Promoting Inclusive Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Communities: Promising Practices

**Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance
January 2019**

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO *BELONG* HERE?

National Initiative on
Mixed-Income Communities

JACK, JOSEPH AND MORTON MANDEL
SCHOOL OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES
CASE WESTERN RESERVE
UNIVERSITY

Center *for the*
Study *of*
Social Policy
Ideas into Action

USI | URBAN STRATEGIES, INC.
Families at the Center of Results

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report considers the key challenges of promoting "inclusive social dynamics" in mixed-income communities, presents key principles and approaches to achieve greater success, and spotlights promising efforts to advance these approaches. The Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance produced this report as part of a broader inquiry regarding social inclusion in mixed-income communities. Our aim is to help advance strategic action in the community development field to more effectively promote a shared sense of belonging, increased social cohesion and broadened voice and influence in order to increase equitable outcomes in mixed-income communities. The report was created through scans of the field, evidence mapping, reviews of the literature, and in-depth interviews with practitioners.

Our findings suggest that conventional communitybuilding strategies in mixed-income settings often fall short in overcoming barriers to inclusion because they do not address isolation and exclusion across individual, social and structural levels. Recognizing that perceptual dynamics, relational dynamics, and power and influence dynamics are all at play in mixed-income communities, we propose that successful mixed-income interventions must address all three of these dynamics in order to cultivate an inclusive community where everyone feels they belong and can thrive. Spotlighting four promising models—trauma-informed community building, Trusted Space Partners' community network-building, Kindred's parent cohort groups in mixed-race, mixed-income schools, and Regent Park's equitable governance models—we examine how these efforts seek to transform perceptions, relationships, and underlying exclusive structural conditions. We identify specific components of these interventions, including a comprehensive theory of change, community stewardship, and strategic implementation, which should be carefully considered and incorporated. A companion document presents a Conceptual Framework for Inclusive Social Dynamics. Another companion document on Implications for Action builds off the lessons here and puts forth specific recommendations for practitioners, policymakers, funders, researchers, residents, and community members to cultivate social inclusion.

The Imperative of a Greater Focus on Promoting Inclusive Social Dynamics

Mixed-income communities have the promise of providing a conducive environment for residents from a variety of social and economic backgrounds to thrive and lead healthy lives. One primary lesson that has emerged from past mixed-income community interventions (particularly where public housing sites have been redeveloped into new mixed-income communities) is that providing high quality housing and supportive services is not enough to ensure that low-income families fully thrive in the revitalized communities.[1] While there are clear benefits of living in a socially and economically diverse community, there are also significant social challenges. It has become clear that while mixed-income communities may facilitate residential integration, they do not ensure meaningful and positive social integration. Deeply held attitudes and behaviors—including perceptions of difference, othering, lack of trust, and bias—can reinforce the marginalization of low-income residents in a mixed-income setting. Today's political and social environment of race-baiting and exclusion exacerbates and complicates the us-versus-them group segregation dynamics that often naturally emerge in mixed-income communities. For example, we recently learned of a couple of new homeowners in a Seattle-area mixed-income development who, upon coming out to the community barbeque, asked the staff community builder (to her dismay): "This is great, how can we start a barbeque for homeowners?" suggesting the instinct to create spaces exclusively for people like themselves.

The social isolation that often emerges in mixed-income communities may be com-

pounded by individual trauma, health issues, as well as persistent barriers to resources and economic opportunity. That social isolation may further compound pre-existing health issues, having been shown to be as harmful as clinical risk factors.[2] Furthermore, there are often limited opportunities for active and equitable participation in local deliberation and decision-making in socioeconomically diverse environments. While conventional "community building" efforts aim to engage residents and provide spaces for interaction, research shows that it is particularly difficult to promote and sustain meaningful relationships, particularly across race and class differences.[3] Therefore, in addition to the financial, operational, economic, legal, political, and other consequential "dynamics" that are at play in mixed-income communities, we assert that "social dynamics" are particularly critical to the health and well-being of all residents.

We identify three main categories that make up what we refer to as "social dynamics": perceptual dynamics, relational dynamics, and influence and power dynamics.[4] Perceptual dynamics concern individual identity, efficacy, and self-agency; aspirations for self and family; neighborhood frames; and perceptions of one's role in the broader community and societal context. Relational dynamics concern how individuals are socially connected to each other, which encompasses factors like social capital, social support, social networks, and social cohesion. Influence and power dynamics concern how individuals can impact their surroundings and environment through voice and local influence, participation, governance, collective efficacy, and informal social control. Thus our framing of social dynamics is broader than more typical frames of social cohesion, social relations or social inclusion.

We believe there are two main imperatives at this stage of policy and practice to ensure that all people who live and work in mixed-income communities feel like they belong, can thrive socially, and can influence life in their community.

Imperative #1: Promote an enhanced and sustained vision, clarity, and communication among all stakeholders about **a shared commitment to inclusion and equity** in the mixed-income environment with a keen anticipation of the challenging social dynamics due to the socioeconomic and racial diversity in these communities.

Imperative #2: Implement intentional strategies to translate this **shared vision into durable policies, practices, and routines** that promote inclusive social dynamics.

Trusted Space Partners, which we highlight later in this report, advocates for an "operating culture shift," which refers to a significant change in the way that institutions, organizations, and individuals take (or fail to take) responsibility for cultivating inclusive mixed-income communities.[5] Like a Culture of Health paradigm shift, a culture of inclusive social dynamics would completely shift thinking and action in mixed-income communities. In Trusted Space Partners' view, to achieve mixed-income communities where all residents (and professionals) can thrive, existing community and institutional contexts that are so often (and increasingly) shaped by fear, division, and isolation must be replaced by an operating culture grounded in aspiration and connectedness. They assert that creating and sustaining mixed-income communities where all can thrive requires stakeholders (planners, developers, property managers, service providers, institutional representatives, funders, and resident leaders among many others) to navigate this endeavor with more holistic, proactive, and human-centered approaches than are characteristic of most past and existing efforts. This process demands intentional practices and spaces, dedicated capacity, and a deep commitment to shifting the way we think about, address, and encourage relationships both among residents and among community members, professionals, and residents.

In this report, we first briefly describe the existing individual, social, and structural exclusion

that establishes the imperative to promote inclusive social dynamics in mixed-income communities. We then provide a brief overview of the shortcomings of conventional community-building efforts. Next, we highlight promising models and key insights drawn from those examples about how to effectively pursue this endeavor.

Setting the Scene: Contexts of Social Isolation and Exclusion

To effectively cultivate inclusive social dynamics across race and class differences, it is essential that those working to promote mixed-income communities have a clear sense of the existing self-perpetuating conditions of isolation and exclusion. These conditions are at play at the individual level, social level, and structural level.[6]

The **individual level** includes physical, mental, emotional, and behavioral health challenges, and internalized racism. These conditions create barriers to meaningful participation in community life, generate negative neighborhood frames and limit perceptions of aspiration, belonging, self-agency, and the ability to envision and effect personal change.

The **social level** includes disconnection, othering, interpersonal racism and discrimination, stigma, and negative perceptions of peers. These conditions limit social interaction, the formation of social networks, conflict resolution, shared learning, empathy, and compromise. Because of these conditions, a collective sense of community often does not naturally emerge, particularly across lines of difference. Even in places with relatively high levels of neighboring (whereby individuals establish shared expectations and values that enable them to live well together), relationships most often emerge amongst people of similar housing tenures, incomes, and races. Research also shows that the more diverse a community is, the less interaction occurs, even among individuals of the same social group.[7]

The **structural level** includes differential means and access to quality services, amenities, and educational opportunities, disparities in participation and voice in decision-making by race and class, economic exclusion and income disparities, and structural and institutional racism.

In our view, the most promising practices to promote inclusive social dynamics address exclusionary conditions at all three levels.

Conventional Community Building in Mixed-Income Communities and Its Shortfalls

In many mixed-income community settings, particularly in planned mixed-income developments, there have been explicit efforts to promote engagement and a sense of community, in recognition of naturally-existing divisions between residents. Through activities such as social events and programs that are open to everyone in the community, these efforts generally intervene at the social level with a focus on providing opportunities for individuals to mix with one another. These strategies may include intentionally shaping the physical space to encourage social mixing through common areas and other design features, hosting activities and events on site, providing shared amenities and institutions, and implementing place-making strategies. Creating attractive spaces and opportunities for residents to interact, while important, is limited, and fails to reflect the individual–level conditions of trauma, poor self-perception and low self-agency, prevalent stigmatization, and broader structural conditions in which social divisions are embedded. They also generally focus on resident-to-resident connection rather than genuine engagement or relationship-building with those in positions of local and institutional power.

Some efforts intentionally combine supportive services (sometimes referred to as "human capital" or "social services") with community-building efforts. Through case management, new programs and supports that focus on

health, education, and economic self-sufficiency, this approach tends to incorporate both social-level and individual-level strategies to overcome components of isolation and exclusion. These approaches recognize that promoting individual well-being creates a more level social playing field, which is essential to the cultivation of more inclusive social dynamics.

Most mixed-income community interventions fail to incorporate a focus on structural-level inclusion such as equitable participation, inclusive governance, and equitable informal social control (without which public housing and other low-income residents' actions and voice and access to space may be constrained and disproportionately monitored and sanctioned). Where tenant councils or other structures for public housing residents do exist, they tend to be less influential than condo associations or structures for residents of market-rate units. In failing to interrogate the equity of formal and informal rules, regulations, governance structures, and norms, these approaches do not recognize the underlying culture and pervasive systems that perpetuate fear, isolation, and division.

How to Promote More Inclusive Social Dynamics?

We offer the following questions to guide decision-makers seeking more effective and durable approaches to promoting inclusive social dynamics in mixed-income communities.

Why? The Theory of Change

- Is there a comprehensive strategy in place that addresses perceptual, relational, and influence/power challenges and opportunities? Does this comprehensive strategy employ a trauma-informed/healing-informed, asset-based (as opposed to needs-based) frame?
- Have stakeholders jointly named the existing underlying historical and enduring conditions that perpetuate isolation and exclusion and their implications?
- Have community stakeholders developed and articulated a commitment to self-reflection, transformation, and an operating culture shift away from the status quo?

Who? Community Stewardship

- Are residents, community members, community-based professionals, and other institutional stakeholders "stewarding" the process of cultivating an inclusive mixed-income community? Are there intentional efforts to identify such community "stewards" and build their local capacity?
- Is there a shared understanding that everyone has a role and that promoting inclusive social dynamics is not a task that can be assigned to a particular person or silo of an initiative?
- Is there comfort with the need for both resident leadership and mobilization for advocacy and power-building to promote the interests of marginalized residents and community stewardship to cultivate common ground and a shared, inclusive institutional, and community operating culture?

How? Strategic Implementation

- What is the organizational infrastructure that will incubate, support, and sustain this process and how is it resourced?
- How can an "operating culture shift" to cultivate inclusive social dynamics be incorporated into all routines, practices, and activities?

Examples of Promising Practices for Cultivating Inclusive Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Settings

Each of the models highlighted below is notable for its explicit approach to addressing individual, social, and structural barriers. Unlike

programs and approaches that mainly encourage interaction amongst diverse community members, each of these examples is grounded in a theory that acknowledges the underlying exclusionary conditions and a need to radically shift existing mental models, operating culture, and practices. It should be noted that each of these examples are relatively new and all are still being piloted and modified on a relatively small scale of a single site or a few sites. So while these practices are indeed promising, there is still much to be learned about their implementation, results, sustainability, and scalability.[8]

Trauma-Informed Community Building

Trauma-Informed Community Building (TICB) is an approach to community-based work that prioritizes community healing and empowerment (see summary tables for more details about the theory, strategies, and implementation contexts on each of the four models highlighted below). This approach requires stakeholders to recognize individual and community-level trauma, which may have resulted from violence, racism, and historical harms. Such traumas cause a deep distrust of new programs and leadership. TICB applies the trauma-informed lens from the social services field to community-building efforts, to better acknowledge and address the deep challenges of individual, community, and structural contexts in high-poverty neighborhoods. Unlike in the social services arena, in a community setting the focus can be on the experiences of and implications for all community members, including professionals. This method emphasizes long-term consistency, reliability, and transparency, and is particularly attentive to how key actors position themselves to avoid reinforcing inequity.

TICB was first developed by Emily Weinstein, formerly of BRIDGE Housing, and Jessica Wolin, of San Francisco State University in the course of their work with the HOPE SF mixed-income public housing transformation initiative in San Francisco.[9] Today, the trauma-informed community building approach is influencing place-based initiatives around the country, but the model does not have any centralized home. In April 2018, the Urban Institute, which helped implement these strategies in Benning Terrace, published a practical guide to inform practitioners, housing authorities, and other stakeholders on trauma-informed community building and engagement.[10] There is additional work needed to identify specific policy levers to deploy and advance a TICB approach (please see our Implications for Action memo for our emerging work on how a range of actors can take action to apply these practices).

The strategies and desired impacts of TICB are conceptualized at the individual, social, and structural level. At the individual level, trauma-informed strategies strive to provide repeated and consistent opportunities for individuals to engage with the opportunities for personal and community support, and offer reliable incentives and personal rewards. In order to increase trust, motivation, and self-efficacy, strategies aim to meet residents at their current state of readiness and to avoid overpromising or introducing unrealistic expectations. The goal is to help residents envision change in their lives—despite their past experiences with people and systems failing them—and to increase their capacity to seek out this change. One exemplary aspect of the TICB model is its efforts to proactively create space and incentives for community members to take on leadership roles. At the social level, engagement and regular peer-to-peer activities are rooted in personal sharing and mutual support to create shared positive experiences and trust between residents and staff and to cultivate community leadership. At the structural or "systems" level, TICB approaches aim to build partnerships for long-term investment. Using community voices to communicate a sustainable shared vision to stakeholders, institutions can then better address local needs and opportunities. The goal is for system processes to better drive strategies based on community input and assets.

The model acknowledges that without these changes, systems will continue to fail individuals, reinforcing inequities and deepening mistrust of those in positions of power.

TICB is still relatively early in its implementation and evolution. In practice thus far, the trauma-informed community building lens has proven effective at expanding awareness and shifting narratives, but its outcomes have not yet been well measured. For example, trauma-informed language may be incorporated in strategy documents, but implementation efforts thus far have lacked clear mechanisms to track and evaluate outcomes. Another key challenge is the task of institutionalizing and sustaining a TICB focus. For example, at the Potrero Hill public housing development in San Francisco where this approach was originated, there has been considerable staff turnover. Weinstein and Wolin are no longer involved in the site effort, there is a new development team in place, and the relocation and construction phase of the mixed-income transformation has generated considerable disruption to local activities. Finally, there is a danger that a trauma-informed focus will reinforce a deficit focus, without a strong associated focus on existing resilience and on healing.

Trusted Space Partners

The Trusted Space Partners model of community network building aims to create a new organizational and community operating culture rooted in connection and aspiration. This process works to shift energy and focus away from existing siloed institutional and community processes that can foster isolation, division, and fear. Rather than working primarily through resident organizations and associations, the Trusted Space Model aims to create a new, fresh, inclusive, flexible, and open community network with no gatekeeping and many ways to join and participate. Using creative, dynamic open space techniques and intentional practices to foster meaningful exchange, community network building identifies shared interests and builds trusting relationships among diverse community residents and stakeholders.

Trusted Space Partners was founded by Bill Traynor and Frankie Blackburn, who are currently based in North Carolina. Traynor honed his perspectives and approaches on community network-building during his time leading Lawrence CommunityWorks in Massachusetts and Blackburn did so while leading Impact Silver Spring in Maryland. Today, members of the Trusted Space team train and coach city planning departments, public housing authorities, real estate developers, property owners, managers, residents, and community partners and provide on-the-ground implementation and technical assistance in numerous cities cross the U.S.

Trusted Space's community network-building processes are particularly intentional about weaving together individual-level, community-level, and systems-level transformations, through both a goal shift and an operating shift amongst stakeholders and community members. At the root of the Trusted Space theory is the belief that every individual—whether a decision-maker or not—has wisdom and value to contribute. When provided intentional spaces and opportunities to exchange, individuals across lines of difference can engage in relationships of trust and mutual benefit. The model calls for a goal shift—from distinct goals held by disparate stakeholders, residents, and neighbors in a community—to a shared aspirational vision. As referenced earlier, the model also calls for an operating culture shift in the way that individuals and groups interact and operate (moving away from compliance-driven, risk-averse and fear-driven routines and practices). The Trusted Space team helps build networks and promote operating culture shifts in a number of settings and communities, including the affordable housing and mixed-income community space.

The notion of an operating culture shift has been generally compelling to partners in various community initiatives. There are ele-

ments of the strategy that have been relatively easy for community members to launch and adopt, such as the monthly NeighborUp Night gathering for residents, staff and community members, in which interaction is fast-paced and curated with numerous opportunities to derive actionable value from time spent with others that evening. The "party with a purpose" elements are the same every time: heavy recruitment for diverse attendance, a lively and energetic welcome, a visually festive and positively disruptive atmosphere that primes attendees for a different meeting experience, a "new and good" opening in a seated circle where all voices in the room are heard saying something positive within the first 15 minutes of the event, a "table talk" period where meeting attendees spontaneously select and host conversation topics for the evening, a "marketplace" in a standing circle when attendees exchange information and favors or make positive declarations about self-improvement, and finally a "bump and spark" opportunity to mix and mingle. NeighborUp Night is just one "device" in Trusted Space Partners' community network-building regimen that also includes community pop-ups, steward-seeking, mutual support cohorts, idea contests, and neighbor-circles.

While the activities of community network-building have been relatively easy to launch, it has proven far harder to ground these activities within a broader, sustained process of an operating culture shift that meaningfully shifts mindsets about the trajectory and possibilities for the community, blurs and bridges lines of difference, and elevates residents and other community members to a different position of influence in order to shape decision-making and achieve durable policy and systems change. A key ingredient to help sustain and deepen the work is the organizational infrastructure and staffing dedicated to orchestrating the overall process, integrating these processes into everyday work flow, and taking responsibility coordination across various partners involved in the effort.

Kindred

Kindred, founded in Washington, DC by Laura Wilson Phelan, is an organization that builds structures and relationships for parents from diverse backgrounds to advance racially and economically just outcomes for children within their school communities. The foundation of the model involves carefully curated small dialogue groups in the educational setting to bring together diverse parents to build interracial, interclass relationships and create the space for honest conversations and action-oriented projects about equity. Kindred aims to shift attitudes and behaviors of parents in a way that will change school behaviors, and resource allocation and improve student outcomes. There is an explicit focus on equity and coalition building with a priority of creating a sustainable model by training cohorts of parents to lead dialogue groups and equity-driven actions on-going. Kindred's model includes the intent to build a digital platform for parents across schools to connect on issues of equity. Ultimately, Kindred's intention is to create a critical mass of parents who, transformed by their interracial, interclass experiences, become lifelong advocates for social justice in their priorities and actions, including how they raise their children.

As of 2018, eight school sites across Washington, DC implement the Kindred model (which is currently designed as a 3-year program). In the coming school year, at least four additional sites will be added, with the intent to scale the model through partnerships and training school-based staff. The model currently is directly implemented by Kindred staff and is funded in part by the school (sources vary depending on whether it is a charter school or public school), but mostly through foundations and individual philanthropy.

Though a young organization, Kindred has invested in two external evaluations of its program in each year of operation to assess whether the intended impact of the program is being realized. These evaluations, available

online, offer insight into the sustainability of the model and stages of Kindred's theory of change. Both studies found that parents who participated in Kindred's program experienced a change their beliefs, values and networks, especially as related to building empathy, valuing diversity, increasing their efficacy and diversifying their social capital networks. Further, parents who participated in Kindred accessed additional resources—either through other parents or the schools. The most recent evaluation, published October 2018, found that there was no diminished effect in the school where parents facilitated the dialogue groups for Kindred (vs. Kindred staff) with regard to building trust and community among parents nor in discussing issues of race, ethnicity, and equity in their schools.

This evaluation also found promising indicators of whole-school effect from Kindred's programs, including changing school environments to shift the culture to be more equity-driven. For example, at one site parents took initiative to draft and post an equity statement. In addition, they shifted their PTA meetings so that every other one is held in Spanish with English translation while the other is the reverse, to enable a more welcoming, inclusive setting for families whose first language is Spanish. These changes have been coupled with a noticeable difference in topics raised on the parent listserv and in the PTA to focus on creating equitable opportunity for families to access resources. There is also a new comfort level in naming race and disadvantage in different school experiences, and increased parent activism. Taken together, the evaluations suggest that the Kindred model has effects at all three levels of social dynamics: individual, social, and structural.

Unlike the other examples highlighted here, the Kindred model operates in mixed-income schools rather than mixed-income housing communities, and thus the social dynamics are shaped by a different set of organizational and systemic realities and constraints. However, the sophisticated model of cultivating mixed-income, cross-racial groups to promote individual mindset shifts, meaningful relations, and ultimately advocacy and policy change seems like it might be quite applicable to other settings such as mixed-income housing communities.

Regent Park

Regent Park, a mixed-income community in Toronto, Canada, has recently instituted an innovative governance model meant to increase tenant influence and power in decision-making and build leadership capacity. Regent Park is a revitalized Toronto Community Housing (THC) public housing site that began undergoing a mixed-income community transformation in 2009. The mixed-income design includes completely separate buildings for subsidized tenants and condo owners which creates a core level of segregation in the community. Anticipating that there would be an imbalance of representation and having experienced adverse social outcomes in prior mixed-income conversions, THC's plan to revitalize Regent Park prioritized social inclusion goals—building a cohesive integrated community while also celebrating its diversity—through the creation of a Regent Park Social Development Plan.

Julio Rigores, the Manager at the Resident and Community Services Division at Toronto Community Housing led the development of the current Regent Park governance model in collaboration with TCH tenants. As of 2018, this current governance model is only used by the Regent Park community, but the goal is to serve as a replicable model across TCH properties, and other mixed-income communities.

The prior system of governance—the Regent Park Neighbourhood Initiative (RPNI)—had played a key role in promoting resident voices (including early advocacy for the community's revitalization). RPNI disbanded, however, in early 2014 due to leadership and financial issues, leaving tenants without a working governance structure. In accordance with the Regent Park

Social Development Plan and in response to the Neighbourhood Integration Study conducted in partnership with the University of Toronto, THC aimed to develop an innovative new system that would ensure influence for THC residents in the governance of Regent Park. In anticipation of a 70 to 30 proportion of market-rate residents to THC (subsidized) residents in the new mixed-income community, the new system (and notably the process used to design it) would build tenant capacity and representation so that they could be more equal participants and decision-makers as it relates to important decisions such as funding streams and service provision.

The Regent Park governance structure consists of representational mechanisms on both the private condo side and the THC side, as well as a combined Regent Park Neighborhood Association (RPNA). At the building level, THC's system mirrors the existing condo boards', which have three directors per building. Thus, Regent Park instituted a three-person elected Building Committee for each building. THC Building Committee members make up a Tenant Council, which has a seven-member leadership team. Representatives from both the condo and THC side form the RPNA, Terms generally last three years (and bi-elections are held to fill unexpected vacancies). Additionally, subcommittees within the RPNA focus on priority areas identified collectively (including safety, maintenance, gardens, employment, and programs and services). While THC financially supports collaborative projects and provides staff for capacity-building efforts, RPNA is funded through a grassroots approach. Through connections with neighborhood agencies and in kind contributions, RPNA is financially independent of THC. All elected members are volunteers.

The governance model integrates both ongoing processes with sustainable structures to build individual capacity, cultivate new relationships, and create and maintain inclusive decision-making and power sharing systems. These structures exist both at the individual building level as well as the neighborhood level (through collaborations between TCH buildings and Regent Park condo boards). At the individual level, THC offers opportunities for leadership training and capacity building through workshop curriculums that focus on topics such as civic engagement, marketing and communications, community organizing, and advocacy. These workshops begin with training and capacity building for elected representatives. These processes are also meant to promote social cohesion and more meaningful integration in the new mixed-income community. With building celebrations, which are local gatherings within individual buildings, for example, residents can come together to celebrate the diversity of their communities. Participation in committees and the Neighborhood Association provide further spaces to interact with neighbors on equal footing, promoting relationship and trust building. Ultimately, the model's focus is to create an equitable governance structure for local decision-making that responds directly to local needs and desired outcomes.

While the model is still in early phases, some clear challenges and signs of success have emerged. There is a widespread culture around getting involved, though it's worth noting that complicated social tensions do arise. In the RPNA, for example, some residents have felt that their neighbors do not fully understand their backgrounds or understand the need for individuals to exercise their own voices rather than be advocated for. Sometimes well-intentioned market-rate residents tend to speak on behalf of TCH tenants, preventing them from speaking up for themselves. There is also general stereotyping to combat on both sides.

The current focal measures of success are participation and engagement in processes and events such as community surveys, building celebrations, Leadership Cafes, and elections. Both THC residents and market residents have shown strong interest in community participation, and all RPNA positions remain filled.

One staff member noted that residents—regardless of income—are most likely to actively participant when three aspects come together: personal enjoyment, the social connection, and recognizing the benefit to the community.

Conclusion

Research and practice indicate that the pathway toward successful mixed-income communities requires far more than social services and engagement activities. If we really want to promote inclusive social dynamics across race and class, our efforts must help transform individual behaviors, attitudes, and actions and also seek to change the underlying social and structural conditions that breed fear, isolation, and distrust in mixed-income communities. This quest entails an
approach to individual and community transformation that is firmly contextualized within historical and structural conditions and requires intentional,
conceptually-driven practices with a broad mission to shift (or more boldly, disrupt) existing operating cultures among all people and sectors that touch the mixed-income community. With asset-based and trauma-informed approaches, a shared and clear narrative, mechanisms to cultivate inclusive behavior, a willingness to shift influence and power, as well as intentionality and persistence, there will be a greater chance of creating mixed-income communities where all can truly thrive.

Citations

[1] See list of selected resource readings on page 15.

[2] See Pantell, et al. 2013.

[3] See for example, Chaskin and Joseph 2015; Fraser, Oakley, Levy, 2013; Levy, McDade, Bertumen, 2013.

[4] Note that the three levels of our social dynamics framework align well with the three levels in RWJF's Culture of Health Action Framework Action Area 1: Health as a Shared Value: Mind-

sets and Expectations, Sense of Community and Civic Engagement.

[5] Full disclosure: Trusted Space Partners and the National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities have a collaborative venture called Triple Aim Impact to provide technical assistance for community network-building and other strategies in mixed-income communities.

[6] This section draws on Bulger, 2018.

[7] Putnam, 2007.

[8] An evaluation of the Kindred model was released on October 3, 2018. To date, there have not been formal evaluation efforts of the Trusted Space Model. The Trauma-Informed Community Building Model implemented in HOPE SF's Potrero Hill site was formally evaluated in 2015. Other evaluations consider trauma-informed lens of programs such as social service delivery but are not specific to mixed-income settings.

[9] Weinstein, Wolin and Rose, 2014.

[10] Falkenberger, Arena and Wolin, 2018.

Acknowledgements

Summary Table of Promising Models
Key Design Elements and Implementation Examples

Trusted Space Partners Community Network-Building			
Theory of Change	**Core Principles**	**Highlighted Strategies**	**Implementation**
If people of different backgrounds are connected in a clearly identified network, make exchanges of value, and build new understanding, then they will be more successful at achieving systemic change and a higher quality of life. If we create intentional spaces, practices, and a network of mutual exchange and collaborative action, then we can shift the current operating culture of isolation, division and fear to one of aspiration, connection, and co-investment.	Human first Interdependent gifts and reciprocal exchange Compelling invitations for new members Action learning and innovation Form follows function	**Individual:** Frequent one-on-one outreach with a compelling invitation to new members to join the neighborhood network "Steward" teams that can build capacity for the network Sparking of a wider network with campaigns and opportunities for individual growth (i.e. forming a mutual support group) Devices like the "Marketplace" which recognize the value and wisdom of each individual **Social:** Intentional spaces, practices, and devices that promote meaningful exchange across lines of difference Mutual support groups, affinity circles, NeighborUp Nights, pop ups, and other consistent spaces that provide opportunities for individuals to build relationships and to grow the network **Structural:** Development of a shared vision of community change based on aspiration and co-investment Operating culture shift among stakeholders and community members around shared goals	**Delivery Model:** Consulting, coaching, training; some on-the-ground implementation **Setting/Sites:** Affordable Housing Developments (i.e. TREK Development Group, Pittsburgh; Edgewood Terrace, Washington, D.C.) Mixed-income Initiatives (New Communities Initiative in Washington DC, HOPE SF in San Francisco, CA)

Kindred

Theory of Change	Core Principles	Highlighted Strategies	Implementation
Safe, accessible ways for diverse parents to connect and have dialogue will increase empathy, increase how they value diversity in their childrens' educational setting, and share resources to support success of all children. The goal is to change beliefs and values as well as social networks, behaviors, and access to resources, and to take collaborative action to close the opportunity gaps at their child's school.	Addressing root causes of opportunity gap Sustained impact through equity-driven parent organizations Safe spaces to develop empathy and cultural competency	**Individual:** Discussion of identity, histories, and aspirations for children **Social:** Cohort models of parents from diverse backgrounds that come together in dialogue groups to build relationships and collaborate on actions that lead to equity **Structural:** Development of critical masses of parents transformed by interracial, interclass experiences to generate equity-focused policy change Coalition building to advocate for and drive more equitable resource allocation	**Delivery Model:** Program implemented by Kindred Staff **Setting/Sites:** Mixed-Race and Mixed-Income School settings (i.e. E.L. Hayne and, Marie Reed Elementary Schools in Washington, DC)

Trauma-Informed Community Building

Theory of Change	Core Principles	Highlighted Strategies	Implementation
Acknowledging past harms, honoring community knowledge, ensuring sustainability, setting realistic expectations, and creating clear ways for residents to get involved, encourage accountability and foster thoughtful sustainable work, will promote community healing, increased trust and engagement, and long term community change. Operating with a trauma-informed lens allows stakeholders to implement strategies that allow communities to feel genuine ownership over changes.	Do no harm Community power Acceptance Structural frame/Social justice Sustainability	**Individual:** Incentives and personal reward to increase individual motivation and to encourage leadership Meeting residents where they are; grief work Realistic expectations and avoiding overpromising **Social:** Repeated and consistent opportunities for peer and staff engagement Proactively created welcoming spaces for shared positive experiences All activities allow for personal sharing and mutual support and trust between peers and staff **Structural:** Community voices communicating a sustainable shared vision to stakeholders Partnerships for long-term investment based on community-driven research Strategies designed according to community input and assets Visible, tangible activities that reflect community change	**Delivery Model:** Strategic lens to apply to place-based service and engagement strategies **Setting/Sites:** Community-based Initiatives (HOST in Washington, DC, HOPE SF in San Francisco, CA) Other Government Programs (i.e. Office of Resident Services in Portland, Oregon)

Regent Park Model of Equitable Governance			
Theory of Change	**Core Principles**	**Highlighted Strategies**	**Implementation**
Power-sharing, democratic decision-making, and capacity-building to form an inclusive, cohesive, and representative community where residents have the mandate to influence decisions like funding streams and service provision	Representation Shared decision-making Capacity building Governance structures at multiple levels	**Individual:** Opportunities for leadership training and individual capacity-building through workshop curriculums **Social:** Building Celebrations to provide spaces where residents can come together to celebrate diversity within their community Participation in committees and the Neighborhood Association which promotes relationship and trust building with neighbors on equal footing **Structural:** Formation of equitable governance structures including Tenant Council, Condo Boards and Neighborhood Association Election processes to ensure equitable representation in decision-making processes	**Delivery Model:** Community engagement processes tied with capacity-building and equitable governance structures among residents across income levels **Setting/Sites:** Piloted in Regent Park in Toronto, Canada, a mixed-income community with separate market rate condos and public housing buildings

Resource Readings

Blackburn, Frankie. 2015. The Power of Intentional Networks in Mixed Income Housing.(2015). http://www.trustedspacepartners.com/uploads/7/7/3/4/77349929/the_power_of_intentional_networks_in_mixed_income_housing_-_blackburn.pdf.

Blackburn, Frankie, William Traynor and Yerodin Avent. 2018. Practical Ideas for Addressing Micro-Segregation in Mixed Income Communities. https://shelterforce.org/2018/07/06/practical-ideas-for-addressing-micro-segregation-in-mixed-income-communities/.

Bulger, Morgan. 2018. Toward a Theory of Social Inclusion: The design and practice of social inclusion in mixed-income communities. (Doctoral Dissertation. Case Western Reserve University, submitted June 2018).

Chaskin, Robert and Mark Joseph. 2015. Integrating the Inner City: The Promise and Perils of Mixed-Income Public Housing Transformation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chaskin, Robert, Amy Khare and Mark Joseph. Participation, Deliberation, and Decisionmaking: The dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in mixed-income developments. Urban Affairs Review. 48(6), 863-906. (2012). http://nimc.case.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/chaskin_study_7_web_1.pdf.

Falkenburger, Elsa, Olivia Arena and Jessica Wolin. Trauma-Informed Community Building and Engagement April 26, 2018. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/trauma-informed-community-building-and-engagement.

Fraser, James, Deidre Oakley and Diane Levy, Guest Editors. 2013. Mixed-Messages on Mixed-Income. Cityscape, 15(2): 83-100.

Gallagher, Megan and Erica Greenberg. 2017. Kindred Pilot Studies: Summary of Findings from Parent Surveys and Focus Groups (2017). https://kindredcommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Kindred-Urban-Pilot-Study-2017.pdf.

Graves, Erin. 2010. "The Structuring of Urban Life in a Mixed-Income Housing Community." City and Community, 9: 109–31.

HOPE SF Learning Center. 2015. A Formative Evaluation of the TICB Model and its Implementation in Potrero Hill.

Hyra, Derek. Addressing Social Segregation in Mixed-Income Communities (2016). https://shelterforce.org/2016/05/04/addressing-diversity-segregation-in-mixed-income-communities/.

Khare, Amy, Mark Joseph, and Robert Chaskin. 2014. "The Enduring Significance of Race in Mixed-income Developments." Urban Affairs Review, 50: 1-30.

Levy, Diane, Zach McDade, and Kassie Bertumen. 2013. "Mixed-Income Living: Anticipated and Realized Benefits for Low-Income Households." Cityscape, 15: 15-28.

National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities. 2013. State of the Field Scan #1: Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Developments (2013). http://nimc.case.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/State-of-the-Field-Scan-1_Social-Dynamics-in-Mixed-Income-Developments.pdf.

Pantell, Matthew, David Rehkopf, Douglas Jutte, S. Leonard Syme, John Balmes, and Nancy Adler. 2013. Social Isolation: A Predictor of Mortality Comparable to Traditional Clinical Risk Factors. American Journal of Public Health. 103:11: 2056-62.

Putnam, Robert. 2007. E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century. Scandinavian Political Studies 30: 137-74.

Tach, Laura. 2009. "More Than Bricks and Mortar: Neighborhood Frames, Social Processes, and the Mixed-Income Redevelopment of a Public Housing Project." City and Community, 8: 269-99.

Traynor, William. 2016. 4 Groups That Need to Change to Make Mixed-Income Communities Work. https://shelterforce.org/2016/05/06/4-groups-that-need-to-change-to-make-mixed-income-communities-work/.

Weinstein, Emily, Jessica Wolin, and Sharon Rose. 2014. Trauma-Informed Community Building. A Model for Strengthening Community in Trauma Affected Neighborhoods. https://bridgehousing.com/PDFs/TICB.Paper5.14.pdf.

Wells, Amy Stuart, Lauren Fox, Diana Cordova-Cobo. 2016. How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students (2016). https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/?session=1.