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Social Change Imperative: “Ending the Segregation of the Poor”

How can we decrease concentrated poverty? How can we promote and sustain economically and racially diverse communities?

U.S. Mixed-Income Development History

Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
1970s
Montgomery County, Maryland
1980s
Mixed-Income New Communities Program
1990-1992
HOPE VI Program
1992-2010
Atlanta Public Housing Transformation
1994-2010
Chicago Plan for Transformation
1999-present
HOPE SF – San Francisco Public Housing Transformation
2006-present
Choice Neighborhoods Initiative
2010-present
The Mixed-Income Development “Intervention”

- Public-private partnerships, market-driven
- Demolition, relocation and resident “choice”
- New urbanist, “mixed-income”, mixed-tenure design
- Stringent tenant screening, vigilant property management
- Some pre- and post-occupancy social services
- Varying approaches to governance, community-building
- Goals, priorities and philosophies vary

Mixed-Income Development in the U.S.
An illustration of “income mix”

- Market-rate
- Affordable
- Public housing
From Larry Vale, MIT:
Income mix in 260 HOPE VI developments compared with income mix in the 51 developments in the NIMC Scan of the Field

National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities
Roles and Services

Research and Evaluation
Research studies
Evaluation projects
Scans of the field

Networking/Convening
Mixed-Income Network
Learning Exchanges

Information Provision
Resource website
Mixed-income database
Mixed-income library

Consultation
Project design and execution
Operating culture shift
Community engagement
Data management

@MixedIncome
#integratingtheinnercity
Mixed-Income Research

Chicago Plan for Transformation
with University of Chicago

HOPESF, San Francisco
led by Learning for Action

Cascade Village, Akron, Ohio

Choice Neighborhoods National Evaluation
led by Urban Institute

State of the Field Scans
Social Dynamics (31 sites)
Resident Services (60 sites)

Hope VI Retrospective Analysis
with MIT

Mixed-Income Consultation

New Communities Initiative
with Dept. of Planning and Economic Development, Washington D.C.

Cleveland Choice Neighborhood
with the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority

Mixed-income development in Pittsburgh
with Trek Development

East Baltimore Redevelopment Initiative
with the Annie E. Casey Foundation

Data management strategies
with Urban Strategies, McCormack Baron

Community Life Model
with The Community Builders
Mixed-Income Development Database
Cities Represented

Current Projects: Cities
Research: Data and Methods

- In-depth interviews
- Household surveys
- Focus groups
- Field observation
- Document review
- Administrative data analysis
- Resident journals
- Staff journals

New Book!

Integrating the Inner City: The Promise and Perils of Mixed-Income Public Housing Transformation

Robert Chaskin & Mark Joseph

November 2015
University of Chicago Press
Defining “Success” in Mixed-Income Developments

1) Promoting and sustaining mixed-occupancy
2) Increased quality of life: physical environment
3) Building community/“effective neighboring”
4) Promoting individual social/economic mobility
5) Neighborhood revitalization without displacement

Research Findings: Areas of high success

Increased quality of life: physical environment
- High quality design of buildings and grounds
- Increased safety and security

Neighborhood impact
- Decreased crime
- Increased private and public investment
Research Findings: Areas of mixed success

Promoting and sustaining mixed-occupancy
- Generally strong demand for market-rate rental
- For-sale demand dependent on market conditions
- Low rates of return of public housing residents
- Substantial turnover in market-rate rental
- Changes in intended mix: rental conversions, vouchers

Research Findings: Areas of low success

Building community/“Effective neighboring”
- “Us versus them” dynamics
- Social isolation, exclusion and stigma
- Challenges re: public space, norms, governance

Promoting individual social/economic mobility
- No evidence of general improvements
- Limited resources for sustained social supports
“Incorporated Exclusion”

Physical integration reproduces marginality and leads to withdrawal and alienation rather than engagement and inclusion.

*Chaskin and Joseph (2015)*

Implications for Policy and Practice: Mitigating “incorporated exclusion”

- Marketing diverse, urban places
- Intentional vs. “organic” community-building
- Proactive mixed-income property management
- Inclusive decision-making: towards shared norms
Implications for Policy and Practice: Changing social and economic trajectories

**Post-occupancy supports and services**
- Deep, extended case management
- From services to capacity and network-building
- Changing capacities, resources and *mindsets*

**A strategic focus on youth**
- Proactive and broad outreach
- Youth as leaders and designers