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1. Policy context: mixed-income development
2. Organizational context: mixed-income center
3. Research projects and findings
4. Policy and practice implications
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?
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”
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

---

[nimc.case.edu](nimc.case.edu)

@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 Production and Services 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 Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh and 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 observations (meetings, community activities)
- 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) Nhood revitalization, without displacement
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
Physical integration reproduces marginality and leads to withdrawal and alienation rather than engagement and inclusion.

*Chaskin and Joseph (2015)*
Implications for Policy and Practice: “Activating the Mix”

- 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 case management where needed
- From services to capacity/network-building
- Changing capacities, resources and mindsets

A strategic focus on youth
- Proactive and broad outreach
- Youth as leaders and community builders
Implications for Development Teams

Expanding the Leadership Role

- Clarity about mixed-income goals and strategies
- Customizing design and strategies to each local context
- Broadening capacity: internal and through partnerships
- Focus and investment in mixed-income property management
- Concurrent focus on current and future phases
The Triple Aim Impact Consulting:
A Joint Venture of Trusted Space Partners and National Initiative on Mixed Income Communities

The Triple Aim Framework for Mixed-Income Development

- **Community Transformation**
  - Physical, Economic and Social Revitalization

- **Individual Transformation**
  - Social and Economic Advancement of All Residents

- **Operating Efficiency**
  - Increased property revenue and property reduced costs
Implications for Development Teams: “Operating Culture” Shift: From Fear to Aspiration

**GOAL SHIFT**
From separately-defined goals to shared interests

**OPERATING SHIFT**
From compliance, needs, and problem-solving to aspiration and co-investment

with Bill Traynor and Frankie Blackburn
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