Promising Practices to Promote Inclusive Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Communities[1][2]

Joni Hirsch, Fines and Fees Justice Center
Mark L. Joseph, National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities

Mixed-income communities have the promise to provide an environment in which residents with a variety of social and economic backgrounds can thrive. Living in a socially and economically diverse community has clear benefits, however, significant social challenges also often arise. One primary lesson that has emerged from past mixed-income interventions (particularly where public housing sites have been redeveloped into new mixed-income communities) is that high-quality housing and supportive services alone are not enough to ensure that low-income families feel like they belong and can fully benefit from living in the revitalized communities.[3] Further, while conventional "community building" efforts aim to engage residents and provide spaces for interaction, research shows that promoting and sustaining meaningful relationships across divisions of race and class is particularly difficult,[4] and there often are limited opportunities for equitable participation in local deliberation and decision-making in socioeconomically diverse environments. 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 further exacerbates and complicates the us-versus-them group exclusionary dynamics that often naturally emerge in mixed-income communities. Therefore, in addition to the financial, operational, economic, legal, political, and other consequential

---

[1] This essay appears in Mark L. Joseph and Amy T. Khare, eds., *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*, please visit the volume website for access to more essays.

[2] A version of this essay was previously released as a Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance research brief with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance, *Promoting Inclusive Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Communities: Promising Practices*, (Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, 2019).

[3] Robert Chaskin and Mark Joseph, *Integrating the Inner City: The Promise and Perils of Mixed-Income Public Housing Transformation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).; Mark L. Joseph and Miyoung Yoon, "Mixed-Income Development," In *Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies,* edited by Anthony M. Orum John Wiley & Sons Press, 2019.

[4] Robert Chaskin and Mark Joseph, "Contested Space: Design Principles and Regulatory Regimes in Mixed-Income Communities Replacing Public Housing Complexes in Chicago," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 660 (2015): 136-154.; Khare, Amy T., Mark Joseph, and Robert Chaskin. "The Enduring Significance of Race in Mixed-income Developments." *Urban Affairs Review* 50 no. 4 (2014): 1-30.
James Fraser, Deidre Oakley and Diane Levy, "Mixed-Messages on Mixed-Income," *Cityscape* 15, no. 2 (2013): 83-100.; Levy, Diane, Zach McDade, and Kassie Bertumen. 2013. Mixed-Income Living: Anticipated and Realized Benefits for Low-Income Households. *Cityscape* 15 (2013): 15-28.

dynamics at play in mixed-income communities, "social dynamics" are especially critical to address proactively.

We identify three main categories that make up what we refer to as "social dynamics": perceptual dynamics, relational dynamics, and influence and power dynamics.[5] **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. **Relational dynamics** concern how individuals are connected to each other, which encompasses factors such as social capital, social support, social networks, and social cohesion. **Influence and power dynamics** concern how individuals can impact their surrounding environment through voice and local influence, participation, governance, collective efficacy, and informal social control.

While recognizing the complexity of cultivating inclusive dynamics across these three levels, we believe there are two main imperatives to ensure that all people in mixed-income communities feel like they belong, can thrive socially, and can influence life in their community:

- Promote an enhanced and sustained vision, clarity, and communication among all stakeholders about a shared commitment to inclusion in the mixed-income environment, with a keen anticipation of challenging social dynamics that may arise due to socioeconomic and racial diversity.
- Implement intentional strategies to translate this shared vision into durable policies, practices, and routines that promote inclusivity.

Trusted Space Partners, a consulting group with deep experience in community building that we highlight later in this essay, 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.[6] 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 inclusive mixed-income communities 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

---

[5] Thus our definition of social dynamics is broader than more typical concepts of social cohesion, social relations or social inclusion. National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities, *State of the Field Scan #1: Social Dynamics in Mixed Income Developments.* (Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, 2013).

[6] Trusted Space Partners and the co-authors are part of a collaborative venture called Triple Aim Impact to provide technical assistance for community network building and other strategies in mixed-income communities.

deep commitment to shifting the way we think about, address, and encourage relationships among residents, community members, and professionals.

In this essay, 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 four promising models: trauma-informed community building; the Trusted Space Partners community network building model; the Kindred interracial, interclass parent engagement model in Washington D.C.; and the Regent Park inclusive governance model in Toronto, Canada. We share key insights drawn from those examples about how to cultivate more inclusive communities, and we conclude with implications for action.

Existing Context of Social Isolation and Exclusion

To cultivate inclusive social dynamics across race and class differences, those working to promote mixed-income communities must have a clear sense of the existing and often self-perpetuating conditions of isolation and exclusion. These conditions of exclusion can be categorized at the individual, social, and structural levels.[7]

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 differences. Even in places with relatively high levels of neighboring (where individuals have established 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 frequent interaction occurs, even among individuals of the same social group.[8]

The **structural level** includes differential means and access to high-quality services, amenities, and educational opportunities; disparities in participation and voice in decision-

---

[7] This section draws on the research of Morgan Bulger, PhD. See, Morgan Bulger, "Toward a Theory of Social Inclusion: The Design and Practice of Social Inclusion in Mixed-Income Communities" (PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2018), https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=case1531151650737104&disposition=inline

[8] Robert Putnam, "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century," *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2007): 137-74.

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 should address exclusionary conditions at all three levels.

Conventional Community Building in Mixed-Income Communities and Its Shortfalls

Many mixed-income efforts (particularly in planned mixed-income developments) have included explicit efforts to promote engagement and a sense of community among residents, in recognition of naturally existing divisions. Through 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 interact with one another. These strategies may include intentionally shaping the physical space to encourage social mixing through common areas and other designed features, activities on site, shared amenities and institutions, and place-making strategies. Creating attractive spaces and opportunities for residents to mix, while important, is limited; it fails to reflect the individual–level conditions (e.g., trauma, prevalent stigmatization) and broader structural conditions (e.g., structural racism) in which social divisions are embedded. These strategies 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 and 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 better address components of isolation and exclusion. These approaches recognize that promoting individual well-being creates a more level social playing field, though these approaches do not generally address the individual attitudes and perceptions of higher-income residents – who play a significant role in creating inclusive (or exclusive) social dynamics.

Most mixed-income community interventions also fail to incorporate a focus on structural-level inclusion, such as equitable participation, inclusive governance, and equitable informal social control (without which low-income residents' actions, voice, and access to space may be constrained and disproportionately monitored and sanctioned). Where tenant councils, or other structures for public-housing and other low-income residents, do exist these structures tend to be less influential than condo associations or structures for market-rate renters or home-owners.[9] 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 systems that perpetuate fear, isolation, and division.

---

[9] Robert Chaskin, Amy Khare and Mark Joseph, "Participation, Deliberation, and Decisionmaking: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Mixed-Income Developments," *Urban Affairs Review* 48 no. 6 (2012): 863-906.

How to Promote More Inclusive Social Dynamics?

The following questions may guide decision makers seeking more effective approaches to promote inclusive social dynamics in mixed-income communities.

Why? 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 enduring historical conditions that perpetuate isolation and exclusion and their implications?
- Have community stakeholders articulated a commitment to self-reflection, transformation and an "operating culture" shift away from the status quo?

Who? Community Stewardship.

- Are residents, community members, and other community and institutional stakeholders "stewarding" the process of cultivating an inclusive mixed-income community? Are there intentional efforts to identify and build the local capacity of community "stewards"?
- Is there a shared understanding that promoting inclusive social dynamics is not a task that can be assigned to a particular person or organization in an initiative, and that *everyone* has a role?
- Is there comfort with the need for local power-building and advocacy to promote the interests of marginalized residents?

How? Strategic Implementation.

- Is there organizational infrastructure that will incubate, support, sustain, and resource this process?
- Will intentional strategies to shift the operating culture be incorporated into all routines, practices, and activities?

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.[10]

Trauma-Informed Community Building. Trauma-informed community building (TICB) is an approach to community-based work that prioritizes community healing and empowerment. This approach requires stakeholders to recognize individual and community-level trauma, which may have resulted from violence, racism, and historical harms and often cause 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. In a community setting (unlike in more traditional social services), the focus should be placed on the experiences of and implications for all community members, including professionals. This method emphasizes long-term consistency, reliability, and transparency of resources and supported provided to community members, and is particularly attentive to how key actors position themselves to avoid reinforcing inequity.

TICB was 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.[11] Today, the trauma-informed community building approach influences place-based initiatives around the country, but the model does not have a specific centralized home. In April 2018, the Urban Institute published a practical guide to inform practitioners, housing authorities, and other stakeholders on trauma-informed community building and engagement.[12]

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.[13] 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 influence this change. One exemplary aspect of

---

[10] 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. There is still much to be learned about their implementation, results, sustainability, and scalability.

[11] Emily Weinstein, Jessica Wolin, and Sharon Rose, *Trauma-Informed Community Building. A Model for Strengthening Community in Trauma Affected Neighborhoods,* (San Francisco, CA: BRIDGE Housing, 2014), https://bridgehousing.com/PDFs/TICB.Paper5.14.pdf

[12] Elsa Falkenburger, Olivia Arena and Jessica Wolin, *Trauma-Informed Community Building and Engagement.* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2018). https://www.urban.org/research/publication/trauma-informed-community-building-and-engagement

[13] HOPE SF Learning Center, *A Formative Evaluation of the TICB Model and its Implementation in Potrero Hill.* (San Francisco, CA: HOPE SF Learning Center, 2015), http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/hope-TraumaInformedCommunity_Building-2015.pdf

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 organizational and institutional partnerships for long-term investment. Crucial pieces of this involve effectively positioning and equipping community members to communicate their vision for avoiding processes that reinforce trauma, and promoting healing-oriented approaches.

The model acknowledges that without these changes, systems will continue to fail individuals, reinforcing inequities and deepening mistrust of those in positions of power. The trauma-informed community-building lens has proved effective at expanding awareness and shifting narratives, although it is relatively early in its implementation phase and outcomes have not yet been measured well. 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 originated, considerable staff turnover and the relocation/construction phases of the mixed-income transformation disrupted 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 the imperative of individual and collective healing.

Trusted Space Partners. The Trusted Space Partners model of community network-building[14] 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 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 seeks 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 helps identify shared interests and build trusting relationships.

Trusted Space Partners was founded by Bill Traynor and Frankie Blackburn. 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

---

[14] Frankie Blackburn and Bill Traynor, "A Call for Property Management Transformation To Meet the Challenges of Mixed-Income Communities," in *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*, eds. Amy T. Khare and Mark L. Joseph (2020)..; Frankie Blackburn, *The Power of Intentional Networks in Mixed Income Housing.* (Graham, NC: Trusted Space Partners, 2015), http://www.trustedspacepartners.com/uploads/7/7/3/4/77349929/final_-_the_power_of_intentional_networks_in_mixed_income_housing.pdf

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 across the United States.

Trusted Space's community network-building approaches 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 can engage in relationships of trust and mutual benefit across lines of difference. 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. Some elements of the strategy have been relatively easy for community members to launch and adopt, such as the monthly NeighborUp Night[15] 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, and idea contests.

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 shift in operating

---

[15] Frankie Blackburn, William Traynor and Yerodin Avent, "Practical Ideas for Addressing Micro-Segregation in Mixed Income Communities," July 6, 2018, *Shelterforce* (blog), https://shelterforce.org/2018/07/06/practical-ideas-for-addressing-microsegregation-in-mixed-income-communities/

culture—one that meaningfully changes 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 for persistence and sustainability from coordination across various partners involved in the effort.

Kindred. Kindred, founded by Laura Wilson Phelan in Washington, D.C., 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 core of the model involves carefully curated small dialogue groups in a school setting, which bring together diverse parents to build interracial, interclass relationships and create space for honest conversations and action-oriented projects about equity. Kindred aims to shift parents' attitudes and behaviors in a way that will change school behaviors, alter 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 ongoing dialogue groups and equity-driven actions. Kindred's model includes the intent to build a digital platform for parents so they can connect across schools on issues of equity. Ultimately, Phelan expects 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. Kindred currently is designed as a 3-year program at each school, funded in part by each school (sources vary depending on whether it is a charter school or public school) but mostly through foundations and individual philanthropy.

Kindred has invested in two external evaluations to assess whether the program's intended impact is being realized.[16] These evaluations[17][18] offer insight into the sustainability of the model and stages of Kindred's theory of change. The evaluators found that parents who participated in Kindred's program experienced a change in their beliefs, values and networks, especially related to building empathy, valuing diversity, increasing their efficacy, and diversifying their social capital networks. Further, parents who participated in Kindred accessed more informational and support resources, either through other parents or the schools. The October 2018 evaluation found there was no diminished effect on trust or sense of community in

---

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

[17] Community Science, *Evaluation of the Kindred Program Final Report,* (Gaithersburg, MD: Community Science, 2018).

[18] Alysse Henkel, *Evaluation of the Kindred Parent Dialogue Groups at Six Schools: Programs at Amidon Bowen Elementary School, Bancroft Elementary School, EL Haynes Public Charter Elementary School, Garrison Elementary School, Miner Elementary School, and Washington Yu Ying Public Charter School in the 2018-2019 School Year,* (2020).

the school where parents, rather than Kindred staff, facilitated the dialogue groups; nor were discussions of the school's issues involving race, ethnicity, and equity.

This evaluation found promising indicators of a whole-school effect from Kindred's programs, including culture shift to make the school environments more equity-driven. For example, at one site parents took the initiative to draft and post an equity statement. They also changed PTA meetings so that every other one is conducted 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 were coupled with a noticeable shift in topics raised on the parent listserv and in PTA meetings to focus on creating equitable opportunity for families to access resources. Parents also gained comfort in naming race and disadvantage in different school experiences, and their activism increased. 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, intentional model of cultivating mixed-income, cross-racial groups to promote individual mindset shifts, meaningful relations, and ultimately advocacy and policy change seems likely to apply in other settings such as mixed-income housing communities.

Regent Park. Regent Park, a mixed-income community in Toronto, Canada, has 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 a mixed-income community transformation in 2009. The mixed-income design includes completely separate buildings for subsidized tenants and condo owners, which creates a fundamental level of segregation in the community. Anticipating that there would be an imbalance of influence and representation, and having experienced adverse social outcomes in previous 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. 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 set out to develop an innovative new system that would ensure THC residents influenced the

governance of Regent Park. Anticipating a 70:30 ratio of market-rate to 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 residents could be more equal participants and decision-makers in important choices about 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 representational 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 site-wide tenant council, which has a seven-member leadership team. Representatives from the condos and tenant council form the RPNA. Terms generally last three years; bi-annual elections are held to fill unexpected vacancies. Subcommittees within the RPNA focus on priority areas identified collectively (including safety, maintenance, gardens, employment, and programs and services). While THC provides financial support for collaborative projects and staffing for capacity-building efforts, RPNA is funded independently at the grassroots level, through connections with neighborhood agencies and in-kind contributions. All of RPNA's elected members are volunteers.

The governance model uses intentional structures and processes to build individual capacity, cultivate new relationships, and create and maintain inclusive decision-making and power sharing systems. These structures exist at the individual building level and 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 workshops on civic engagement, marketing and communications, community organizing, advocacy, and similar topics. The workshops begin with training and capacity building for elected representatives. These processes also are meant to promote social cohesion and more meaningful integration in the new mixed-income community. For example, at building celebrations—local gatherings within individual buildings—residents come together to celebrate their community's diversity. Participation in committees and the neighborhood association provide other spaces to interact with neighbors on equal footing, promoting relationships and building trust.

Ultimately, the model aims to create an equitable governance structure for local decision-making that responds directly to local needs and desired outcomes. Some early signs of success and some clear challenges have emerged. There is a general culture of resident involvement in neighborhood activity, although it is 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 recognize the need for individuals to exercise their own voices rather than being advocated for by others. Sometimes, well-intentioned market-rate residents speak on behalf of TCH tenants, preventing them from speaking up for themselves. There also is general

stereotyping and prejudice 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, regardless of income, residents are most likely to actively participate when three aspects come together: personal enjoyment, the social connection, and recognizing the benefit to the community.

Implications for Action

The approaches and experiences of the promising models we have described hold some implications for action by all stakeholder groups involved in mixed-income community interventions. These broad, cross-cutting recommendations are:

- Develop a shared vision and explicit commitment;
- Promote skills and build knowledge;
- Establish role clarity and accountability;
- Sharpen strategy and intentionality; and
- Facilitate assessment and learning.

In addition, we offer the following implications for stakeholders in specific roles.

Implications for Policy and Practice.
- Elevate attention to the importance of inclusive social dynamics by incorporating it into project descriptions, proposals, reports, and other strategic documents.
- Provide trainings, workshops, and learning opportunities to create a platform of shared understanding and common language among staff and partners. Anticipate turnover and the need for to refresh current and new staff.
- Maintain ongoing discussions about historical and contemporary marginalization on the basis of race and class and its implications for current efforts; draw from a growing set of resources and tools on racial equity and inclusion.
- Revise job descriptions and staff roles to incorporate a focus on shifting the operating culture, and modify performance reviews to incorporate assessments of progress in attending to social dynamics, including racial equity and inclusion.
- Build out job pipelines that recruit candidates whose backgrounds include sensitivity to and skills in managing operating culture.
- Promote community "stewardship" and consider the identification, recruitment, training, and ongoing support of a growing cohort of community "stewards" who can

embrace the responsibility of cultivating inclusive social dynamics within organizations and in the community.

- Design, activate, and curate spaces—meeting rooms, lounges, parks, gathering places—that can serve as intentional, safe spaces for comfortable informal and formal interaction across lines of difference.
- Co-develop a clear plan, structures, and processes for decision making and governance that promote voice and influence from an array of community members.
- Ensure that program guidelines, regulatory and compliance requirements, and other policies consider inclusive social dynamics and promote the development of specific strategies that facilitate positive change at individual, social, and structural levels.

Implications for Research and Evaluation.

- Help advance the formulation of theories of change and evidence pathways (including the perceptual, relational, and influence/power pathways) about inclusive social dynamics as an element of mixed-income community interventions.
- Develop metrics and methods to track and document progress; institute regular check-ins on progress and opportunities for determining course correction.
- Build and disseminate evidence on strategies to promote inclusive social dynamics, including community network building, trauma-informed community building, inclusive spaces and venues, and inclusive governance mechanisms.
- Establish formal and informal partnerships with funders, policymakers, and practitioners that can support the learning, evaluation, and evidence-building process. Engage as a learning partner in peer-to-peer organizational relationships for learning exchanges and mutual accountability.

Implications for Development and Investment

- Developers should elevate the focus on managing social dynamics alongside the commitment to physical revitalization and social services, with a requisite commitment of time and resources.
- Developers and their property management partners should make clear that success on financial bottom-line issues (e.g., reducing turnover, maintaining high occupancy, promoting safety and security, reducing vandalism and property damage, reducing littering) all are contingent on strong and inclusive social dynamics and a community where all residents respect each other and value the shared community norms and expectations.
- Funders should use requests for proposals, notices of funding availability, and other funding guidelines to promote consideration of inclusive social dynamics. Funders should ensure that program and policy staff stay focused on these issues throughout the intervention, not just during the selection process.

13

Implications for Residents and Community Members.

Residents and community members should:

- Probe implementers to understand how residents are expected to benefit from living in the mixed-income community, and to understand how implementers define and see inclusive dynamics as connected to the community's positive outcomes.
- Contribute ideas, aspirations, and concerns to help shape the intervention's goals, definitions, visions, and commitments.
- Participate in trainings, workshops, and other learning opportunities about inclusive social dynamics and marginalization and their implications for the current project.
- Seek to understand and help shape the plan and structure for decision-making and governance so that it lifts up a wide range of community voices and reflects the everyday routines and practices needed to shift the operating culture.

Conclusions

Research and practice indicate that the path toward inclusive mixed-income communities leads through much more than social services and community 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. We must seek to change the underlying social and structural conditions that breed fear, isolation, and distrust in mixed-income communities. We must approach individual and community transformation in ways that firmly contextualize historical and structural conditions. And we must use intentional, conceptually driven practices to shift (or, more boldly, disrupt) existing operating cultures among all people and organizations 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, and intentionality and persistence, we will have a greater chance of creating mixed-income communities where everyone can truly thrive.

About the Volume

This essay is published as part of a volume titled, *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*, edited by Dr. Mark L. Joseph and Dr. Amy T. Khare, with developmental editing support provided by Leila Fiester. Production is led by the National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities (NIMC) at the Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University, with lead funding provided by The Kresge Foundation. The volume aims to equip a broad audience of policymakers, funders, practitioners, community activists, and researchers with the latest thinking and tools needed to achieve more inclusive and equitable mixed-income communities. This is the fifth volume in the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco's What Works series, which has sought to analyze a variety of key themes in urban development.

The views expressed in the essays reflect the authors' perspectives and do not necessarily represent the views of The Kresge Foundation, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco or of the Federal Reserve System.

Readers can view this essay, the framing paper for the volume, and all currently posted essays on NIMC's website where new pieces are being uploaded every month. Essays will be compiled and released in a final print volume, with an anticipated release in 2020.

You can also sign up to receive email updates and notice of other content releases by signing up for newsletter updates here.

References

Blackburn, Frankie, *The Power of Intentional Networks in Mixed Income Housing.* Graham, NC: Trusted Space Partners, 2015.

Blackburn, Frankie, William Traynor and Yerodin Avent. "Practical Ideas for Addressing Micro-Segregation in Mixed Income Communities." July 6, 2018. *Shelterforce* (blog).

Bulger, Morgan. "Toward a Theory of Social Inclusion: The Design and Practice of Social Inclusion in Mixed-Income Communities" (PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2018).

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

Chaskin, Robert and Mark Joseph, "Contested Space: Design Principles and Regulatory Regimes in Mixed-Income Communities Replacing Public Housing Complexes in Chicago." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 660 (2015): 136-154.

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 no. 6 (2012): 863-906.

Community Science. *Evaluation of the Kindred Program Final Report.* Gaithersburg, MD: Community Science, 2018.

Falkenburger, Elsa, Olivia Arena and Jessica Wolin. *Trauma-Informed Community Building and Engagement.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2018.

Fraser, James, Deidre Oakley and Diane Levy, "Mixed-Messages on Mixed-Income," *Cityscape* 15, no. 2 (2013): 83-100.

Gallagher, Megan and Erica Greenberg, *Kindred Pilot Studies: Summary of Findings from Parent Surveys and Focus Groups.* Washington DC: Urban Institute, 2017.

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

Henkel, Alysse . *Evaluation of the Kindred Parent Dialogue Groups at Six Schools: Programs at Amidon Bowen Elementary School, Bancroft Elementary School, EL Haynes Public Charter Elementary School, Garrison Elementary School, Miner Elementary School, and Washington Yu Ying Public Charter School in the 2018-2019 School Year*, 2020.

HOPE SF Learning Center. *A Formative Evaluation of the TICB Model and its Implementation in Potrero Hill.* (San Francisco, CA: HOPE SF Learning Center, 2015).

Hyra, Derek. "Addressing Social Segregation in Mixed-Income Communities," *Shelterforce* (blog). May 4, 2016. https://shelterforce.org/2016/05/04/addressing-diversity-segregation-in-mixed-income-communities/

Joseph, Mark L., and Miyoung Yoon, "Mixed-Income Development," In *Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies,* edited by Anthony M. Orum John Wiley & Sons Press, 2019.

Khare, Amy T., Mark Joseph, and Robert Chaskin. "The Enduring Significance of Race in Mixed-income Developments." *Urban Affairs Review* 50 no. 4 (2014): 1-30

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

Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance. *Promoting Inclusive Social Dynamics in Mixed-Income Communities: Promising Practices.* Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, 2019.

National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities, *State of the Field Scan #1: Social Dynamics in Mixed Income Developments.* (Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, 2013).

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

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

Additional Resources

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

Joseph, Mark L., Amy T. Khare, Jung-Eun Kim, "The Organizational Challenges of Mixed-Income Development: Privatizing Public Housing through Cross-Sector," *Urban Research and Practice* 12, no 1 (2019): 61-83.

Pantell, Matthew, David Rehkopf, Douglas Jutte, S. Leonard Syme, John Balmes, and Nancy Adler. "Social Isolation: A Predictor of Mortality Comparable to Traditional Clinical Risk Factors." *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 11 (2013): 2056-62.

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

Traynor, William. "4 Groups That Need to Change to Make Mixed-Income Communities Work." *Shelterforce* (blog). May 6, 2016. https://shelterforce.org/2016/05/06/4-groups-that-need-to-change-to-make-mixed-income-communitieswork/

Wells, Amy Stuart, Lauren Fox, Diana Cordova-Cobo. *How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students.* Washington, D.C: The Century Foundation, 2016.