the needs, priorities, and culture of low-income</p>	<p>PLACED-BASED POLICY AND THE WHITE HOUSE NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION INITIATIVE</p> <p>“The latest phase of urban policy has seen a “democratic devolution revolution” in which “government serves as a powerful catalyst and largely provides the funds needed to create stable, ongoing, effective partnerships” (Benson et al. 2007).</p> <p>Leveraging partnerships with different tiers of government and other institutional partners, the interdisciplinary programs call for the convening of numerous local actors. In all of these efforts, community outreach, input, and leadership will be critical for success.”</p> <p>“With the Obama administration making efforts to develop a coherent agenda across federal agencies, administrators will be guided by the White House’s direction on place-based policy. In a series of joint statements to the heads of all federal executive departments and agencies, a number of high-ranking White House officials announced the Obama administration’s</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Tomaney, J. (2010). Place Based Approaches to Regional Development: Global Trends and Australian Implications Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, Newcastle University (UK) Institute of Regional Studies, Monash University A report for the Australian Business Foundation</p> <p>The “Commitment to Regional Australia” agreement following the 2010 Federal Election called for the adoption of “place-based thinking” in order to address the problems of regional Australia. This report for the Australian Business Foundation examines international trends in “place-based thinking” and their implications for Australia, drawing especially on thinking developed by the OECD and the European Union.</p> <p>The new paradigm of local and regional development emphasizes the identification and mobilization of endogenous potential, that is, the ability of places to grow drawing on their own resources, notably their human capital and innovative capacities. This approach aims to develop locally-owned strategies that can tap into unused economic potential in all regions and are the basis for strategies that tackle questions of sustainable development and human wellbeing. Such approaches require strong and adaptable local institutions, such as regional development agencies, which are increasingly commonplace around the world. At the same time, such approaches require the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders and mechanisms for identifying assets in the local economy that can be the basis for local growth strategies.</p> <p>Examples of this new approach are drawn from the European Union. Although Australian and European experiences are different, the relative success of some European regions is worth studying. The report looks in detail at the performance of three regions from different parts of Europe that outperformed their respective national economies in recent years. While revealing a diversity of experiences and conditions, the regions have a number of attributes in common, including a strong</p>	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>White House. (2010) Developing effective place based policies for the FY 2012 budget. Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, June 21 (www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/memoranda_2010/m10-21.pdf).</p> <p>This memo provides guidance on developing place-based policies for the President’s FY 2012 Budget. Effective place-based policies can influence how rural and metropolitan areas develop, how well they function as places to live, work, operate a business, preserve heritage, and more. Such policies also leverage investments by focusing resources in targeted places and drawing on the compounding effect of cooperative effort. This Administration has made a priority of promoting such policies, and, last year, we issued a guidance memo laying out the principles and definitions underlying place-based policies and requesting agency proposals...</p> <p>Our goal is to continue applying place-based principles to existing policies, potential reforms, and promising innovations, with a particular focus on strengthening economic growth and achieving greater cost effectiveness: Place-based policies target the prosperity, equity, sustainability and livability of places – how well or how poorly they function as places and how they change over time. Place-based policy leverages investments by focusing resources in targeted places and drawing on the compounding effect of cooperative arrangements. By definition, all domestic policies affect people who live or work in particular places. But many domestic policies are not place-based or place-driven. This is not to say that place-based approaches are always the most effective way to achieve particular policy goals. However, the Administration’s work should be guided by a clear understanding of the useful role that place-based policy can play and how to make it most effective.</p>	<p>II. Specific Actions Requested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the place-based programs or initiatives that you believe show special promise for achieving better outcomes, whether the place-based approach is well-established or newly proposed. In so doing, please give special emphasis to programs that promote economic growth. These policies should be within OMB Guidance (M-10-19) and cost effective. For each, please explain the policy’s measurable outcomes, using empirical evidence to the degree possible. In addition, please provide options for improving the intra- or inter-agency coordination and effectiveness of the proposed policy. • Identify the existing place-based programs or policies within OMB Guidance (M-10-19) that are not cost effective and that you would propose to reduce, terminate, or significantly restructure due to inefficiencies or ineffectiveness. Please explain why you have reached this determination, using empirical evidence to the degree possible. <p>Principles for Place-Based</p>

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Byron, Placed-based approaches to addressing disadvantage: Linking science and policy</p> <p>Introduction: There is mounting evidence that the rapid social and economic changes associated with globalisation, economic restructuring and demographic change have had differential impacts (both positive and negative) across Australia’s cities and towns (Gregory & Hunter, 1995; O’Connor, Stimson & Taylor, 1998; Stimson, 2001). Gregory and Hunter provided a stark account of growing inequality across Australian neighbourhoods. Their study showed that while population averages can show a general pattern of improvement, this can hide vastly different experiences across neighbourhoods of different socio-economic status. Notwithstanding a period of prolonged economic growth (preceding the global financial crisis), more recent research indicates that disadvantage is becoming increasingly concentrated in some locations, reinforcing spatial inequality. Indeed, Stimson (2001) observed that despite strong national economic performance, the disparity across areas seems likely to get worse. Vinson (2007) found that a relatively small number of localities accounted for a much greater share of disadvantage across a wide range of indicators, including unemployment, low income, criminal convictions, child maltreatment and early school-leaving. Similarly, Baum (2008) stated that while disadvantage has been a feature of Australian cities for some time, current forms of place-based disadvantaged have become more entrenched and more difficult to escape. Government agencies, both Commonwealth and state, deliver a broad range of programs to improve the economic, social and community wellbeing of Australians. Traditionally, many of these policies and programs have focused on single aspects of socio-economic disadvantage at a national or state level; that is, they aim to provide universal support to people who experience a particular form of disadvantage. Wolff and de-Shalit (2007) described this approach as one based on sectoral justice, where different aspects of disadvantage are considered independently, often demarcated along lines of portfolio responsibilities. As evidence and concern about the spatial concentration of disadvantage has accumulated, a range</p>	

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Griggs, J., Whitworth, A., Walker, R., Mclennan, D., Noble, M. Person- or place-based policies to tackle disadvantage? Not knowing what works</p> <p>Summary: This study reviews evidence of the effectiveness of policies introduced in Great Britain since 1997 to tackle employment, education and income disadvantage, focusing on policies that explicitly take account of people and places. While the Government has sought to tackle disadvantage across a number of fronts since 1997, person- and place-based policies have mostly developed separately and often in isolation from each other. This separation does not reflect the relationships between places and the poverty and disadvantage of people who live in them. This study looks at evaluations of the policies targeted at people and places to draw out key messages about what works, comparing and contrasting the effectiveness of person- and place-based interventions.</p>	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Crane, R., & Manville, M. People or place: revisiting the who versus the where of urban development UCLA – (forthcoming in Lincoln Land Lines)</p> <p>No Abstract</p> <p>“One of the longest standing debates in community economic development is the face-off between “place-based” and “people-based” approaches to combating poverty, housing affordability, chronic unemployment, and community decline. Should help go to distressed places or distressed people? The question is not an easy one to answer. Poverty and unemployment are often spatially concentrated—whether in the large declining swatches of a Detroit or Buffalo, or a few blocks of smaller underperforming neighborhoods in otherwise economically healthy metropolitan economies. Marked by low incomes, high social service demands, deteriorating housing stock, and high unemployment rates, these places often have inadequate services, failing schools, and few jobs matching the skills of residents.”</p> <p>“The most direct step toward helping their residents would seem to be by rescuing these places, and indeed that is the focus of most economic development programs. Consider the popularity of enterprise zones, redevelopment projects, and tax increment finance districts, which target investments, job-training subsidies, and tax breaks to residents and employers who locate in specific neighborhoods. Education, safety, health, and inclusionary zoning programs also often restrict eligibility to families living in certain places. Public money frequently underwrites sports stadiums, convention centers, or large commercial districts in struggling neighborhoods (or cities), in the hope they will spur job growth and revitalization. When elected leaders and redevelopment agency staff talk of rebuilding New Orleans, resurrecting Detroit, or revitalizing downtown Buffalo, they have place-based strategies in mind.”</p> <p>“Yet despite their prevalence and appeal, many researchers consider place-based programs wasteful and counterproductive. They argue that such strategies are too</p>	

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
Partridge, M.D. Rickman, D S. (2006). Geography of American Poverty : Is There a Need for Place-Based Policies? Kalamazoo, MI, USA: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research	

Place- Based Strategies	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Moore, K.A. Murphey, D., Emig, C., Hamilton, K., Hadley, A., Sidorowicz, K. (2009). Results and Indicators for Children: An Analysis to Inform Discussions About Promise Neighborhoods Produced with support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Harlem Children’s Zone. Introduction President Obama has proposed creation of up to 20 —Promise Neighborhoods in communities experiencing poverty, crime, and low student achievement. Promise Neighborhoods would engage children and parents within a defined geographic area in a multi-faceted strategy to meet several goals: good physical and mental health for every child, enrollment in and graduation from college by every child, and good jobs for parents so that families are economically self-sufficient. Measuring the effectiveness of Promise Neighborhoods will be critical. Are children healthier, and are they prepared for college? Are parents better able to nurture and support their children? Are communities stronger and more supportive of families? The extent to which these questions can be answered well will tell us much about the potential of ambitious, community-based efforts to change the odds for poor children in disadvantaged communities. So how well can we answer these questions? The news is mixed. On the one hand, significant progress has been made at both the national and state levels on using information to assess child well-being. On the other hand, when it comes to smaller geographic levels, our capability to track important well-being indicators is weaker. While some information is routinely available at the city level, and several cities have built rich, albeit unique data resources for their own jurisdictions, there are few indicators comparable across cities. The Promise Neighborhoods initiative underscores the importance of taking this work to a new stage. 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/neighborhood-level data that may figure in the design and evaluation of the Promise Neighborhoods initiative. The President has identified as a model for this initiative the Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) in New York City. HCZ</p>	

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

2. TITLE 2

The Role of Neighbourhood/ Community Engagement	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Beauvais, C., & Jenson, J. The Well-being of Children: Are There “Neighbourhood Effects”? Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc</p> <p>Executive Summary: We know that children’s development is influenced by many factors. The most familiar are factors in the child’s life such as family composition, socio-economic status, and so on. Increasingly, however, studies seek to map “neighbourhood effects,” that is the impact on developmental outcomes of the area in which children live. The notion is that the composition and condition of neighbourhood can increase or decrease children’s life chances. Such research seeks to demonstrate that the individual circumstances of a child and her family do not completely account for developmental achievements and life success; neighbourhood matters. But, while there is a growing body of research asserting that as children grow up the determinants of their development go beyond the immediate or even extended family, there is little agreement about the nature of the relationships between neighbourhood and child outcomes. The first goal of this Discussion Paper is to update the state of knowledge on the impact of neighbourhood on child development, focusing on “what we know” as well as where further research is needed.</p> <p>We first describe the aggregate factors identified as affecting child development. Average socioeconomic status (SES) has been identified as the key factor in explaining differences in developmental outcomes, such as IQ, school readiness, and delinquent behaviour. These effects can be positive as well as negative. Living in a well-off neighbourhood can “pull up” a child from a low income family, for example. Despite the crucial role played by SES, however, researchers have begun recently to use more refined variables and indicators and to pay attention to other characteristics of the neighbourhood, such as family composition (including numbers of lone parents), residential mobility and forms of civic engagement. One of the major lessons of most studies of neighbourhood effects on children’s development is that the factors are highly intertwined or inter-related. Given the evidence of such inter-relationships, as well as weak relationships and a lack of agreement about causality, researchers have sought to develop theoretical models. We identified and</p>	

The Role of Neighbourhood/ Community Engagement	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Kegler, M., Ellenberg, P, J., Joan M. TWISS2, Aronson, R., NORTON, B.L. (2009). Evaluation findings on community participation in the California Healthy Cities and Communities program. Health Promotion International. 24(4) Abstract: As part of an evaluation of the California Healthy Cities and Communities (CHCC) program, we evaluated resident involvement, broad representation and civic engagement beyond the local CHCC initiative. The evaluation design was a case study of 20 participating communities with cross-case analysis. Data collection methods included: coalition member surveys at two points in time, semistructured interviews with key informants, focus groups with coalition members and document review. Participating communities were diverse in terms of population density, geography and socio-demographic characteristics. Over a 3-year period, grantees developed a broad-based coalition of residents and community sectors, produced a shared vision, conducted an asset-based community assessment, identified a priority community improvement focus, developed an action plan, implemented the plan and evaluated their efforts. Local residents were engaged through coalition membership, assessment activities and implementation activities. Ten of the 20 coalitions had memberships comprised of mainly local residents in the planning phase, with 5 maintaining a high level of resident involvement in governance during the implementation phase. Ninety percent of the coalitions had six or more community sectors represented (e.g. education, faith). The majority of coalitions described at least one example of increased input into local government decision-making and at least one instance in which a resident became more actively involved in the life of their community. Findings suggest that the Healthy Cities and Communities model can be successful in facilitating community participation.</p>	<p>“Healthy Cities espouse the philosophy that residents have a right to self-determination, and therefore, should be involved in identifying problems and solutions that directly affect their lives” “Ascribe to a common set of principles: (i) a broad view of health, (ii) a shared vision, (iii) improving equity and quality of life, (iv) diverse resident participation and widespread community ownership, (v) a focus on systems change, (vi) development of local assets and resources and (vii) a means to measure progress and use results to make improvements (Norris and Pittman, 2000; Raphael, 2001; Wolff, 2003).” “Level and intensity of participation varies over time and certain phases are typically more staff driven”</p>

The Role of Neighbourhood/ Community Engagement	
Reference and abstract	Comments/citations
<p>Chaskin, R.J. (2003) Fostering Neighborhood Democracy: Legitimacy and Accountability within Loosely Coupled Systems. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. (</p> <p>This article explores the range of organizations and participatory mechanisms that take on some aspect of the role of neighborhood-based governance (in some way speaking for or acting on behalf of their neighborhoods) in three cities. It describes the extent to which they perform similar or different functions and discusses the strengths and weaknesses presented by the system of relationships as they are currently structured. It also explores two key issues—legitimacy and accountability—in an attempt to distill lessons about the relative roles and effectiveness of these different participatory mechanisms and community organizations and the relationships among them. The article suggests ways that sponsors (including foundations and government) can more effectively engage with neighborhoods and promote neighborhood-based decision making and action and highlights some unanswered questions that might be pursued as part of a larger research agenda to inform the practical pursuit of participatory, community-building strategies.</p>	

3. TITLE 3

Strathcona	

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies

4. **TITLE 4**

Aboriginal and Minorities	
<p>Shepherd, Robert P.; Persad, Karen. Place-Based Evaluation in a First Nations Context: Something Old, Nothing New, Often Borrowed, and Frequently Blue. Ottawa, ON, CAN: Policy Horizons Canada, 2011. p 2. http://site.ebrary.com/lib/sfu/Doc?id=10516426&ppg=3 Copyright © 2011. Policy Horizons Canada</p> <p>Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to explore the question: what do we know about evaluating the effectiveness of place-based First Nation initiatives? It uses First Nations economic development programs as a test for how federal approaches have changed over time to account for local experiences and whether there is evidence of any place-based attributes. The paper is structured in three parts. The first part reviews current research in the area of place-based initiatives, and evaluative methods in First Nations context. The second section identifies emerging methodologies and tools for evaluating local First Nation initiatives. It also identifies gaps in knowledge and the challenges with respect to evaluating First Nations economic development initiatives with concern for methods, but also for how to include various forms of evidence for understanding the effectiveness of these initiatives. The final section provides some thoughts on how evaluation as a function can move forward in a First Nations context regarding the evaluation of place-based initiatives. The study uses six federal programs that have a community focus to understand evaluation in this context. The paper argues that evaluations on First Nations programs tend to focus at the level of program, rather than understanding community experiences with local programs or projects. Departmental officials tend to be more concerned with evaluating the national program at the national level, whereas communities are concerned about understanding local programs and projects. As a result, First Nations input in general evaluation design is limited to how best to collect data federal evaluators want which may vary from what First Nations need to improve their work. Ironically, the studies examined show that First Nations actually played a minor role in data collection despite the attention to this detail at the planning stages. In addition, there appears to be a tension between satisfying central agency concerns for accountability and First Nations concerns for improvement, best practices and innovation. Prescriptive evaluation methods, approaches and questions complicate the usefulness of evaluations for First Nations, which is manifested in the growing pre-occupation with accountability and the need</p>	<p>These ideas aside, there are a number of challenges that have complicated the design and implementation of interventions for First Nations in Canada that may differ from other contexts. Despite central program objectives that recognize local circumstances, it has been challenging for government to reconcile the objectives of such initiatives to foster local creativity and centrally derived programmatic requirements for accountability, including evaluation.</p>

Literature review: Place-Based Strategies