

Measuring the River: Strategies for Evaluating Neighborhoods Work

Tom David

Neighborhood Small Grants Network
2004 Conference on Neighborhood Capacity Building
Minneapolis, MN

I would like to thank Janis Foster, Eunice Letzing and the other organizers of this gathering, not only for inviting me to be with you, but also for the theme for this day. "Measuring the River" is not only poetically appropriate given our setting, but also because it's so evocative of the challenges we face in assessing the impact of our work in neighborhoods.

Rivers play a central role in ecosystems throughout the world, so critical for life that they are considered sacred in many cultures. Learning to understand the dynamics of rivers (e.g. the flood cycles of the Nile) was critical to the development of human civilization. And, of course, our attempts to alter the flow of rivers have had both beneficial and unintended negative consequences, some of which we are only beginning to fully understand.

The recent anniversary of Lewis and Clark's expedition reminds us of the centrality of rivers to exploration and the frontiers of imagination in this country. In their wake, those who began to use rivers for commerce became adept at mapping their shape, currents and depth to aid navigation. That which was tacit became explicit, and that knowledge was shared to provide guidance for those who would follow.

For most of us, however, I suspect our grasp of the complexity of river systems is limited. To illustrate, I'd like to briefly share two personal stories. On a trip to New Orleans, I went for a walk on the levee known as the Moonwalk, just across from Jackson Square. Watching the river traffic navigate the famous crescent in the Mississippi, my understanding of the scene was totally changed by overhearing a tour guide explain that the river is more than 200 feet deep at that point, and the power of its flow is a daunting challenge for even the largest ships heading upriver. Hard to imagine!

In the second instance, I have a vivid recollection of flying out of Dulles on a sunny Spring morning after a night of thunderstorms and looking down from my window seat to see the glistening serpentine of the Shenandoah river. Its shape is a long series of pronounced "s" curves that would be hard to visualize from the ground. I literally gasped out loud at the sight!

The parallels with our work are many and varied. How often are we attempting to buck unseen undercurrents of unimaginable force? In how many instances could a radical change of perspective dramatically affect our comprehension of phenomena occurring right before our eyes?

Understanding local context is critical in efforts to transform communities, and many on the ground in those settings would argue that their situation is unique. And, certainly, we in the funding community have frequently been naïve in our attempts to disseminate ideas (perceived as coming from a cookie cutter) in an attempt to promote “best practices” and “take them to scale.” But there are other, more effective mechanisms to promote knowledge sharing among communities (just like those early river maps). Our charge here today is to explore how evaluation and assessment can be of use in that effort.

I’m particularly excited about having that conversation with this group, because your work is grounded in neighborhoods. Your knowledge of local context, history and dynamics directly informs your decision making as grantmakers. And with relatively small dollars at your disposal, your judgment needs to be particularly acute. It’s some of the most challenging but ultimately satisfying work in philanthropy, in my view. How can evaluation assist you and the neighborhoods in which you’re working to achieve your goals?

Or, perhaps I’m jumping ahead a bit too quickly. Given the negative experiences many communities and funders have had with evaluation, perhaps the first question should be: Why bother with evaluation at all? Our grant budgets are tight enough as it is. Why devote some of those precious dollars to evaluation?

To approach that question, let me share another story. Last year about this time, I was invited to be part of a working conference of more than three dozen activists, evaluators, and other “learning partners” from eleven countries at an old lakeside hotel in Gray Rocks, Quebec. The purpose of the 3 ½ day meeting was to discuss how organizations committed to social change might better analyze, explain and strengthen their work (Mott, 2004).

It was an amazing gathering of experienced organizers from all over the developing world, and their stories were powerful. A common thread was frustration with demands from donors for data that was often irrelevant to the core of their work. They called it “the tyranny of the targets.” Evaluation was so associated with that kind of burdensome, inappropriate focus on accountability that they had expunged the word from their working vocabulary, preferring instead to focus on assessment and organizational learning.

Their concerns about evaluation would be familiar to all of you. They constructed a lengthy list. I’ll mention just a few illustrative examples (complete list in Mott, 2004, pp. 10 and 11):

- Evaluations are often “add ons,” adding work without adding resources and often bypassing rather than reinforcing the organization’s own learning systems.
- The power imbalance between those who have the money and those who want it makes it difficult for groups to be candid or to press for better approaches to evaluation.
- Unrealistically short time frames are used to gauge progress, despite the fact that social change requires long time horizons.
- Change happens in a non-linear fashion, with many ups and downs, yet many donors’ frame of reference is a linear “logic model” approach.

In contrast, many of the organizations had developed their own internal systems of assessment, including a rich array of low-cost tools and techniques they had developed with client populations of limited literacy. Parenthetically, let me note that there are many lessons to be learned about grassroots assessment from the experience of our colleagues in the Global South. I’d strongly encourage you to seek out exchanges with them to continue this conversation.

Since a colleague and I had been asked to frame and lead a conversation on the topic of evaluation to lead off the third day of the meeting, we were in a bit of a quandary. We decided to tackle their concerns head on. We acknowledged their very justified discomfort with evaluation as it has been employed to their detriment. But we also needed to confront the reality of donors’ (particularly new donors) desires to track the outcomes of their investments. If anything, that trend is more pronounced now than in years past. We didn’t use the phrase “resistance is futile” although we might have (with a smile), if the situation hadn’t been quite so charged with tension.

Yet, it was clear from all the previous discussions that these groups were deeply committed to being effective in their work. They were also concerned about the ultimate sustainability of their organizations and recognized the need to make a stronger case to current and new funding sources. We saw that as common ground for a conversation among CBOs, evaluators and funders. Rather than refuse to use the word “evaluation,” we urged them to reclaim it and begin to reshape it to better support the goals of assessment and organizational learning. We then had a spirited session to see if we could begin to jointly craft some principles that might underly a more just form of evaluation (more on that later).

I wanted to share the story of Gray Rocks with this audience because even if you are not working in Uganda or India or the Philippines, I’d submit that the issues you’re confronting in your neighborhoods are essentially the same. Many (if not most) of the groups you’re working with have had similarly negative experiences with evaluation and are not interested in “being studied.” With limited resources to do their work (and commensurate limitations on dollars and time on the funders’ side of the table) anything dedicated to evaluation is seen in “zero sum”

terms ... as taking away from other critical needs. How can that trade-off be justified?

I believe that this group is poised to craft a unique and innovative response to this question for North America that builds on the experience of our colleagues in the Global South, and can also rebound to their benefit. First of all, unlike international donor organizations located thousands of miles from the recipients of their funds, you're in face-to-face contact with your grantees. You also begin with a set of values relative to grassroots community development that emphasizes participation and building voice and power among underserved constituencies.

In my conversations with experienced community organizers over the past two years, I've found a growing openness to dialogue about evaluation. Privately many are feeling frustrated that after a lifetime of work for social justice they see the tide of events in this country moving inexorably in the opposite direction. There is a general sense that there's lots of knowledge out there in the heads of long-time activists about what works and what doesn't ... but there have been too few opportunities for sharing and joint reflection. And like their international counterparts, they also want to be able to make a stronger case for increased and sustained funding for their work.

When the challenge of evaluation is framed in terms of learning and building reflective practice to support organizational sustainability rather than simply accountability to funders, I believe there's space for a conversation that can be of benefit to both grantees and funders. I'm not naïve enough to believe that CBOs will suddenly want to share all their missteps in elaborate detail. They have every reason to want to keep their distance from their funding sources. But if the resources dedicated to evaluation can be shown to produce information that is truly useful for all parties – to improve practice or strengthen advocacy work – the door could be opened to a deeper kind of partnership.

When CBOs are given the opportunity to help determine the measures of their own progress and to build their internal skills for self evaluation, there's a different quality to the exchange. It also changes the traditional hierarchy of audiences for evaluation. Rather than funders and policy makers, the first level audience for evaluation becomes the grantees themselves. The initial test of an evaluation becomes: how useful is this information for those doing the work on the ground?

As Engel, Carlsson and van Zee (2003) note in a Policy Management Brief for the European Centre for Development Policy Management, this kind of organizational learning approach recognizes the complementary role of multiple stakeholders in the evaluation process. It emphasizes a collective understanding of development issues and finding the way forward. Finally, it also recognizes the existence of potentially insurmountable differences in perspectives among

interested parties, yet at the same time acknowledges the need to negotiate sustainable answers to common challenges.

This approach also changes the role of the evaluator. From being a remote, research-oriented “objective” onlooker, the evaluator becomes a process facilitator whose job it is to help design and organize others’ inquiry and learning. Stakeholder analysis and communications skills as well as the ability to manage group dynamics become as important as analytic skills.

For those who would argue that this approach sacrifices rigor and objectivity, two supposed attributes of “traditional” evaluation, I’d counter that what is gained by incorporating a variety of voices and perspectives is of significant importance. Self analysis and reflection can also be quite rigorous and unsparing if community groups are given access to the right kinds of information and are given the opportunity to hone and develop their analytic skills. When there are few resources available for grantmaking let alone evaluation, an opportunity is created (just as in the developing world) for a different approach that is participatory and collaborative in all respects.

Some of you are undoubtedly employing this kind of approach to evaluation. For the rest of us, how might we begin to move in this direction? I’d like to issue three challenges for this group to consider:

1. Reframing our work as learning organizations.
2. Committing to a participatory approach to evaluation.
3. Engaging in a dialogue to formulate and implement principles for “just evaluation.”

Let’s take a few minutes to explore each in more detail.

Foundations as Learning Organizations

While most foundations tend to refer to themselves as “learning organizations,” very few actually achieve that goal in practice, in my experience. Aspects of organizational structure and culture or longstanding commitments to certain ideas or organizations can create barriers to the seemingly simple notion of making learning an institutional priority.

What would a foundation look like that was truly committed to the goal of becoming a learning organization? It would frequently ask itself the question “How do we know we’re being effective?” The first and most critical step toward that goal is an ongoing effort on the part of all the members of the organization to hold themselves accountable for the wise stewardship of the foundation’s resources.

To achieve that, a foundation needs to do the following:

1. It must ensure that adequate time is set aside for learning by the board, staff and grantees. Too often, we've all seen perceived time pressures drive decisions, with mixed results at best. This entails periodic strategic planning/visioning exercises to help ensure that the foundation's priorities and procedures are on track. It also drives how time is spent at board meetings. Rather than spending most of the time probing the details of proposed grants, substantial blocks of time are set aside to meet directly with grantees, to conduct site visits, and to engage in in-depth discussions with staff and experts in the foundation's fields of interest.
2. It must place a value on candor by all members of the organization, starting with the board. Board members must demonstrate a willingness to speak openly with one another and exhibit a genuine interest in finding out what's not working out as expected, particularly in the case of "favored" projects. Staff and grantees (including evaluators) must feel safe in their interactions with the board ... and know that they will not be sanctioned for sharing the unvarnished truth.
3. Closely related is a commitment to genuine dialogue that is respectful of varying points of view. A learning organization must encourage questions and be able to dispassionately debate disagreements, while maintaining collegial relationships among all concerned. Among staff, these exchanges have to be rooted in a strong sense of collaboration, cooperation and mutual respect rather than competition (whether it be for attention or enhanced funding for one's ideas).
4. Similarly, a priority must be placed on sharing lessons learned among all the members of the organization as well as with key audiences outside the organization. There can be no departmental secrets or "proprietary" information. "Open Source" software is an intriguing model that provides a platform for multiple individual contributions to a shared public product. The very openness of the process helps to engender the best possible outcome (see Weber, 2004). Placing foundation documents on its website for all to see is one way to achieve that kind of transparency within philanthropy.
5. Patience is also key. This has several dimensions, including the willingness to operate with a long time horizon. It acknowledges that change in human behavior and social systems is a complicated, multi-year undertaking at best. Patience also entails realistic expectations regarding evaluation. In my view, it is important that a foundation invest in evaluation to try to learn whether its grantmaking programs are achieving their desired outcomes. But there's no single "best" approach, nor do large expenditures guarantee a better result. Therefore, it's incumbent on the

board and staff to be able to openly explore the tradeoffs of different approaches to evaluation and to carefully gauge the opportunity costs of those decisions and allocations.

6. Finally, it's essential that sufficient resources be allocated to support learning. This is not a trivial concern, particularly since it's possible that most if not all of those expenses are likely to show up under "administrative costs." Even if they are qualifying distributions in the eyes of the IRS, many boards have strong feelings about the percentage of foundation resources that go each year to grants vs. administration. While I would argue that it's always prudent for foundations to keep their internal expenses in check as a matter of public accountability, in this case it can be a counterproductive juxtaposition.

This is tough stuff to implement. It takes real leadership. In an insightful piece entitled "Parting Thoughts on Foundation Evaluation" written as she was leaving the Lilly Endowment, Susan Wisely (2002) observes that :

The conditions and personal qualities that promote learning are not the natural bloom of organizational life. If they are to flower more fully, they require an organizational climate and personal relations that nurture rather than blight our impulses to learn. In my experience, learning is not continuous or smooth. Some times we are open to it, sometimes resistant. We need to ask why we don't learn, even when we earnestly claim a desire to learn. We need to explore what conditions make learning possible and what personal qualities and communal arrangements we must cultivate. We need to inquire further into how we learn and from whom.

Participatory Approaches to Evaluation

A second challenge is how best to directly involve CBOs and their constituents in the evaluation process. Internationally, there is a growing move to participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches (PM&E for short) that involve local people, development agencies and policy makers in deciding together how progress should be measured and results acted upon (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998; Estrella, et al. 2000). It is a challenging process for all concerned since it encourages people to examine their assumptions about what constitutes progress, and to face up to the contradictions that can emerge.

As Irene Guijt and John Gaventa (1998) note, "PM&E is not just a matter of using participatory techniques within a conventional monitoring and evaluation setting. It is about radically rethinking who initiates and undertakes the process, and who learns or benefits from the findings." They identify four broad principles at the heart of participatory monitoring and evaluation:

1. **Participation** – which means opening up the design of the process to include those most directly affected, and agreeing to analyze data together;
2. The inclusiveness of PM&E requires **negotiation** to reach agreement about what will be monitored or evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analyzed, what the data actually means, and how findings will be shared, and action taken;
3. This leads to **learning** which becomes the basis for subsequent improvement and corrective action;
4. Since the number, role and skills of stakeholders, the external environment, and other factors change over time, **flexibility** is essential.

A wide range of methods and tools have been developed to carry out PM&E. They all seek to compare the situation before and after a particular project or set of events. They include home-made questionnaires and scientific measurement techniques adapted for use by local people, as well as more innovative methods such as oral histories, and the use of photos, video and theatre.

Parenthetically, it's important to note that these approaches are being implemented in decidedly "low tech" settings in the developing world. It's not about a huge expenditure of additional dollars. It's qualitatively a different way of doing business. Action Aid, a UK-based NGO has been a leader in implementing PM&E across its programs worldwide via its Accountability, Learning and Planning System or ALPS (Action Aid, 2000). Its key principles include:

- ALPS information must be relevant and useful to the people who produce it, receive it and who need it to make decisions.
- ALPS requires that the information provider must receive feedback.
- ALPS aims to make the best use of staff time by cutting down on the written information needed.
- ALPS promotes critical reflection that enables us to learn from our successes and failures.

Implementing a system like ALPS turns evaluation into a two-way street of mutual accountability. As the Action Aid staff note in their first special report (Pinnock, 2001) "for the first time a large international agency has opened itself up to challenge and criticism from poor and marginalized people; we now have to fulfill our commitment to respond to the issues that people are raising."

There are fewer examples of a PM&E approach in the United States, but one of the most impressive lines of work has been undertaken by the network of individuals and organizations connected with the Asset-Based Community Development Institute. A clear and compelling summation of this approach is presented by Thomas Dewar (1997). I believe that most, if not all, of you are familiar with their work, but "asset-based community development" refers to the range of approaches that work from the principle that a community can be built

only by focusing on the strengths and capacities of the citizens and associations that call that community “home.” How can evaluation be useful in that process? Dewar lists at least three ways:

- It can help those who are doing (and funding) the work to learn from one another.
- It can educate others about what the work involves, and about the kind of impact it can have.
- It can also help identify ways for those doing the work to be more effective.

He also goes on to enumerate ten principles for evaluation that would be “appropriate” for communities. I won’t list them all here, but they are in alignment with the ideas we have been discussing, e.g. involving participants directly in the process, being clear about the audience(s) for the work and their information needs, and making sure that the evaluation is telling people something they didn’t already know. He also offers some practical ideas that are critical for success of a participatory process, e.g. documenting some results as quickly as possible and being “descriptive” to be sure the story of the work gets told amidst the data. If you’re looking for a single document to help you take this discussion to the next level within your organization, I highly recommend this one ([A Guide to Evaluating Asset-Based Community Development: Lessons, Challenges and Opportunities](#) see references for full information).

Another important U.S. example of PM&E was an evaluation of the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community (EZ/EC) program during the Clinton Administration (Gaventa, Creed and Morrissey, 1998). One of the ten sites selected for a PM&E pilot project was McDowell County, West Virginia. It is an area devastated by the collapse of the coal mining industry and one of the poorest counties in the country with a 60% child poverty rate (Rutherford, 2000).

A Citizen Learning Team was established that included community members, Enterprise Community implementers, a local coordinator and a professional researcher. It was successful in establishing a participatory evaluation process that enabled community representatives themselves to monitor and measure progress of their EZ/EC program as it developed. Members of the Team learned how to monitor change indicators and to analyze their implications, and shared this knowledge with others in the county. As the team went about data gathering, they engaged in community education and served as role models for citizen participation.

The process provided opportunities to create and expand networks, by helping people get to know one another, become better acquainted with other development activities existing in the county, and build new partnerships for action. Learning Team members grew from the experience by developing new skills and increased self confidence; some have even become involved in other

public roles and have pursued leadership positions in the county (Rutherford, 2000).

Principles for Just Evaluation

A third challenge is to institute a cross-sector dialogue that includes CBOs, activists, evaluators and funders to see if we can jointly develop a set of principles for “just evaluation” to guide our future efforts. By “just” evaluation, I mean simply an approach that works for all stakeholders. To use a California analogy, the “fault line” underlying many of the difficulties that we have experienced is that the key parties are often operating out of different conceptions and expectations for evaluation. Evaluators themselves are frequently “caught in the middle” between funders and grantee organizations who are not in agreement on evaluation and learning priorities.

One of the central recommendations of the Gray Rocks conference was to encourage such a dialogue. During our brief time together, we began to sketch out some consensus principles that might constitute a more just approach to evaluation. The context for our discussion was specifically around assessing the impact of social change work, but I’m assuming that’s where most of you live as well. This is just a starting point, but it gave us a glimpse of some potential common ground that could transform our practice. How would these sound to you?

- Social change organizations should be involved in developing, interpreting and communicating the results of the evaluation and receive adequate support to carry out those responsibilities.
- Evaluation should be designed to be useful in improving the work of grantees, the field, and others.
- Evaluation should build the group’s internal capacity for self-evaluation, and/or build on existing mechanisms for reflection and self assessment.
- Evaluation should respect and acknowledge the context in which the organization is operating.
- All the costs of conducting the evaluation should be fully funded.
- Candor should not be punished, inside an organization or by funders.

Over the past year at the Marguerite Casey Foundation we began a conversation among a number of funders of social change work, following my assumption that it would make sense to start discussing such sensitive topics “within the family” before we were ready to go public. But the real meeting of the minds needs to

take place across CBOs, evaluators and funders. Some additional conversation occurred at the recent Neighborhood Funders Group meeting in Boston. It occurs to me that the Neighborhood Small Grants Network is very well positioned to catalyze the conversation as well.

I've sketched out three big challenges and I know you're all already stretched thin just doing with work you're already doing with the resources available to you. Most of you are probably also not in a position to change the way your organization does business. So, perhaps it would be useful to think together for a moment about some first steps.

If you can't transform your institution into a learning organization overnight, consider ways in which you might personally incorporate a learning perspective into the way you do your work. How might you allocate your time differently to provide the opportunity for personal reflection or dialogue with your colleagues?

If your institution is unlikely to embrace a wholesale shift to participatory evaluation, what are some ways in which you might employ aspects of a participatory approach in your next project, even if it's only a conversation with your grantees and some of their constituents about how they'd like their work to be evaluated.

If you're not in a position to convene a group to probe the question of what constitutes "just" evaluation, perhaps you could start by sketching out your own ideas, or engaging a colleague in conversation on this topic.

Any of all of these activities would constitute small, but real steps in the process of transforming our approach to evaluating neighborhoods work. As Tom Dewar noted to me, it's like leaves dropping in the river. They may not change the flow, but they settle out, "decompose" and feed the fish and other critters.

So, to conclude, I hope that these thoughts have been not only provocative but useful. I haven't spent much time talking about tools or techniques because you've got a rich array of those resources to choose from for the rest of today. You've heard certain themes and ideas repeated (perhaps ad nauseum). I'd like to think of it as a confluence of streams back into the river where we started this conversation. It's because we stand in awe of the complexity of the river and its ever-changing flow (like the communities where we work) that I believe we're most likely to develop the most meaningful ways of measuring its progress... even though, as the sages have noted, "you can never step in the same river twice."

It's precisely because your organizations don't have a lot of money to spend on evaluation – and are therefore skeptical consumers – that I believe you can lead the way in pioneering approaches to evaluation that will better meet not only your needs but those of the neighborhoods in which you're working. The ultimate

challenge for all of us – particularly our Boards – is to take the long view. This is not a short-term undertaking where our progress can be gauged in regular, linear increments. Change in communities doesn't happen that way.

For a final perspective on the long view, I'd like to share a quote from Miles Horton's autobiography. For those of you who've not heard of him, he was the founder of the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee and his story is one that is a continuing source of inspiration for me.

Goals are unattainable in the sense that they always grow. My goal for the tree I planted in front of my house is for it to get big enough to shade the house, but that tree is not going to stop growing once it shades my house. It's going to keep on growing bigger regardless of whether I want it to or not. The nature of my visions are to keep on growing beyond my conception. That is why I say it's never completed. I think there always needs to be struggle. In any situation there will always be something that's worse, and there will always be something that's better, so you continually strive to make it better. That will always be so, and that's good, because there ought to be growth. You die when you stop growing (Horton, Kohl and Kohl, 1990).

Thanks to Tom Dewar for his careful reading of an earlier draft of this talk, and for his sage advice. One couldn't ask for a better teacher on this topic!

References

- Action Aid ALPS: Accountability, Learning and Planning System. London: Action Aid, 2000. Available on-line at www.actionaid.org.uk
- David, T. Becoming a learning organization. Seattle: Marguerite Casey Foundation, 2002. Available from the author at t_david01@yahoo.com
- Dewar, T. A Guide to Evaluating Asset-Based Community Development: Lessons, Challenges and Opportunities. Evanston, IL: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1997. order on-line at www.northwestern.edu/ipr/publications/evalwb.html
- Engel, P., Carlsson, C. and van Zee, A. Making evaluation results count: Internalizing evidence by learning. Maastricht (Netherlands): European Centre for Development Policy Management, 2003. Policy Management Brief no. 16 available on-line at www.ecdpm.org
- Estrella, M. and Gaventa, J. Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review. Sussex (UK): Institute of Development Studies, 1998. Working Paper 70 available on-line from www.ids.ac.uk/ids
- Estrella, M. et al. Learning from Change: Issues and Experiences in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. Ottawa (CDN): International Development Research Centre, 2000.
- Gaventa, J., Creed, V. and Morrissey, J. Scaling Up: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of a Federal Empowerment Program. In: Whitmore, E. (ed.) Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation, New Directions for Evaluation Number 80, Winter 1998, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guijt, I. and Gaventa, J. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Learning from Change. Sussex (UK): Institute for Development Studies, 1998. IDS Policy Briefing issue 12 available on-line from www.ids.ac.uk/ids
- Horton, M. with J. Kohl and H. Kohl, The Long Haul: An Autobiography. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990
- Mott, A. Evaluation: The Good News for Funders. Washington, DC: Neighborhood Funders Group, 2003. Available on-line at www.nfg.org
- Mott, A. Strengthening Social Change Through Assessment and Organizational Learning. Washington, DC: Community Learning Project, 2004. Available on-line at www.communitylearningproject.org

Pinnock, H. (ed) IA Exchanges Special: Review and Reflection. London: Action Aid, September 2001. Available on-line at www.actionaid.org.uk

Roper, L., Pettit, J. and Eade, D. (eds.) Development and the Learning Organisation. Oxford: Oxfam GB, 2003.

Rutherford, F. Strengthening Citizen Participation in Evaluating Community Development: The Case of the EZ/EC Learning Initiative in McDowell County, West Virginia. In: Estrella, M. et al (eds.) Learning From Change, 2000.

Weber, S. The Success of Open Source. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Wisely, D. S. Parting thoughts on foundation evaluation. The American Journal of Evaluation, 2002, 23(2), 159-164.