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ABSTRACT

This study offers recommendations for a program to increase economic self-sufficiency among Bromley Heath residents based on a review of alternate approaches to economic self-sufficiency in federal policy and in case studies of local programs. Approaches are found to differ in their orientation toward either offering community-level interventions or interventions for individual families, and to reflect divergent visions of the appropriate role of public housing communities. It is assumed that self-sufficiency strategies suitable for the Bromley Heath community are those consistent with the objective needs of residents, and the prevailing community values and attitudes, as revealed in demographic, and survey data.

Among the key findings from the demographic and survey data are that the Bromley Heath community is composed of economically and motivationally distinct sub-populations, each having different needs from a self-sufficiency program, and that the community exhibits a significant degree of cohesion. The current collection of on-site services was found to promote community stability, but to lack certain key resources necessary to assist people in human capital investment. The recommendations offered include developing these specific resources, as well as instituting a series of policies and other supportive services intended to transform the community environment in ways to support economic progress for all population groups. The study ends by considering the effect of income mix on community cohesion.
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Title: Professor of Urban Studies and Planning
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express gratitude to the following individuals for their time, encouragement, and assistance. From the Bromley Heath Tenant Management Corporation, I wish to thank Mildred Hailey, David Worrell, Kevin Bumpus, Cheryl Patterson-Turner, Doris Jackson, Rick Johnson and Susan. The resources they provided and their welcoming "open-door" policy have been greatly appreciated.

From the Boston Housing Authority, I would like to first thank Amy Schectman, who served as a reader on my committee, and from whom I have learned an incredible amount about "real life" planning and professional writing. Nanette Robicheau has been a very important part of this research, and is probably most responsible for making my BHA internship an enjoyable and challenging experience. Susanne Forgione from the Family Self-Sufficiency Department provided many helpful insights on this topic. Steve Holmquist from the Legal Department was also an excellent source of information and direction.

I deeply indebted to Larry Vale, who both gave me invaluable assistance as a reader on my thesis committee and provided the primary data source. Langley Keyes was the perfect thesis advisor for me: he never allowed me to panic, and challenged me to make sense--often out of nonsense. I would also like to thank Louise Dunlap and Leticia Rivera-Torrez who have been special friends to me while I have been at MIT.

I would like to congratulate the members of my thesis support group, Sara Barcan and Lynne Bernard, and thank them for their empathy and helpful suggestions. Other people who provided support or advice include Sharon Greenberger, Adrienne Broadbear, Jo Louie, Janet Fisher, Joanna Stone, Dr. Miriam Wood, and Professor John Rife. Thanks to my housemates, Natalie Hardy and Kim Hawkins, just for being such great friends and for their prayers and encouragement. Finally I would like to thank my parents for their love and support, and most importantly I would like to thank Jesus Christ for fulfilling every promise to me.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ABSTRACT** .................................................................................................................................................. 2  
**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS** ..................................................................................................................................... 3  

**CHAPTER 1**  
Exploring the Meaning of Economic Self-Sufficiency through Federal Policy and Programs ........................................ 6  
  Defining Self-Sufficiency ........................................................................................................................................ 7  
  Federal Housing Policy and Economic Self-Sufficiency .......................................................................................... 14  
  Family Self-Sufficiency Programs in Practice ........................................................................................................ 24  
  Service Coordination Features ................................................................................................................................. 34  
  Program Effectiveness ............................................................................................................................................... 39  
  Summary ................................................................................................................................................................. 42  

**CHAPTER 2**  
A Demographic, Social and Economic Profile of Bromley Heath Residents .......................................................... 43  
  Bromley Heath Resident Profile ................................................................................................................................. 43  
  Social Conditions of Bromley Heath Residents: Social Networks, Living Environment and Attitudes ......................... 50  
  Summary ................................................................................................................................................................. 64  

**CHAPTER 3**  
A Profile of the Bromley Heath TMC and Other On-Site Services ........................................................................... 66  
  A Brief Overview of On-Site Services ....................................................................................................................... 67  
  Background ............................................................................................................................................................. 68  
  Resident Attitudes and Utilization of On-Site Services ............................................................................................ 70  
  Self-Sufficiency Services at Bromley Heath ............................................................................................................. 82  
  Profile of Selected Services at Bromley Heath .......................................................................................................... 84  
  Modes of Service Delivery ........................................................................................................................................ 87
CHAPTER 1: EXPLORING THE MEANING OF ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY THROUGH FEDERAL POLICY AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

Economic self-sufficiency is the guiding principal behind a number of national policies and local programs currently in place. While there are certain basic features common to all of these initiatives (for example, that the net effect of each initiative result in less reliance on public assistance and public subsidies), programs and policies diverge both in how the actual destination of "self-sufficiency" is understood and in their selection of the appropriate target for intervention. The goal of this study is to develop effective strategies for an economic self-sufficiency initiative at the Bromley Heath public housing development in Boston, Massachusetts, as part of a planning process undertaken in conjunction with HUD’s HOPE 1 (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) program. Given the variety of approaches applied to the concept of self-sufficiency, in order to accomplish this goal it will be necessary to address the following issues:

(1) "Self-sufficiency" must be clearly defined. While the HOPE 1 program views self-sufficiency through the lens of homeownership, many current residents may never desire to purchase units in public housing. Is there a broader or more appropriate notion of self-sufficiency for public housing residents? Also, should a self-sufficiency initiative primarily improve the lives of individual families or the quality of life in communities? Chapter one compares alternate definitions of self-sufficiency and raises several dilemmas currently confronting the self-sufficiency movement.

(2) What does self-sufficiency mean in practice? What lessons can be drawn from the experience of self-sufficiency programs currently in operation? Chapter one also
economic mobility and offers intervention in the form of coordinated services and built-in program incentives to encourage (rather than discourage) labor market participation. "Self-sufficiency" then is the antithesis of "dependency"--a state of persistent poverty.

The roots of persistent poverty in the United States are complex and include (1) the decline of the manufacturing sector that accompanied economic restructuring (Harrison and Bluestone, 1985); (2) massive migrations of unskilled African Americans from the rural south at the same time blue collar jobs were declining (Lemann, 1992); (3) discrimination in housing and labor markets leading to the rise of spatially concentrated poverty, disconnection from labor markets and the erosion of work-ethic type values (Wilson 1987, Goldsmith and Blakely 1992); (4) changes in family composition, including increasing numbers of single-parent, female-headed households (Bane, 1986); and (5) the rise of the drug economy and the crack cocaine epidemic. These trends occurred within the context of a public benefits environment that tended to punish rather than reward movement toward self-sufficiency. The punishments, termed "earnings disincentives" are seen most readily in the implicit tax rates people endure as they transition off welfare, and as subsidized rents increase in response to increased earnings. All of these forces have conspired to effectively erect the previously mentioned "barriers to self-sufficiency" for poor families and within poor communities.

Alternative Views of Economic Independence as a State and as a Process

While the factors underlying persistent poverty are complex, its policy remedy, self-sufficiency programming, offers relatively simple forms of intervention and therefore inevitably raises conflicting visions of both the state and process of self-sufficiency or economic independence.\(^1\) Does self-sufficiency mean earning enough to leave welfare and/or public housing? Does it mean earning enough to become a homeowner? The following quote from a 1992 GAO report illustrates the lack of

\(^{1}\)The terms "economic independence" and "economic self-sufficiency" will be used interchangeably.
reviews the practices and findings of five different programs designed to increase the employability of very low- and low-income people.

(3) The economic and social characteristics of Bromley Heath residents and of its environment must be examined in order to locate the specific environmental, institutional and personal barriers to self-sufficiency facing residents. Chapters two and three will profile Bromley Heath residents and on-site services respectively. These descriptive chapters attempt to characterize the community dynamics at Bromley Heath and to better understand the net effect of community life on residents' economic prospects.

This study ends by offering a series of recommended strategies for an economic self-sufficiency program suitable to the economic status of residents, the governing community values and goals, and the current mix of on-site and off-site services available to residents at Bromley Heath.

DEFINING ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY

The language of the self-sufficiency movement and the very term "self-sufficiency" is intended to convey a complete reversal of previous approaches to poverty alleviation. Traditionally, economically deprived families have received in-kind benefits and income transfer payments on the presumption that their poverty was a short term aberration that would self-correct. Research by Bane and Ellwood (1983) has shown that for 50 to 85 percent of AFDC recipients, this assumption was appropriate. However, the other 15 percent of long-term AFDC recipients account for a disproportionate fraction (more than 50%) of total expenditures on welfare (Ellwood and Summers, 1986). Likewise, public housing was developed to support families through a "temporary" housing crisis, but now houses many families who are second, third and fourth generation occupants. Where past policies assumed a degree of economic mobility among recipients, the self-sufficiency movement assumes barriers to
agreement within the federal government on the point at which self-sufficiency is reached:

"The Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) Act implies that self-sufficiency and economic independence have been attained when a family achieves independence from housing assistance. The Secretary of HUD [Jack Kemp] has said the FSS program will help lower-income families achieve home ownership. Other organizations, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, define self-sufficiency differently--as freedom from all government assistance, partial independence from government assistance, and intermittent freedom from government assistance" (GAO, 1992, p. 3).

There is no single operative definition of economic self-sufficiency, but instead many programs in operation that seek to lessen reliance on public benefits for a targeted population. Shlay (1993) suggests that economic self-sufficiency can best be viewed as a process rather than a state:

[A] sensible definition of economic independence does not insist that families are entirely free of public subsidies but rather are moving in the direction of achieving greater economic mobility and financial stability...[E]conomic independence is more appropriately viewed as a process of reducing welfare assistance, increasing employment, developing greater human capital, and increasing family income (Shlay, 1993).

However, there are also alternate conceptions of the process of self-sufficiency. In particular, does the self-sufficiency process involve overcoming community-level barriers to self-sufficiency or simply the personal barriers that an individual family might encounter? Shlay's generous definition resolves the controversy over when the state of self-sufficiency is attained by focusing on the process, however, it presupposes that the process involves an intervention at the level of the individual family rather than, for example, a strictly "community-level" intervention. Economic self-sufficiency as currently understood seems to exhibit this family-intervention bias, and programs that offer virtually any sort of family-level intervention are easily associated with the notion of self-sufficiency. Thus, Shlay (1993) offers the Gautreaux experiment (a court ordered program to compensate families in Chicago public housing for past
discriminatory practices by giving them opportunities to move to white suburban locations) as an example of economic self-sufficiency, even though fair housing and not self-sufficiency was its mandate.

Because the Gautreaux program arose from a consent decree in a housing discrimination case, it is designed only to improve housing opportunity, not to promote labor market participation. The program provides no counseling, training, or encouragement about employment. Participants are expected to be good tenants, but *there are no expectations about employment, either explicit or implicit* (Rosenbaum and Popkin, 1991, emphasis added).

Shlay's article goes on to present an array of approaches to self-sufficiency that extend services to families while manipulating various aspects of the housing bundle. We are, however, left without a meaningful understanding of these processes outside of the family experience. Furthermore, McKnight (1987) and Kane (1987) have argued that certain modes of service intervention can inadvertently increase dependency for families by diminishing their sense of personal responsibility and control. McKnight's alternative to the "services strategy" is for communities to encourage the development of local, voluntary associations where residents approach one another as peers, and thereby become community contributors rather than merely service recipients. McKnight says that voluntary associations are lacking in low-income communities precisely because of the detrimental effects of service systems. Also, Spence (1993) suggests that it is access to social *capital* (the underlying capacity to form these voluntary associations) rather than social services that is needed to end persistent poverty in public housing.

**The Dilemma of Community and Family**

The arguments put forth by McKnight and others call for a community level intervention (e.g., diversifying the income-mix, fostering personal networks among residents), but ultimately share the same goals of the "economic independence" process.
outlined by Shlay. The self-sufficiency movement has been primarily a "family self-sufficiency" movement, because it is after all families that hold on "too long" to public housing units and languish on welfare case loads. The origins of self-sufficiency as a budget reduction effort that subsequently views success as so many cases closed (i.e., families now "self-sufficient") has led to the current focus on family-based intervention. And strategies that operate outside of the family-based service intervention model are only marginally viewed as promoting economic self-sufficiency among low-income communities.\footnote{For example, empowerment zones seek to increase employment and lower welfare dependency, but are not typically considered to be "economic self-sufficiency" initiatives. Our perspective would therefore lessen the distinction between strategies thought to be in the realm of "community development" and economic self-sufficiency strategies. This interpretation may be most appropriate when considering site-based economic-self-sufficiency programs.}

Thus, while the self-sufficiency movement has apparently "resolved" any dilemma between family and community (by presupposing a family-level intervention), the broader movement to counter the forces of persistent poverty continues to confront the question of whether to intervene on behalf of (1) families, (2) families within communities, (3) communities and their families, or (4) communities alone? These options can be thought of as a spectrum across which various policies and programs lie.

**Diagram 1.1 Family-Community Spectrum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families alone</th>
<th>Families in Communities</th>
<th>Communities and their families</th>
<th>Communities alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies can be characterized as "families alone" if full attention is devoted to the family and its personal barriers to self sufficiency—no residential context is relevant except as it relates to program jurisdiction and basic service accessibility. Success is understood solely as it relates to the economic progress of the individual family, regardless of the community the family lives in currently or eventually moves to.
The category, "families in communities" refers to strategies that seek to offer services to families within a community context. Thus it would include programs that may be sited within a particular community, but whose mission is to primarily serve families, both in the immediate community and in nearby communities. The communities in which families are located become important as an environmental context shared by many program participants. Institutions based within the community (e.g., schools, health care) and other community characteristics (e.g., security, social networks) present both challenges and opportunities as they deter or assist family participants in gaining self-sufficiency. If communities happen to stabilize and improve under "families in communities" initiatives, it is indirectly through the improvement in the lives of individual family participants. In other words, community benefits may happen to flow through families.

Policies and programs fitting the "communities and their families" label seek to directly alter the characteristics of a particular community. The primary strategic aim is to transform community attributes such that all families within the community derive some benefit, therefore these initiatives are always site-specific. Services may also be offered to particular families, however, they are offered within a structure that is designed to maximize community benefits. For example, a program may incorporate peer outreach mechanisms, which serve to multiply skills in a community because each newly skilled participant becomes a teacher to her neighbor.

Finally, the "communities alone" approach shares the community concerns of the prior category but offers no additional services or any direct intervention to families; only some community-wide initiative. Families' economic prospects improve because the community climate has been modified in some specific way that supports earnings, voluntary associations, or labor market connections.
Related Programmatic Questions

The programs or strategies that do primarily involve service intervention for families (i.e., strategies in all categories except "communities alone") face two additional questions that have important implications for public housing communities: (1) which families should get help—the motivated families most eager to receive the assistance or alternatively, should limited resources be devoted to those facing the most extreme barriers to self-sufficiency, including lack of motivation? and (2) Is success synonymous with ending reliance on a housing subsidy and therefore leaving the public housing community, or is there some value to having families remain in public housing after they have successfully formed and attained economic goals? Neither of these questions is as relevant to community-targeted strategies, since each family residing in the particular community becomes an object of concern by virtue of being an element of a community system. Also, the community derives benefit from family investment only to the extent that the family remains in the community. The benefit to the community of a particular family’s economic progress ceases when the family departs.

The family-community spectrum presented in diagram 1.1 will be used as a framework throughout this study. In this chapter it is used to comparatively locate the goals of the following policies and self-sufficiency programs:

**Policies:**
- HOPE 1
- Mixed Income New Communities Strategy (MINCS)
- Family Self-Sufficiency

**Self-Sufficiency Programs:**
- the Family Development Center at Lafayette Courts (Baltimore, Maryland)
- The Lincoln Action Program Demonstration Partnership Project (Lincoln, Nebraska)
- Gateway Transitional Families Program (Charlotte, North Carolina)
- Project Match (Chicago, Illinois)
- The Family Investment Initiative (Winston-Salem, North Carolina)
The next two sections review the policies and programs listed above in the context of their orientation toward either family or community, and, for those cases in which families are the focus, the types of families targeted and how success is defined. Rather than attempting to resolve these questions, the selected strategies will be used to generate parallel examples of various approaches to promoting economic independence.

**FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY AND ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY**

Three initiatives contained in the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 illustrate fundamentally divergent approaches to overcoming persistent poverty within subsidized housing: the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Act, HOPE 1, and the Mixed Income New Community Strategy (MINCS). HOPE 1 and MINCS attempt to address the problems of communities, while the FSS Act authorizes service intervention on behalf of families and has therefore faced the additional questions, "which families" and "should the successful remain or leave?" These policies can be placed as follows on the family-community spectrum:

**Diagram 1.2 Family-Community Spectrum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families alone</th>
<th>Families in Communities</th>
<th>Communities and their families</th>
<th>Communities alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE 1 &amp; MINCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Focused Policies: HOPE 1 and MINCS**

Public housing communities have been particularly vulnerable to the forces contributing to persistent poverty noted above, and by the middle of the 1980s, these communities became characterized as prime settings for an emerging "urban underclass" (Wilson, 1987). HOPE 1 and MINCS are equivalent in their focus on the character of the public housing community first and foremost, and services for families
are offered as a means to that end. They are also similar in that they address the concentration of poverty in public housing by trying to restore "mainstream" or "middle class" influences into public housing settings.

HOPE 1

Founded on the notion that the demise of public housing is inherent in its nature as a publicly subsidized program, HOPE 1 was developed by free-market enthusiast Jack Kemp during his tenure as Secretary of HUD. In attempting to harness the forces of private property to alter the character of public housing communities, the ultimate aim of the program is to end government intervention in low-income housing altogether by allowing public housing residents or resident management corporations to purchase their developments. The underlying premise of HOPE 1 is the belief that both physical environments and individuals are transformed by homeownership:

Ownership, [supporters] argue, provides a number of psychological benefits, such as increased self-esteem, a sense of control over life events, and a sense of financial security. Moreover, ownership is said to give these former public housing tenants a strong incentive to work hard and increase their household incomes since their rents will no longer be tied to income. According to Jack Kemp: "Homeownership gives the poor new reasons to work and save" (Rohc and Stegman, 1992).

All families opting for ownership experience its psychological and environmental benefits, while those who wish to continue renting are offered replacement housing in another setting. Success is understood as remaining within the community albeit under an alternate form of housing tenure.

As an affordable housing policy, HOPE 1's efficacy is questionable. As critics such as Peterman (1993) have rightly pointed out, selling units to individual families in the end makes them unavailable for renters and constitutes a net loss of affordable housing at a time when shortages are still at critical levels.

Since vacant units, certificates, and vouchers can be counted as replacement housing, the real number of public and subsidized units is most certain to drop as
developments are converted. There is unquestionably a need for more, rather than less, housing. A policy whose net effect is to reduce the number of units seems unwise (Peterman, 1993).

Furthermore, Rohe and Stegman (1992) found that ownership of units was financially infeasible for a majority of public housing residents. Implicit in the provisions of HOPE 1, however, is the possibility that the social (as well as the physical) environment of public housing communities can become transformed by encouraging working families to stay in public housing and thereby restoring important linkages to the labor market. This potential outcome, implicit in HOPE 1, is the expressed policy goal of MINCS.

Mixed Income New Community Strategy (MINCS)

MINCS, currently operating as a demonstration at the Lake Parc Place development in Chicago, is a direct response to the research by Wilson (1987) and others on the causes and consequences of concentrated poverty (Shlay, 1993). According to Wilson, families living in these spatially segregated and economically inert communities become trapped into long-term poverty, essentially because the absence of gainfully employed families severs the community's connections to the labor market and collectively diminishes the "mainstream" values and disciplines associated with the world of work. Like HOPE 1, the salvation of public housing communities lies with the revival of middle class values, although under MINCS it is accomplished by importing "middle class" people rather than middle class institutions.

As its name suggests, MINCS aims to alter the income mix in public housing communities by reducing the proportion of very low-income households (typically AFDC recipients) relative to low-income (below 80% of area median income). MINCS also shares features similar to those mandated in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Act,

---

3In evaluating the Public Housing Homeownership Demonstration conducted across 17 cities, they found that "the average income of purchasing tenants was approximately two and one-half times more than that of all public housing tenants" (Rohe and Stegman, 1992).
including coordinated services and escrow accounts for accumulating savings in lieu of rent payments. Again, it differs from FSS in that the community itself is the primary focus. Services are provided to residing families to promote the stability of the entire community. The modification in tenant selection policy remains the primary program innovation.

With the rise of homelessness in the 1980s, the previous trend in federal tenant selection policy had been to ensure that public housing units and Section 8 certificates be first made available to the poorest of the poor. However, some contend that this policy may have exacerbated the "pathologies" associated with concentrated poverty.

The [National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing] argues that the distress of the public housing population has accelerated most markedly during the 1980s, with an increase in the proportion of public housing households with incomes below 10 percent of area median income rising from 2.5 % in 1981 to almost 20 % a decade later (Spence, 1993).

HUD has very recently responded by introducing major modifications of the past tenant selection policies along the lines of MINCS. An article in the Boston Globe cites Assistant HUD Secretary Joseph Shuldiner as stating that "HUD will usher in its new policy later this spring with regulations permitting local housing authorities to jump working families ahead of welfare cases in filling as many as 50 percent of their public housing vacancies." MINCS may very well be the most important public housing demonstration currently underway, since housing developments across the nation will soon institute similar measures.

**Family Targeted Approaches: the Family Self-Sufficiency Act**

The Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Act spells out the logic underlying most family self-sufficiency programs in operation today. It mandates that housing authorities provide coordinated services and monetary incentives for families in order to encourage

---

greater employment and economic independence. In the family-community spectrum (diagram 1.2) FSS lies closer to the "families only" extreme than to the "families in communities" category. The program has the potential to impact communities since public housing residents, as well as Section 8 holders, are eligible. Nevertheless, even when public housing residents participate, they tend to do so as individual, eligible families rather than collectively, as members of one community. Self-sufficiency coordinators typically work out of the central office of the local housing authority (LHA), and interested public housing residents go to the central office to apply and receive follow-up performance monitoring. The spirit of the program is to help people move up and out—that is, out of subsidized housing. Also, the program seems tailored to the Section 8 holder, who has no regulatory ties to any particular community. In fact FSS as administered to Section 8 holders is similar to the Gautreaux experiment in that families are given the means to leave inner city communities. Of course, unlike Gautreaux, families are also given a host of services and support programs to improve prospects in the job market. For Gautreaux, the relocation is the full extent of the intervention.

As a family-targeted approach, FSS has to confront the additional dilemmas noted above: namely (1) "which" families should the program target, and (2) should "successful" families relinquish their public housing unit (or turn in their Section 8), or rather, should they merely stop receiving their AFDC checks. These issues are discussed below, after a brief description of the central features of FSS programs.

The FSS Act makes implementing FSS a prerequisite of receiving funding for new Section 8 Certificates or public housing units. For every new Section 8 granted, an LHA must serve an additional family in its self-sufficiency program. Since fiscal year 1993, housing authorities can request exemption from the program only if they can
demonstrate that "operating the program is infeasible:" for example, if their particular area lacks the supportive services necessary to conduct a program. ⁵

The FSS Act outlines a framework that could be called a "standard" for all LHA-administered self-sufficiency programs in terms of the expected degree of service coordination and level of intervention. FSS consists of three main features:

- **Voluntary Participation:** families who volunteer to participate in the program may be either current Section 8 holders or current residents of public housing.

- **Service Coordination:** LHAs must establish a local service coordinating committee made up of representatives from local social service and job training programs. This committee helps to recommend a service plan for each participating family and works within their own agencies to better ensure that the family can readily access service resources. The family works directly with a FSS social worker, who further assists the family in accessing services and monitors the progress of each family in the program.

- **Escrow Accounts:** the escrow account is the program's solution to the earnings disincentives for those in subsidized housing. For families who earn less than 50% of median income, effective rents are frozen at their current level. Any increases in rent owing to increases in earnings are placed in an escrow account that the family can access when it successfully fulfills the goals of the service plan. There is no restriction on the use of funds in the escrow account. The escrow account provision ceases as earnings rise above 80% of median income.

- **Termination:** families who do not comply with the agreed upon elements of their service contract may lose their Section 8 subsidy (although their public housing unit remains secure) as well as the right to the funds in their escrow account.

---

Does Success Mean Departure?

The FSS Act was originally designed to encourage families to leave subsidized housing. The accumulated savings in the escrow account would provide an irresistible incentive for families to leave subsidized housing at the end of a five-year period, while their increased skills, job experience and self-esteem would make leaving possible. Under a 1992 re-authorization of the FSS Act, the definition of self-sufficiency was broadened so that families are now able to gain access to escrow account funds "when federal and state welfare assistance ceases" or when they meet contractual obligations. Thus FSS policy has shifted from requiring "residential" self-sufficiency (ending receipt of a housing subsidy,) to requiring either economic self-sufficiency (ending receipt of income transfer payments), or compliance with the service plan--i.e., satisfactory participation in a process of self-sufficiency (Shlay, 1993).

This change is an important one to the social and economic character of public housing since it now allows people engaged in a progressive economic process to continue residing in public housing communities. When the goal was exclusively articulated as residential self-sufficiency, public housing communities were implicitly viewed as places of high resident turnover as families would move in, work to become self-sufficient, and leave within five years--newly equipped to fully immerse themselves in mainstream economic life. At any given moment, public housing communities would be made up of people in transition, and long-term residence in public housing would increasingly be viewed as personal failure.

The broader notion of "economic" self-sufficiency supports a vision of increasing the economic choices available to public housing residents, while at the same time allowing them to choose to remain in that housing. Under a regime where economic

---

6Ibid.
7This scenario assumes that there is a significant fraction of a public housing development that participates. Again, this is unlikely since FSS does not tend to target developments but individual households in public housing.
The question of whether or not to target motivated families illustrates well the interconnection of these policy dilemmas. For example, requiring that motivated families leave a "distressed" community as an immediate goal of a self-sufficiency program undermines the positive synergy that can result from having some critical mass of families in public housing who begin progress toward self-sufficiency and who, through their personal associations, bring other less motivated friends along. Thus, this sort of "creaming" in a self-sufficiency program, particularly where self-sufficiency is defined as leaving public housing, would be totally at odds with the community oriented approach, which would recognize the important influence that motivated families can have on their neighbors.

Limitations of FSS as a Community targeted Approach

The Family Self Sufficiency Act mandated that all housing authorities establish a Family Self-Sufficiency program, and presumably hundreds of these programs are or will be up and running across the country over the next few years. However, the FSS Act only requires that the number of new participating families within each LHA equal the number of new Section 8s or public housing units granted to the LHA by HUD in a given year. In the present era of lean budgeting, only 25,000 to 30,000 new families nationwide may be served each year by these programs. And some housing authorities, like the Boston Housing Authority, may opt to limit participation to Section 8 holders. This practice guarantees that the FSS program will serve families rather than communities because the Section 8 program is, by nature, a scattered site subsidy. While the FSS Act ensures that FSS programs will proliferate among LHAs in the coming years, more localized family self-sufficiency programs will also continue to spontaneously emerge, independently of LHAs and the FSS Act mandates, as different
self-sufficiency is promoted within public housing, the possibility arises that a balanced income distribution (and its associated benefits) may be restored to public housing communities, even while families remain the targeted focus.

**Motivated or Unmotivated?**

In targeting families, a self-sufficiency program inevitably leaves some out. The question arises, what happens to the ones left behind? Is the self-sufficiency movement simply another limited program that solves problems for some elite subset of families, but which leaves the masses of poor families in the same economic rut, or perhaps in a worse predicament as the most motivated and stable families are encouraged out of their communities? Also, does the need to demonstrate success in these programs tempt administrators to offer services to the "cream of the crop," or "creaming" as the phenomenon has come to be called?

The dilemma over which families to target was a source of contention between HUD and the LHAs administering the FSS program. While HUD was concerned with the possibility of "creaming," LHAs argued that limiting their ability to pre-screen families for motivation "will increase the time needed to administer the FSS program and may limit an [LHA's] ability to obtain supportive services for program participants" (GAO, 1992). The current compromise solution is that LHAs can screen for motivational factors such as interest and career ambition, but not for capability factors such as education, and job experience (Shlay, 1993). Thus, anyone wanting services, regardless of how limited their skill level might be, can participate in Family Self-Sufficiency. Of course, if motivation is positively correlated with higher skill level, creaming is likely to occur despite the new policy.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\)If "creaming" refers to recruiting those most likely to succeed, the HUD-LHA compromise assumes that people cannot make it on motivation alone. This is a strong assumption. It is more likely that the compromise acknowledges that creaming will take place, but establishes acceptable parameters for it.
community-based groups seek solutions to the problem of persistent poverty among their residents.⁹

Even community- or site-based self-sufficiency programs, operating independently from local housing authorities and FSS regulations, face real challenges to community transformation. For example, a family self-sufficiency program may try to influence the character of a public housing community by bringing additional services on-site, such as day care, health care, job training, and adult education. Bringing in services does not, however, guarantee that troubled families will use them. Without outreach, and built-in mechanisms to ensure that the benefits of the program do not merely fall to the ambitious few, the isolation that tends to exist within troubled housing developments suggests that a site-based program can have a very limited community impact. An unpublished study on the Mission Hill public housing development in Boston, Massachusetts found that the most stable residents were also the most reluctant to get to know others within the development (Wilkinson, 1992). These households responded to the social disintegration in the development by insulating themselves from the total environment—including their neighbors. If people in public housing are suspicious and mistrustful of one another, the kind of social dynamic that can result from positive peer influence and the presence of positive community role models is lost. Instead, residents retreat to their own units after job training or ESL classes, and neighbors remain unaware of their new goals and accomplishments.

**Policies Summary**

With HUD's new tenant selection criteria, federal policy appears to be weighted more toward the "community" end of the family-community spectrum (see diagram 1.3 below).

⁹For example, Bromley Heath's self-sufficiency program will be a site-based program unconnected with BHA's FSS program. It is being developed independently of FSS, in connection with HOPE I funding.
Diagram 1.3. Family-Community Spectrum

However, HOPE 1's long-term future is unclear since the program reflects the philosophy of the Republican party's ultra-conservative wing, while the recent election of a Democratic president signals a national mood drifting toward more moderate positions. With MINCS as a small scale demonstration, federal housing policy is thus ultimately resting on two nationwide initiatives: Family Self-Sufficiency targeting services for individual families, and the reforms in tenant selection, targeting the composition of public housing communities.

The gap in federal policy clearly evident in the "families in communities" category is likely due to the localized nature of these sorts of initiatives. It is difficult for LHAs to administer site-based programs under FSS because HUD provides no funds for services and very little for administrative overhead. Centralized FSS programs are the only feasible way for LHAs to comply with FSS mandates. Thus, as we shall see in the next section, which reviews the experiences of five economic self-sufficiency programs, many of the site-based programs have come about through partnerships with non-profits, or small scale HUD demonstration projects rather than through the Family Self-Sufficiency Act.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAMS IN PRACTICE

Over the past 7 years, various housing authorities have established "pioneer" family self-sufficiency programs--either because of participation in earlier demonstration programs (Charlotte Housing Authority), an unusually pro-active institutional climate
(Baltimore Housing Authority) or through an affiliation with a private non-profit catalyst (Chicago's Project Match). The experience of these agencies and others not affiliated with LHAs (Lincoln JOBS Demonstration and the Family Investment Initiative) in actually operating self-sufficiency programs is informative, both as pilot data and as a way to compare alternate visions of community and family development and their programmatic implications.

Not surprisingly, each "family" self-sufficiency program offers service intervention at the family level, and can be said to share a family targeted strategy. However, some programs serve families within a community context and include features to either positively alter the community, or to "protect" participating families from negative community influences.

**Diagram 1.4 Family-Community Spectrum**

Since each of these programs provides services for families in one form or another, no program could be described as targeting "communities alone" (which involves community-level interventions only). Likewise, each program must address the additional questions of which families to target and how to define success. As suggested earlier, we can anticipate that programs seeking to improve communities will tend to target a wider range of residents and will not insist that success means departure, whereas programs that desire to, first and foremost, improve the lives of families may approach these questions in a variety of ways, depending upon specific program goals.
In this section, we will first present an overview of each program outlining their essential features. Secondly, we will progress across the family-community spectrum describing the elements of each program that (1) locate it on the spectrum, (2) indicate "which" families get targeted and (3) indicate the residential implications of "success." Third, program examples will be used to illustrate various approaches to the important issue of service coordination. Finally, program evaluation results will be reviewed, both to discover the extent to which program goals were realized, and to help establish reasonable expectations for program effectiveness.

Program Overview

- **The Family Development Center** at the Lafayette Courts housing development in Baltimore began in 1987. The Family Development Center (FDC) is an "integrated service delivery center operating under a single administrative entity" (Pines, 1992). All services that are brought on-site come under the umbrella of the FDC. They provide child care, youth services, employment and training, education and health care service to the whole family.

- **Gateway Transitional Families Program** is a self-sufficiency program run by the Charlotte Housing Authority since 1989. It is not based in a particular development, however, participants either reside in public housing, or are on the waiting list for public housing. In addition to day care, education and job training, participants are encouraged to pursue home ownership.

- **Project Match** is a program developed by researchers at the Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research at Northwestern University in 1985. It is based at the Cabrini-Green public housing development in Chicago, Illinois. Project Match has developed a strong case management model where needed services are brokered rather than brought on-site.

- **The Lincoln Action Program Demonstration Partnership Project** (JOBS/DPP) is a demonstration program to test the effect of attaching intensive, in-home case management services to the JOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) program. It has been running since 1990 in Lincoln, Nebraska, and provides an array of services to help welfare recipients overcome barriers to self-sufficiency.

- **The Family Investment Initiative** (FII) is a program run by the "Experiment in Self-Reliance," in Winston Salem, North Carolina. The program has been in
operation since 1991 and offers a very structured program of case management to AFDC recipients. The Family Investment Initiative is not based at a particular site, however, it serves many residents living in subsidized housing.

Families Only: Lincoln JOBS Demonstration Partnership Project, (Lincoln, Nebraska)

The JOBS initiative is essentially a welfare-to-work program that seeks to end long-term welfare dependency. The full objective is to work with the individual family, regardless of the community setting or environment, and provide needed services to encourage self-sufficiency defined as "ineligibility for public assistance by virtue of employment." The Lincoln JOBS Demonstration Partnership Project (JOBS/DPP) articulates all objectives with reference to an individual family's attempt to overcome its own personal barriers to self-sufficiency. There were five basic objectives of the program:

- raise average salary while lowering average ADC (Aid to Dependent Children) payments;
- enroll participants in appropriate educational programs;
- increase basic living skills;
- decrease barriers to self-sufficiency; and
- raise access to health care by increasing immunizations, increasing the number of patients who have a regular doctor, and decreasing the number of inappropriate emergency room visits.

Types of Families Targeted

The JOBS/DPP, like JOBS programs across the country, targets those families most in danger of long-term welfare dependency.

JOBS targets welfare recipients under 24 years old who lack a high school education or who have limited work experience, long term welfare recipients (3 out of the previous 5 years), and recipients with a youngest child within 2 years of being

---

ineligible because of age. These groups are targeted because they have the most difficulty becoming self-sufficient.\textsuperscript{11}

The challenge of targeting this group, however, is getting them to seek out services. Programs hoping to serve the most dependent must either incorporate a carrot or a stick. As a JOBS initiative, JOBS/DPP was able to employ the latter, since participation in JOBS is required of all AFDC recipients.\textsuperscript{12} The demonstration consisted of three levels of intervention: intensive, moderate and a control group that received very light services. Those in need of the most intensive intervention were required to participate as a pre-condition for receiving welfare.

**Residential Implications of Success**

The JOBS/DPP has no requirements or expectations of successful participants with regards to housing.

**The Family Investment Initiative (Winston-Salem, North Carolina)**

The Family Investment Initiative (FII) falls somewhere between "families-only" strategies and "families within communities" strategies. FII provides "intensive case management, individualized services, short-term crisis stabilization, and long-term goal planning for self-sufficiency" (Rife and Scullion, 1993). Its goals, listed below, are not unlike those of JOBS/DPP:

- reductions in AFDC dependency by families;
- improvements in employment earnings and labor force participation;
- improvements in educational levels;
- improvements in housing conditions; and
- improvements in basic independent living skills (Rife and Scullion, 1993).

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{12}AFDC families with children under the age of three are exempt.
However, the Family Investment Initiative model looks to remedy environmental as well as personal barriers to self-sufficiency, such as residing in a high crime area. Families may be relocated if their housing situation is sufficiently unsafe or unsuitable.

Types of Families Targeted

The FII has perhaps the most well defined target group, which could be described as moderately troubled households that want to improve their economic prospects. Specifically, the program targets motivated AFDC recipients who are "currently experiencing difficulties in 2 of 5 social areas, such as housing, crime, unemployment, education, family unity/violence, or health" (Rife and Scullion, 1993). These criteria are similar in spirit to the Family Self-Sufficiency regulations in that it is not only the very capable families that get selected, however, families must express genuine interest.

Residential Implications of Success

The FII has no residential implications of success other than that the successful family reside in healthy and suitable housing. To the extent that a particular neighborhood prohibited these goals, success might entail relocation.

Families in Communities: Gateway Transitional Families Program (Charlotte, North Carolina)

The Gateway Program offers supportive services (child care, transportation, education, job training) to both public housing residents and families on the waiting list for public housing. The program consists of two phases: (1) a two year maximum remedial phase, where the family undergoes education and job training, and (2) a five year maximum transition stage where the individual works, receives homeownership counseling, financial budgeting and other transitional services. Although the program
is administered by a central agency, the Charlotte Housing Authority, it both recognizes and has attempted to manipulate the community environment of participants. One participant described the isolating effects of living in an economically stagnant public housing community while trying to pursue self-sufficiency.

We got these people around us who just sit around all day. It's 6:30 in the morning and they're out drinking. I come home at 6:30 or 7 o'clock and they're still out there drinking. I slam my door. I just walk around the house and I talk to myself (Rohe, 1993).

To help create a new positive community of support, Gateway administrators attempted to cluster residents in one development, however, the selected site--Piedmont Courts--had "one of the worst reputations among the city's public housing developments and many people simply refused to move there to participate in the program" (Rohe, 1993). The intention, however, was laudable and clearly favored--at least in theory--by the residents, as revealed in the words of one participant: "Put us in better housing and put us all together because we can help each other out" (Rohe, 1993).

Types of Families Targeted

Among the sample of programs here, Gateway provides the best example of a program geared toward the most highly motivated and capable individuals. Applicants to the program go through a rigorous screening to determine if they would be able to earn $7.00 an hour (the minimum income necessary to rent in the private market) within two years of participation. People without a high school diploma were excluded on those grounds because it was assumed they could not earn this "self-sufficient" income within two years. The high program standards made it difficult to find qualified applicants, and program attrition was a persistent problem (Rohe, 1993).
Residential Implication of Success

For the Gateway program, success is equated with leaving public housing—ideally by becoming a homeowner. Otherwise, participants are considered to have succeeded when they "graduate" into private rental housing—which, upon preliminary evaluation, 16% were able to do (Rohe, 1993). The investment that the Gateway program makes is clearly in the family and is not intended to benefit any particular community.

Project Match (Cabrini Green Housing Development, Chicago, Illinois)

Project Match is located between the "families in communities" and "communities and their families" categories. Although its primary form of intervention is at the family level (brokered services via supportive case management), it is based at a public housing development and incorporates programmatic mechanisms to maximize its impact throughout the community. For example, Project Match widely publicizes and celebrates the accomplishments of its participants throughout the Cabrini-Green community. Even small personal victories, such as regular attendance at a GED class, are publicly recognized by--

- publishing a citation in their newsletter, The Independence,
- posting participant accomplishments on an office bulletin board,
- awarding certificates of achievement, and
- hosting an annual recognition party.

The recognition helps to both bolster the morale of those who are in the program and enables those who are not in the program to learn of the accomplishments of their neighbors. Project Match program developers described their approach in the following way:

We believe the recognition strategies are effective because most of our participants live in the same community. Therefore their individual accomplishments can become
publicly recognized. In this way, recognition can promote the positive, natural forces of peer pressure and role models (Olson and Herr, 1989, p.31).

Types of Families Targeted

Project Match is ultimately concerned with all families in the Cabrini Green Housing Development, although its flexible program structure makes it particularly appropriate for young or troubled families. It maintains an "open-enrollment" policy (in which friends and relatives of participants are encouraged to join) as an effort to draw in new members as well as to "allow family and friends to participate in the same process" (Olson and Herr, 1989). In this way, Project Match can take advantage of support networks that may already exist in the community by showing friends and family members how to be mutually supportive as they seek to gain training and education.

Residential Implications of Success

Project Match focuses on the process rather than the state of self-sufficiency. Thus, all goals are articulated in terms of sustaining a family’s progressive momentum throughout a self-sufficiency process.

Communities and their Families: the Family Development Center at Lafayette Courts (Baltimore, Maryland)

The following program description clearly portrays the Family Development Center as an initiative undertaken at the community level to impact the families living at Lafayette Courts.

"The Family Development Center is a pilot program to test the belief that if resources are focused to provide saturated services to a high rise development which has families with tremendous needs, a measurable difference can be made in the quality of life and self-sufficiency of the families within the development."13

---

While families are the obvious recipients of these services, the distinction is that the intervention brings the services to the community for the benefit of the families. In fact, the most profound community impact of the FDC is its role in expanding the amount and quality of services at Lafayette Courts. The FDC is essentially an umbrella organization within Lafayette Courts that administers all services brought on-site including case management, job training, child care, and health care. Pines (1992) characterized it as an "integrated service delivery center."

**Types of Families Targeted**

Any family residing at Lafayette Courts is a potential program target. Like Project Match, the FDC incorporates specific strategies to increase awareness and participation throughout the development. For example the FDC maintains an open drop-in center to draw potential clients: "Facilities include a washer and dryer, a kitchen, a toddler play area, a living room with television, and a meeting room" (Marzke, et. al., 1992). The drop-in center gives families a way to become friendly with case managers on an informal, non-threatening basis.

Both JOBS and JTPA resources can be accessed through the FDC, therefore, welfare recipients as well as low-income residents who are not welfare-eligible can find on-site assistance.

**Residential Implications of Success**

There was no expressed residential goal for participants in the FDC. Rather, as long as families reside at Lafayette Courts, the FDC is there to ensure that they have access to coordinated, quality services that promote economic independence.

**Family Self-Sufficiency Program Summary**

Of the three programs operating through or in connection with a local housing authority (Gateway, Project Match, and the FDC), only Gateway imposed clear
residential criteria for success (i.e., homeownership), a strategy consistent with its family oriented focus. Gateway also targeted the most motivated and educated families in public housing. JOBS/DPP and the FII both primarily sought to reduce AFDC dependency: JOBS/DPP among the least motivated, and the FII among a moderately troubled but ambitious population. Finally, the two site-based (and more community oriented) programs, Project Match and the FDC used very different models to support self-sufficiency among residing families: Project Match directs off-site services toward families in a service brokering model while the FDC transforms the community dynamic by bringing all needed services to Lafayette Courts.

Thus programs that characterize themselves as promoting "self-sufficiency" can in practice seek very different outcomes for very different groups of people. This section has highlighted the relationship between a program’s goals and its orientation toward either family or community. The next section raises the issues surrounding a feature common to all family self-sufficiency programs--service coordination--and uses examples from each program to highlight different approaches.

SERVICE COORDINATION FEATURES

Service coordination is a strategy used to (1) modify regulatory barriers to self-sufficiency, (2) enhance service delivery while minimizing funding needs by using existing programs more efficiently, and (3) assemble a comprehensive package of services for a particular client. Three levels of service coordination respectively address these objectives: institutional, inter-agency, and client levels.

Institutional Level Coordination

Institutional level service coordination involves the cooperation of several large and autonomous bureaucracies that administer certain key public benefits, in order to facilitate service access for participating families. In some cases, these agencies can
waive eligibility requirements found to conflict with the goals of self-sufficiency or that create disincentives to work. For example, participants in the Gateway program have their AFDC and Food Stamp benefit levels, as well as their rent levels, frozen at their initial levels for the first two years of the program (Rohe, 1993). These kinds of program innovations can only come about through waivers of welfare, Food Stamp and public housing regulations and therefore require the cooperation of the various local and federal program administrators.

For self-sufficiency programs operating in any moderate- to large-sized city in the U.S., some degree of institutional level service coordination is necessary for success. Actions taken in Baltimore prior to the FDC's creation perhaps best illustrate the ultimate form institutional level integration can take:

In 1984, the City of Baltimore consolidated multiple program resources into one large public agency, the Neighborhood Progress Administration (NPA). This agency administered the public housing, community and urban development programs, as well as a city-wide welfare reform demonstration project and the employment and training system. Thus multiple federal funding streams flowed through one administrative entity, greatly facilitating integration of service (Pines 1992).

Typically this degree of systems integration is not possible. The more common approach is modeled after the local "service coordinating committees" mandated by the FSS Act for local housing authorities. For example, the Lincoln JOBS/DPP program brought several different service institutions together to share service responsibilities:

Six partner agencies were an integral part of the JOBS/DPP Program. These agencies are Lincoln/Lancaster County Department of Social Services, Lincoln/Lancaster County Department of Health, Lincoln/Lancaster Drug Project, Lincoln Training Resource Center, Child Guidance Center and Family Preservation Team. This group of agencies acted as a team which met on a monthly basis to discuss progress as well as any difficulties the project may have been facing. Each of the partner agencies also had a direct responsibility to the grant project, in providing direct services to participants and/or staff training to workers.14

Agency Level Coordination

A slightly less formal approach involves establishing regular contact with agencies that serve participating clients and, where possible, sharing client files. These agencies may be under no contractual obligation to cooperate, therefore agency-level coordination must be predicated on either a shared mission or on well developed interpersonal relations among agency directors. Release forms may be required for agency personnel to exchange client information with one another. The Family Investment Initiative in Winston-Salem offers the best example of the goals and practices of this method of service coordination:

Formal linkages for the purposes of family referral and service delivery were developed with many community agencies. These linkages prevent unnecessary duplication of service while promoting cooperation between agencies. Frequent coordination occurred between the Family Investment Initiative and the following agencies: Forsyth Department of Social Services, local substance abuse agencies, crisis control ministry, area vocational schools and Winston-Salem State University, Citizens' Coalition for A Better Tomorrow, and the Winston-Salem Housing Authority. Coordination was facilitated by the use of an electronic/computer interagency network information system (Rife and Scullion, 1993).

Agency-level service integration also promotes service access by helping a family cut through the complex application and recertification processes for these services. Distress over having to repeatedly share the most personal aspects of life with total strangers can itself be a barrier to services. Linking information systems reduces the number of times people have to endure "sharing their story" although, again, permission through release forms must first be obtained from the individual.

Service Coordination at the Client-Level: Case Management

A case manager acts as an "agent" for the client by identifying and advocating for the particular services needed by a given family. The case manager may also be a "watch-dog" by monitoring the family's compliance in programs where violations can result in disciplinary measures (e.g., the FII, Gateway, and JOBS/DPP). For programs
based on a "long-term commitment," such as Project Match, the caseworker becomes a source of support, advice and encouragement through the family's successes and failures. All of the programs profiled above provide an element of case management, yet the form case management takes varies across programs. None of these categories is, however, mutually exclusive for any program.

**Home-Based Case Management**

The Lincoln JOBS/DPP program brings case management to the family through regular home visits. This approach is consistent with their selected target group--the most welfare dependent families. It enables these families to receive services, even though they may lack the initiative to seek them out.

Case management has been defined for the project as flexible, home-based intervention which responds to the needs of individual families. Our case management took a holistic approach to helping clients through assessment, development of comprehensive case plans to increase self-sufficiency, coordination of available service to meet all client needs, and case monitoring. Family Coordination workers served as case managers, acting as a liaison between clients and the human service system, providing advocacy and guidance.¹⁵

Home-based case management can serve as an effective way to bring additional family members into a self-sufficiency program. The difficulty with this approach is that it is very labor intensive, although time spent traveling is minimized in place-based self-sufficiency programs.

**Structured Case Management**

Structured case management employs a highly stylized methodology in which interaction with the case manager progresses in distinct phases. As a clinical intervention, case management almost always possesses some measure of structure, however, here the structure primarily determines the nature of the case manager - client

¹⁵Ibid.
interaction over time. The best example of a highly structured case management approach is the description of case manager functions in Winston-Salem's Family Investment Initiative: case managers engage in "screening, assessment, identification of obstacles to self-sufficiency, planning and social contracting, implementation of service plans, monitoring, [and] support advocacy" (Rife and Scullion, 1993). These functions are spelled out in a manner that suggests a standard, sequential protocol identically applied to all program participants. Likewise, the Gateway program is separated into two phases--the remedial phase where education and training occurs, and the transition stage where earnings are expected to rise and budgeting and savings takes place. The role of the case manager is determined by which phase the individual family member is in.

The structured approach is appropriate when there is a very clear set of obligations expected of participating individuals, and is useful whenever case monitoring is stressed. The stylized structure enables case managers to clearly assess a family's progress vis-à-vis other families and offers a greater ability to clearly document violations of the "social contract." This approach is inappropriate for families who lack the motivation to pursue self-sufficiency or their own. These families will frequently miss appointments, get fired from jobs, and drop out of GED programs (Olson and Herr, 1989). The objective, however, must be to keep the family participating in the face of these failures.

Flexible Case Management

Project Match has developed an alternative approach to highly structured case management that takes into account the non-linear route most families will take to self-sufficiency. Their model focuses all case management efforts on the articulated goal of economic self-sufficiency, and case managers work to keep participants "on track," defined as "successfully involved in an activity that will help lead to assuming a self-
sufficient role" (Olson and Herr, 1989). A much broader scope of activities is considered as appropriate for being "on-track." For example, volunteer work may be the best introduction to work discipline for one mother, while simply attending Head Start Parents' classes regularly is marked progress for another.

Project Match case managers act primarily as advocates in brokering existing services for participants, and as sources of moral support. Rather than viewing a failure, such as the loss of a newly found job, as an unexpected event and as possible evidence that the family should be dismissed, Project Match case managers work to help the family deal with setbacks and move beyond them. Case managers initiate regular contact with clients, and case monitoring is performed with the assistance of computerized record keeping.

**Service Coordination Summary**

Service coordination usually occurs to some degree across all levels. Case management is almost universal among programs that attempt to provide comprehensive services to families, and its content is highly dependent upon the type of family targeted. Case management can substitute for inter-agency coordination in very small self-sufficiency programs. However, there is no substitute for institutional level coordination whenever program innovations require the modification of regulations governing public benefits.

**PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS**

Of the programs that conducted formal evaluations, the results generally suggested that most succeeded in terms of increasing educational enrollment, quality of health care, and access to other services. The results on reducing welfare dependency were mixed, ranging from--
1. the report on Winston-Salem's Family Investment Initiative, which found that participants "significantly improved" their employment status and decreased their dependence upon AFDC," (Rife and Scullion), to

2. the evaluation of the Lincoln JOBS/DPP program showing little significant change in wages or employment status for participants and concluding that "it would not be possible to make expectations in this area," and finally,

3. Shlay and Holupka's (1992) evaluation of the Family Development center, which found that the control group receiving no services actually had higher gains in employment and were more likely to reduce their dependence on AFDC. Since after controlling for other factors, employment and earnings of FDC participants showed a slight rise, Shlay and Holupka attributed this apparently perverse outcome to the decrease in labor force participation associated with "educational investment" on the part of FDC members.

In sum, these results reveal that only modest gains in the short-run can be expected from family self-sufficiency programs, particularly as people opt for education and training programs over immediate employment. And the first entry into paid employment may be neither full-time nor permanent and may not, therefore, quickly catapult the family out of poverty. The nature of the progression out of welfare dependency is, as the developers of Project Match remind us, a long-term process, and the most objective measures of success--employment and earnings--must be patiently followed over a reasonable time horizon. The next section briefly highlights other significant evaluation results from selected programs.

\[16\text{ibid.}\]
Summary of Key Evaluation Results

Lincoln Action Program JOBS/DPP:

The "most significant changes occurred in this project in the areas of basic living skills, barriers, health related issues and educational outcomes. These were all areas that were agreed to place the most emphasis on case management."17

Family Investment Initiative:

"Families reported being very satisfied with the program. Of particular importance, families felt their relationship with their investment manager was significant in helping them reach their social contract goals and they rated the services of housing assistance with child care, personal and family counseling, and educational services as the most helpful" (Rife and Scullion, 1993).

Gateway: (Rohe, 1993)

- Gateway had difficulty finding qualified applicants, possibly because of their high educational requirements; many were taken from Section 8 and public housing waiting lists;
- 38% either withdrew or were terminated from the program; problems could be traced to (1) understaffing, (2) some people from the waiting list may have signed on merely to get preference for housing and not out of a genuine interest in self-sufficiency, (3) non-traditional careers for women were heavily encouraged, which created more program stress, and (4) community college schedules were not compatible with the time requirements of single parents on AFDC;
- clustering failed because of the chosen site although participants favored the idea;
- participants gave the program very good ratings in terms of its positive impact on their lives.

Family Development Center:

- The FDC met its goals of recruitment, providing comprehensive services (typically child care and adult education or training), but did not display evidence of decreasing welfare dependency.
- The FDC was able to influence "social and behavioral characteristics...believed to be associated with achieving economic independence" (Shlay and Holupka, 1992).

17Ibid.
Across four of five indices of behavioral characteristics, participants demonstrated improvement. The FDC was not, however, able to reduce participants' overall feelings of "stress and anxiety" (Shlay and Holupka, 1992).

SUMMARY

After surveying several models of family self-sufficiency and their effectiveness, we can conclude that most structures providing support in the form of case management, greater access to job training and education, and other comprehensive services such as health care and day care, will lead to positive results in the lives of many of the participating families. Improvements in earnings will occur over the long run in the form of returns on investments in human capital. Reductions in AFDC dependency will therefore occur only gradually, especially in models targeting the most troubled families.

Within the stated objectives of each program, none registered as a complete or even partial failure. The most important issue facing the designers of a self-sufficiency strategy for Bromley Heath is, therefore, the one that has framed this discussion from the beginning: where on the family-community spectrum should a self-sufficiency program suitable for Bromley Heath lie? Also, which families should be the fortunate beneficiaries of the expected program impacts? These are questions both of ideology and objective need which can only be answered by uncovering the social, economic and cultural dynamics of community life at Bromley Heath. We must discover residents' employment patterns, barriers to self-sufficiency, and attitudes toward life in the development in order to establish reasonable program objectives. This task is undertaken in the following two chapters, which profile the objective and attitudinal characteristics of the Bromley Heath community.
CHAPTER 2: A DEMOGRAPHIC, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROFILE OF BROMLEY HEATH RESIDENTS

The Bromley Heath community can be narrowly defined as, for example, residents of the development. However, a broader notion of community would include others who may not reside at Bromley Heath, but whose presence exerts influence within the spatial bounds of the development. In that regard, Bromley Heath is a community composed of residents, staff of the TMC and other on-site agencies, and the regular clients of the on-site agencies who may not reside at the development. The community may also include marginal "members," such those who live a clandestine existence doubled up with friends or, as residents reported in the "Bromley Heath Resident Survey" the drug dealers who come into the development from other neighborhoods to sell drugs. Each group, the official as well as the unofficial, contributes to a particular social and economic environment that is experienced by all community members, particularly the residents. This chapter will profile those characteristics and attitudes of Bromley Heath residents most important to the issue of self-sufficiency in the context of this community environment. These include the economic characteristics of residents (jobless rates, work experiences, career goals), barriers to self-sufficiency, the extent of social support networks, and attitudes about the quality of life at Bromley Heath.

BROMLEY HEATH RESIDENT PROFILE

Much of the information presented in this chapter is derived from the "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," (TMC, 1994). The survey was undertaken to give direction to the HOPE 1 planning process, and to give the Bromley Heath Tenant Management Corporation (TMC) additional feedback from residents about their views on the quality of TMC services, security at Bromley Heath, the built environment, economic
development needs, and their personal aspirations--especially attitudes on homeownership. Other sources of information include the "Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report," (TMC, 1993) and the Jamaica Plain Healthy Boston Action Plan of 1993.

Demographic Characteristics of Bromley Heath Residents

The total population of Bromley Heath numbers 1409 residents who make up 498 separate households. Table 2.1 provides a breakdown of all residents by their racial/ethnic characteristics.

Table 2.1 Bromley Heath Population by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993)

Approximately 46% of Bromley Heath residents receive some form of public assistance, including AFDC, Emergency Assistance to the Elderly, Disabled and Children (EAEDC), Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI).¹ Residents employed full-time total 194 or 26% of the adult, non-elderly resident population. Bromley Heath's employment rates significantly exceed those of many neighboring housing developments, including Orchard Park (17.8%), South Street (17.5%), and Mission Hill (11.4%).² Table 2.2 presents the current income distribution among Bromley Heath's 498 households:

---

¹This 46% figure may underestimate the true number of households receiving public assistance due to under reporting.

²Source: Boston Housing Authority, Tenant Demographics Report, October, 26, 1993. These figures are ratios of the total number of residents employed full time to the total adult, non-elderly/disabled
Table 2.2 Household Income Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Family Income</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $4,999</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 +</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993)

Bromley Heath is largely made up of single parent, female-headed households (74%). Also, 42% of the population consists of children 18 years of age and younger, while 23% of the population is 10 years of age or younger.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF BROMLEY HEATH RESIDENTS

Over 67% of the participants in the "Bromley Heath Resident Survey" (TMC, 1994) were jobless. This result concurs with the "Demographics Report" (TMC, 1993), which found that 70.4% of all adult residents were without jobs. The resident survey also revealed a much greater degree of labor market estrangement for the Latino population at Bromley Heath, with joblessness rates of almost 90%. Of the Latinos who answered the question, "have you ever worked in the past?" 56.3% answered "no." In contrast, all African American respondents to that same question had previously held a job at some point in their lives. The lower employment rates for Latinos were not replicated in the TMC's "Demographics Report," which suggests that, within Latino population. The total adult, non-elderly/disabled population was obtained by subtracting the number of minors, elderly and disabled from total resident count.

329.6% of the population of the adult, non-elderly population at Bromley Heath is employed. Figures obtained from the "Demographics Report," Bromley Heath TMC, December, 1993.
households especially, teens and other adult household members (other than the household head) may be employed at greater rates.\(^4\)

The distribution of "length of employment" for Bromley Heath residents was heavily weighted toward the longer working histories: of the 27.4% answering the question "how long have you had this job," 75% had worked at their current job for 7 years or longer, and 55% started their current jobs over 10 years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in current Job</th>
<th>% of Employed Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 3 mos.</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mos. - 1 year</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10 years</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 10 years</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

These figures suggest that many of those who are currently working obtained their jobs during the economic boom of the 1980s or before, and that there are relatively few new entrants into the labor force. Were this trend to continue, eventually jobless rates could rise as the working cohort retired, and the (presumably) younger cohort continued their labor force participation patterns.

The types of jobs held by residents tended to be in the service industries and included such occupations as cooking, teaching, hair styling, maintenance, and customer service. The importance of having friends who are employed to help forge connections to the labor market was verified as the employed relayed how they

\(^4\)The resident survey did not ask whether respondents were household heads. Latino respondents were, on average, younger than African American respondents (42.8 years compared with 48.4). However, this is more likely due to the relatively recent increase in Latino representation at the development. The average length of time in the development for Latino respondents is 14 years, while the average length for all respondents is 22 years.
obtained their jobs: of the 21 employed survey respondents, 33.3% got their current jobs through either friends or relatives. This compares with 14.3% who got jobs through Welfare's Employment and Training (ET) Choices Program or other job training programs, and 24% who found jobs on their own.

**Perceived Barriers to Employment/Self-Sufficiency**

Those who did not work were asked additional questions to identify their perceived barriers to work, ideal job, and ideal work location. A substantial majority (64%) of those without jobs at Bromley Heath would like to be working. The desire to work is comparable for African Americans and Latinos, thus, the relatively lower employment rates for Latino heads of households cannot be blamed on differing attitudes toward work.

To measure the extent that residents faced structural impediments to employment, survey participants were asked "What [services, circumstances] would make [employment] possible?" The most frequently cited response was "skills/job training" (29.0%). Otherwise, responses were fairly evenly distributed across the spectrum—the second most frequent response was "higher wages" (9.6%).

**Table 2.4 Barriers to Self-Sufficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would make it possible for you to work?</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>better transportation</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child care</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills/job training</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher wages</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better health</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not losing benefits</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

5 The 39% of responses recorded as "other" include some of the responses indicated in the table below (relating barriers to self-sufficiency and comments) as well as responses such as "don't know," "no reason," and "not ready." Otherwise, qualitative responses to this question tended to support the categorical responses.
The supporting comments from survey participants on this question illustrate the full range of possible barriers to self-sufficiency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Related Barrier to Self-Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I'm comfortable sitting at home.&quot;</td>
<td>Lack of motivation / ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Every time you work, the rent goes up. You can't have a bank account, you can't get ahead. Why work?&quot;</td>
<td>Regulatory disincentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There ain't no jobs. If I could get a good job with a good salary.&quot;</td>
<td>Lack of well paying jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jobs don't offer medical benefits.&quot;</td>
<td>Fear of losing Medicaid health coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;when my children get older&quot;</td>
<td>Child care concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I don't know how to read or write&quot;</td>
<td>Need for basic adult education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have the skills--getting hired is the problem.&quot;</td>
<td>Need for job placement assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would like to work outside the project [and] would like assistance with training.&quot;</td>
<td>Need for general job training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments, on the whole, confirmed that residents view skills and job training as the services most needed to enter the world of work. They also appeared realistic about their job prospects. Even when asked to fantasize about an ideal job, most survey participants stated occupations well within their possible reach:

"working with retarded children"

"as a stitcher--I make clothes"

"as a secretary, having my own desk, working 9 to 5"

"cleaning or child care"

"electronics; working with men"

"X-ray technician; that's the field I like"
Job Skills Among Residents and Desired Job Training

Approximately 22% of the residents surveyed reported that they had no job skills, while 61% were able to identify at least one job skill. These skills ranged from crafts (knitting and sewing) to clerical (typing, data entry, telephone), personal service (hair care, home health care, day care) and light industrial (welding, quality control, assembly). That the jobless rates are so high despite these self-identified skills suggests either a mismatch between skills and existing labor market needs, or some other skills deficiency—such as erosion of skills over time due to prolonged unemployment. Furthermore, despite claiming to have some skills, residents believe that additional job training is needed to help them enter the paid labor market.

Survey participants were directly asked what job skills they would like to learn. Computer skills and related training, such as word processing or spread sheets, were the most common responses. Some residents had clear occupations in mind, requiring a very specific course of job training. Examples of these occupations were nursing, working as a dental assistant, a police officer, and in construction. Other participants either were undecided or had no clearly discernible job goals:

"Anything--doesn't really matter"

"I don't really know; anything I could get!"

"[I'm] thinking about going back to working in a lab, but am afraid of the AIDS virus. Maybe office work."

"investigating skills"

"a bit of everything"

---

6 Question 86 of the Bromley Heath Resident Survey asked, "What skills do you posses?" The question was asked in the context of a series of questions regarding employment.
Interest in Self Employment

Only one respondent explicitly reported that her ideal job would involve opening her own business. A direct question was later asked to further draw out potential interest in self-employment. About 19% of those asked expressed interest in self-employment. While this may not initially appear to be a large number, Working Capital, a Boston-based non-profit lender to micro-enterprises, typically expects that only 10% of any given population has both the interest and the basic entrepreneurial skills to start a micro-enterprise. Usually, the successful candidate for their assistance is already providing some good or service from her home or another base, and uses funds from Working Capital to purchase new equipment or engage in marketing efforts.

One resident indicated that she ran a day care business out of her apartment for four years, but did not mention if it was currently in operation. Otherwise, the survey produced no evidence on the extent that residents, who are interested in self-employment, are currently running small businesses from their apartments. Not surprisingly, money was the most frequently cited obstacle to opening a small business. Other responses included "a larger apartment," "a building of my own--space," and "after I get myself together."

SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF BROMLEY HEATH RESIDENTS: SOCIAL NETWORKS AND ATTITUDES ON LIVING ENVIRONMENT

Mobility

The survey presented a profile of the Bromley Heath community as being fairly mobile, with a significant locus of activity outside of the immediate surrounding neighborhood. Some of this movement was, however, involuntary--as in the case of supermarket shopping: 67.1% of those surveyed had to go outside of the neighborhood...
to shop for food. These patterns are expected to change dramatically with the arrival of a new 44,000 square foot supermarket, which has been sited adjacent to the development and is scheduled be completed by 1995. Other activities such as retail shopping (for clothing, books, hardware, etc.), seeking health services, going to parks for recreational outings, and other forms of entertainment (nightclubs, concerts, restaurants) were usually sought outside of the neighborhood.

Table 2.5 Resident Mobility Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Other Shopping</th>
<th>Health Services</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Other Entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

The places where residents said they went for fun demonstrated an exposure to and familiarity with recreational resources in Boston and throughout New England, including the following:

"Topsfield"

"Downtown Boston, Museum, walks around Boston Common"

"Centre Street Bar to play pool"

"Whalon Park"

"New Hampshire"

"Worcester, Rhode Island, Springfield"

Private Vehicular Transportation

The population is, however, heavily dependent upon public transportation, as only 17.8% of the residents surveyed reported owning a car. Although an additional 41% of

---

7"Outside of the neighborhood," for the purposes of the survey, was defined as over two miles away. One survey question asked "what kinds of businesses are most needed in this neighborhood?" "Supermarket" was the most frequent response (43.8%) with no close rival response.
respondents claimed to have access to an automobile, the survey does not permit determining the degree of "access" that residents have (e.g., whether the vehicle is owned by someone within the household versus a friend or other relative). Thus, while the survey estimates that 82.2% of households may lack an automobile, the figure is likely an overstatement and should be thought of as an upper bound on the true estimate.

Kasarda (1989) found an inverse correlation between the rate of household car ownership and neighborhood joblessness in inner-city areas: "In those black census tracts with the greatest joblessness, more than 80 percent of the households did not possess a private vehicle in 1980." He attributes this relationship to the flight of quality jobs to suburban locations which accompanied economic restructuring, making car ownership "increasingly necessary to obtain employment" (Kasarda, 1989). Since Bromley Heath's car-less rates are comparable to those neighborhoods characterized by chronic joblessness, this is a matter worthy of further examination with more suitable data.

**Public Transportation**

The high mobility of Bromley Heath residents is, therefore, primarily a function of its proximity to public transportation. The Jackson Square subway station, which also serves as a major depot for several MBTA (Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority) bus lines, is located on the perimeter of the development. Additional bus routes are accessible from Heath Street, which borders the opposite side of the development. When asked to evaluate the quality of public transportation near the development, 72.6% described it as either "very good" or "good."
Table 2.5 Attitudes on Public Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you feel about the availability of public transportation here?</th>
<th>Frequency n = 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not good</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Satisfaction with public transportation services was also evident in the response to question 23 which asked, "What do you like most about Bromley Heath? In what ways does Bromley Heath best meet your needs?" "Location" was the most frequent response (43.9%), and an additional 5.5% explicitly cited the accessibility of public transportation. Supporting comments relating to public transportation included the following:

"T Station [i.e., subway] is close. I don't have a car."

"Transportation is good."

"The transportation is great. Now the shopping with the mall is good. If I've ever had to complain, as far as office or maintenance, its always been fulfilled..."

"Clinic, T-station, not too much traffic."

Problems with Public Transportation

There are two areas where public transportation fails Bromley Heath residents. First, residents tend to be fearful of walking to and from the subway station at night. Respondents were asked a series of questions on their feelings of safety at various places within the development in the daytime and at night. The results indicated that, during the day, residents generally feel "somewhat safe" throughout Bromley Heath (including in the development, outside their front doors, in their apartments, and in hallways). However, even during the day, residents felt least secure "walking to and
from the T." And at night, 34.2% of residents said they felt "very unsafe" walking to and from the T." It was the first and only time the "very unsafe" rating appeared as a mode response for any location. Also, 60.2% of respondents reported feeling either "somewhat unsafe" or "very unsafe" walking to subways and buses. Night time safety results are summarized in Table 2.6 below.

Table 2.6 (a) Night Time Safety Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Rating</th>
<th>At Bromley Heath</th>
<th>In the neighborhood</th>
<th>Outside front door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very safe</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat safe</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very unsafe</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Table 2.6 (b) Night Time Safety Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Rating</th>
<th>In your apartment</th>
<th>In hallways</th>
<th>Walking to /from T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very safe</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat safe</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very unsafe</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Fear of taking subways and buses at night is a likely contributor to "home-boundness" among a segment of Bromley Heath residents. Home-boundness among Latinos was particularly prevalent, with approximately 89% of the Latino respondents stating that they go "nowhere" for entertainment. The following comments

---

8Question 53 asked participants to "rate how safe you feel in the following locations during the day." For all categories of daytime safety (i.e., at Bromley Heath, in the neighborhood, outside front door, in your apartment, and in hallways) the mode response was either "somewhat safe" or "very safe." In contrast, the category "walking to and from T" was unique in having a mode response of "somewhat unsafe."
typify the sentiment expressed by those who tend to remain within the boundaries of Bromley Heath:

"I don't go anywhere; it's not like it used to be."

"[I stay] right here in my own house. I entertain myself with TV."

"I don't go out--I'm home all the time."

"It's too dangerous to go out at night."

The second problem with public transportation involves youth, who are unable to travel freely on the subway due to turf-related hostilities with rival neighborhood gangs. Rick Johnson, a youth counselor with the TMC, described how Bromley Heath youth must carefully plan excursions outside of the development to avoid getting off the subway at the "wrong" stop or being seen in the wrong territory. This danger does not limit itself to travel by public transportation. The hostility with youth at Academy Homes (a privately managed subsidized housing development diagonally across from Bromley Heath) is so intense that Bromley Heath youth must be careful even when driving by the complex. Thus, despite the ready accessibility of public transportation, many young residents of Bromley Heath lack mobility due to the heightened climate of youth violence throughout Boston.

**Personal Networks: Family and Friends at Bromley Heath**

The extent of interpersonal relationships among Bromley Heath residents is a predictor of the degree to which families influence one another--either for the good or the bad--or alternatively, if residents are largely socially isolated. Higher levels of social isolation need not hinder the self-sufficiency process, however, they may influence its character: especially whether families progress in isolation or whether the process ripples out to others in the development through social networks.
A study conducted by Jamaica Plain Healthy Boston found compelling evidence that Bromley Heath residents want to strengthen support networks within the development. Several Bromley Heath residents participated in a focus group designed to garner resident input on the need for parenting support services.\(^9\)

The Bromley Heath focus group primarily sounded the theme of affirming community in Bromley Heath by helping residents gain access to each other as resources.\(...) They emphasized that while community residents might be able to make use of and might at times seek professional help with their children, they were much more interested in establishing self-help groups which would access professional help as a resource to their own support of one another (Jamaica Plain Healthy Boston Action Plan, 1993).

The Healthy Boston study also found that 53.8\% of Bromley residents surveyed "would or currently do seek out help from family" and 20.4\% "would or currently do seek out help from friends." The Bromley Heath Resident Survey shed light on the extent that the family and friends of residents live within the development. Roughly two-thirds of those surveyed reported having family members who lived in other apartments at Bromley Heath. Results of the question, "Do your closest friends live at Bromley Heath, or do they live elsewhere?" tended toward two responses: "no friends at the development (43.8\%) and "some here, some outside" (26\%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do your closest friends live at Bromley Heath, or do they live somewhere else?</th>
<th>All Respondents n=73</th>
<th>African American n=44</th>
<th>Latino n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no friends at development</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all friends at development</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some here, some outside</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no friends</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

---

\(^9\)The focus group participants may not be representative of the entire Bromley Heath community. The Healthy Boston Action Plan notes that "the Bromley Heath focus group included several residents who were already involved in informal community organizing initiatives within the complex" (Jamaica Plain Healthy Boston Action Plan, 1993).
One way to interpret this table is that 39.7% of residents have at least some (if not all) of their friends at Bromley Heath. The more pessimistic reading is to construct an estimate of "social isolation" by adding the percentage of those with no friends at the development to the percentage of those with no friends anywhere. This interpretation shows that 56.1% of those surveyed may be experiencing some measure of social isolation, while Latinos may be experiencing social isolation at alarming rates (65%). Latino respondents were more likely to have all of their friends at Bromley Heath than were African American respondents (15% compared to 13.6%), however, they were also almost three times as likely to have no close friends than were African Americans surveyed.

Over half of the survey participants believed that having friends or family in the development was important. The following comments illustrate the kinds of help and support provided by friends and family living at Bromley Heath.

"you need good friends and family for a support system"
"you can look forward to their relationship to help you out when you need it"
"everybody needs a close friend--someone they can talk to"
"I've had relatives here ever since I've lived here so it would be strange not to have any at all. You want them to be near; you feel better."
"Someone to say hello to. You need to have somebody that you know you can come home to and say hello to and know that you don't have to be afraid that you don't know anyone."
"My close friends happen to live here. And if something happens or something goes wrong, then she's there for me and I'm there for her."

Other comments reflected the views of those who do not think having friends on site is important:

"It doesn't matter really. I go to church anyway, so there is my friends."
"It's more important for [my friends] to be outside so I can visit. I don't walk around the projects and its surroundings because it's not safe. If my friends live outside of Bromley Heath, I keep contact with the outside world. If I had the money I would have been long gone from here. I am terrified of letting my three boys go outside. I stay only because of the lower rent. There's too much violence here and it's the innocent ones who always end up paying."

The last quote in particular illustrates the kind of isolation that can result when residents deliberately try to limit social interactions within the development because of perceived threats. This is the inter-development isolation referred to in chapter 1, as depicted in the sociological study of Mission Hill (Wilkenson, 1992). While there is no evidence that this behavior is prevalent at Bromley Heath, the quote indicates that fear produces isolation for at least some members of the community.

**Attitudes toward Bromley Heath**

The Bromley Heath development received a strong endorsement from those participating in the survey. Over 71% were either "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" with living at the development. Only 6.8% stated that they were "very dissatisfied" with life at Bromley Heath. Many of the comments characterized Bromley Heath as a friendly, supportive environment to live in:

"If I had to choose any project, I would choose Bromley Heath. I would not live in another project."

"[We're] one, big, happy family and I feel comfortable."

"I've gotten used to the location, I like the community, I really feel like it's home."

"I can talk to the manager as my personal friend. I'm used to being here. It's home."

Those who had problems with life at the development were extremely candid about their views. Most often complaints had to do with maintenance or security concerns, however, in each comment listed below, what residents express is frustration rather
than resignation—they can envision solutions to their problems and have not given up on the community:

"Nothing has been done to my apartment. There’s no lock on entrance doors. I’m still fighting for a lock on the front door, which is a building code violation. And [I’m dissatisfied] because you have undesirables in the building. There are more desirables than undesirables—everybody shouldn’t have to suffer because of a few."

"I know the living conditions could be better—not in the apartment, but on the outside. Security could be better if they would stop hanging around talking with the women instead of walking around and checking out the development and seeing if people can get in or out."

"The security patrols are slow. Fix up the area! Get out those people who sell the drugs! Get people out who don't belong here!"

There are essentially two significant camps among Bromley Heath residents: those who want to live at Bromley Heath for "as long as possible," and those who want to live there "no longer than necessary." The former group represents the majority opinion shared by 57.5% of the survey respondents. The latter is the only significant minority view, shared by 21% of those surveyed. It is important to understand what motivates these opinions. If the 21% who want to leave are also the most motivated, ambitious group on-site, it suggests that a self-sufficiency program could easily become a vehicle for this group to succeed, move on, and leave the majority residing long-term but making no real economic progress. On the other hand, if many of those who wish to remain at Bromley Heath are motivated, stable residents who simply love the community, then a self-sufficiency program could have the net effect of increasing income diversity within the development. For example, assuming that the percentage of employed people is correlated with the percentage of "motivated people," one could ask if those who are employed are also more likely to want to move, or to express dissatisfaction with the development? The following tables compare the views of employed respondents to the entire survey group regarding satisfaction with Bromley Heath and desired length of residence.
Table 2.8 Satisfaction with Life at Bromley Heath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with living at Bromley Heath?</th>
<th>All Respondents n=73</th>
<th>Employed Respondents n=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very dissatisfied</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Table 2.9 Desired Length of Tenure at Bromley Heath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long do you want to live at Bromley Heath?</th>
<th>All Respondents n=73</th>
<th>Employed Respondents n=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as long as possible</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a while</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn't matter</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no longer than necessary</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

("Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Table 2.8 shows that employed survey participants tended to have more concerns about the Bromley Heath community and were not as enthusiastic in their assessment of life in the development. Only 38.1% of employed respondents were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the development compared to 71.2% for the entire sample. Nevertheless, Table 2.9 demonstrates that employed respondents actually had slightly stronger ties to the community and were more likely to want to remain at Bromley Heath "as long as possible" than the entire sample. These important results imply that (1) working people will have greater expectations of their living environment and tend to make more demands of management, but that (2) upward mobility at Bromley Heath need not be associated with leaving the development.
Another important issue is the degree to which living at Bromley Heath encourages or discourages progress toward economic independence. In other words, what is the net effect of experiencing the particular community environment created by other residents, the TMC, agencies and other more marginal community influences? Are people who move toward self-sufficiency "swimming against the tide" (as in a regressive environment), or do those living in the development get swept along by the progressive, economic momentum of others? The final option is that Bromley Heath is an innocuous or neutral environment: economic advancement is neither hindered nor bolstered by living at Bromley Heath. This issue is perhaps best analyzed with longitudinal data on residents to find out how they actually fare after moving to Bromley Heath, or by asking a direct survey question to discover their perceptions of the economic climate in the development. The survey did not directly address this issue, and only a handful of comments by residents offered any real clues to the way living at Bromley Heath influences prospects for upward mobility. Among those comments, which are listed below, support for the "progressive" characterization was particularly rare:

Progressive Environment: Supporting Responses

"You can better yourself [at Bromley Heath]."

Regressive Environment: Supporting Responses

"It's not a place to help me better myself. People look down on you for trying to better yourself. It's not a wholesome environment. People don't do things together now because they are afraid."

"If I was financially able, I would move. I see a lot of depressing things. Friends have turned to drugs. The kids have to bring themselves up. People give up on life."
Neutral Environment: Supporting Responses

"Nothing has changed and nothing's getting better for me here at Bromley Heath."

"[Bromley Heath] is what you make of it."

"Nobody bothers me [at Bromley Heath]. The place is peaceful."

Another way to gauge resident feelings on how the community impacts their lives is to ask how they feel about their children growing up and remaining in the community. Children are often those most likely to suffer in a regressive environment or to benefit from a progressive environment, and most parents are keenly aware of which direction their children seem to be headed. The results of the survey question dealing most directly with this issue are summarized below:

Table 2.10 Views on Suitability of Environment for Child Rearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think that Bromley Heath is a good place to raise children?</th>
<th>% of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

These results are consistent with an environment that could be characterized as mildly regressive. Only slightly more residents think that Bromley Heath is a poor place for children to grow up in. This suggests that there is enough good happening in the development to generate a degree of ambivalence. The supporting comments collectively paint Bromley Heath as a community that would be a good environment, but for a set of discrete, identifiable problems—namely drugs, gangs and violence. The core quality of Bromley Heath is good—the two or three social ills are what push the community over into the regressive category. This can be seen especially in the
comments that impose qualifying conditions necessary to make Bromley Heath a good place to raise a family.

"Not a good place to raise children": Supporting Comments

"because of the gangs, drugs and guns; it's terrible!"

"Too many people living in one building. There's just so much going on."

"too much violence, crime and vandalism"

"If they clean up and get rid of the drugs, it would be nice."

"At the moment, no. It could be [a good place to raise children]. People now need training. Training starts at home. Some of the young people and older people--both parents and children--need help."

"I like for my kids to grow up like rich people grow up. I'm not rich and people are not rich around here. I wish he could go to a private school."

"A good place to raise children": Supporting Comments

"Some fine kids come out of here. We got lawyers and everything coming out of here."

"Nice neighborhood and the people are nice."

"It's a good place, but you have to get rid of the gangs, drug users, dope pushers, etc. because kids can easily be misled by money. All kids love money and they'll do it for the money."

"It doesn't matter where you raise your children at; the problem is if you raise them right."

"Nowadays it's no different outside of here."

Implicit in the statements of those who believe that Bromley Heath is a good place to raise a family is the notion that children can avoid the negative influences in the development and emerge unscathed, particularly if their parents provide extra support. This sentiment also speaks to a fairly mild level of social distress that can be offset by the actions of a support network. A child born in Bromley Heath is not destined to
drug addiction or a life of crime: although those forces exert influence, many residents believe they can be overcome with parental support.

SUMMARY

Bromley Heath has a sizable employed population compared to neighboring developments. However, a disproportionate number has worked for longer than ten years, and relatively fewer residents have gotten jobs within the past 1 to 5 years. Those who are unemployed would like to work, however, they face a variety of barriers to employment (and therefore self-sufficiency) with the most notable being a lack of job skills.

There is a large degree of satisfaction with life at Bromley Heath, and the potential exists to foster a community of stable residents who are earning income. In other words, there was no real evidence that as families become employed and have more housing options, they desire to leave. In fact, the opposite result emerged from the resident survey, with employed people desiring to remain at Bromley Heath at higher rates than for the general population.

Mobility is not a problem for most residents. While there is a high rate of car-less households, which has been associated with a spatial mismatch theory of unemployment, the 82.2% figure is probably an over statement. Over half of all respondents either own or have at least some limited access to a car, and the proximity of public transportation (both buses and subway) offers mobility to others. The places where respondents reported going for entertainment revealed a knowledge of recreational and cultural resources in Boston and throughout New England.

Nevertheless, there was evidence that mobility is not available for all groups at all times. Night time fear of walking to and from the subway station is shared by a large majority of residents. Also, youth put themselves at risk when venturing out onto the
turf of rival neighborhood gangs. These concerns restrict travel both by subway and automobile.

Bromley Heath residents value the presence of friends and family at the development and desire to find ways to strengthen support networks and create self-help groups with their neighbors. Social isolation is, however, still a problem for a large fraction of the population.

The socio-economic climate at Bromley Heath could be characterized as mildly regressive, exerting slightly negative influences on residents' capacity to progress in life. The negative influences were not at all vague or amorphous, but linked to a readily identifiable set of problems: drugs, gangs and violence. Residents believe these factors make Bromley Heath a moderately difficult place to raise children. Using child rearing as a proxy for the capacity to successfully engage in a dynamic, developmental process, we have asserted that these same forces make Bromley Heath a moderately difficult place to pursue self-sufficiency. On the other hand, taking steps toward eliminating these problems could dramatically raise the already high satisfaction ratings for Bromley Heath. Eliminating drugs, gangs and violence may seem to be a tall order, but residents see it as a critical part of making Bromley Heath into the kind of community where all residents have a good chance of attaining upward mobility.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the Bromley Heath community consists of several entities. This chapter has considered the social and economic status of residents. The following chapter will profile the on-site agencies including resident utilization of services, degree of service coordination and how these agencies currently effect the social and economic climate at Bromley Heath.
CHAPTER 3: A PROFILE OF THE BROMLEY HEATH TMC AND OTHER ON-SITE AGENCIES

Family self-sufficiency programs essentially seek to provide comprehensive services in a coordinated manner to increase the earning capacity of participants. Bromley Heath has services on-site, but no recognized self-sufficiency program. Nevertheless, the presence of several, highly competent service agencies suggests that Bromley Heath has already established a degree of expertise in the area of providing supportive on-site services for the benefit of its residents. It is therefore crucial to understand how the current network of services functions within the development and within the context of the TMC, so that resources devoted toward a self-sufficiency program can be used most efficiently and build from the existing service base.

This chapter seeks to discover where the present collection of services stands in relation to the standard for economic self-sufficiency programs by assessing (1) the extent that comprehensive services are available to residents, (2) the level of service coordination, and (3) the function and impact of on-site programs. After briefly describing the services offered by each on-site agency, the discussion will focus on a few key services. The services selected will be based on two criteria: first, those services found to be the most widely used or most influential among Bromley Heath residents as revealed in the resident survey, and second, those services most essential to the process of economic self-sufficiency. This chapter will end by highlighting any obvious service gaps which emerge from the discussion and barriers to service access faced by residents.
A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF BROMLEY HEATH ON-SITE SERVICES

Programs Exclusively Serving Bromley Heath Residents

The Bromley Heath Tenant Management Corporation (TMC) provides all management and oversight functions for the Bromley Heath development such as maintenance, tenant services, administration of modernization programs and tenant recertification. The TMC also oversees the Bromley Heath Housing Police, publishes the Bromley Heath Newsletter, and administers youth programming including the Youth Crisis Intervention Project and the Young Parents Program. The TMC began as a demonstration in 1968 and was fully incorporated in 1971.

Bromley Heath Community Centers was founded in the 1950s by residents to organize recreational activities for all age groups. Community Centers oversees a recreational center for teens (the Cave) and for pre-teens (the Little Cave), summer tournaments in basketball, volleyball and softball, and events at the Bromley Hall function room.

Programs that Serve Bromley Heath and Other Neighborhoods

Cooper-Bromley Infant and Toddler Day Care is a joint program of the Hattie B. Cooper Community Center (based in Roxbury) and Bromley Heath. It provides day care for up to 20 children, aged 1 month to 2 years, 9 months, on a full day basis.

Jamaica Plain Area Planning Action Council (APAC) is a satellite of Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD), Boston’s anti-poverty agency. The Jamaica Plain APAC provides a number of services to low-income households, including an emergency food pantry, summer youth employment, social service and housing advocacy and senior services. It also distributes U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus food, and administers fuel assistance.

Jamaica Plain Day Care Center provides day care for children aged 2 years, 9 months to 6 years. It can serve up to 85 children and operates on a full day schedule. It is a program of Associated Day Care Services (ADCS, a non-profit agency established in 1952) and has been serving the day care needs of the Bromley Heath Community since 1956.

Jamaica Plain Family Day Care Services, another program of ADCS, provides day care in the homes of licensed day care providers. This service enables children from one family to stay together, and offers flexibility to accommodate a variety of work or

1 Program descriptions are based on promotional brochures and fliers available at the agencies, and from discussions with agency directors.

2 The only management function not provided by the TMC is determining tenant eligibility, which is carried out by the staff of leasing and occupancy at the Boston Housing Authority.
school schedules. Also, several Bromley Heath residents have received training to enter the field of child services.

Jamaica Plain Head Start is a federally funded early childhood development program for children 3 to 5 years of age. It is a free service to low-income households and prepares pre-schoolers for kindergarten and primary school. Head Start also stresses parental involvement through a variety of committees and boards. They can currently serve up to 157 children.

The Martha Eliot Health Center was started by community activists in 1966 to provide basic maternal and child health care services to the Bromley Heath community. It has since expanded to provide complete primary health care services to all age groups in a comprehensive and culturally competent manner. Primary care services include Pediatrics, OB/GYN, Nutrition, Adolescent Medicine, Dental, and Optometry. The Martha Eliot Health Center is also the base for a number of innovative outreach and support programs such as City Life/Vida Urbana's Healthy Homes Program, Perinatal Outreach Workers Empowering Residents (POWER), and Families First.

BACKGROUND

Virtually all services currently based on-site at Bromley Heath were established though the work of resident activists in the late 1960s, many of whom form the core of TMC's board today. The TMC itself emerged out of this tradition of community activism, and was one of the later initiatives undertaken by the organizers. According to Mildred Hailey, Executive Director of the Bromley Heath TMC, the strong resident involvement in the early years meant that services reflected the true needs of the community: "the core group of activists acted as facilitators. They would find out what the needs were, find the resources to develop a program, serve on the board of directors for a while, and then eventually move on to start another program."

Among the first services brought in by residents were the Jamaica Plain APAC, the Community Centers, the Martha Eliot Health Center, and the Jamaica Plain Day Care. In developing these services, residents also developed the organizational capacity which enabled them to make a successful appeal to the BHA for the tenant management
demonstration funds\textsuperscript{3} originally intended for Columbia Point. After residents of Columbia point turned down the offer to pursue tenant management, the application process was opened up to other interested developments. According to an early TMC publication, "the response of the tenants of Bromley-Heath projected the most impressive and genuine indication of tenant interest and support" (TMC, 1972).

Hailey is concerned that the strong connection between service agencies and the community that characterized the successful efforts of the early years is absent today:

The agencies today do not understand the needs of the community as well as they once did. In the past, the kinds of services developed, who provided them, and service monitoring all came from a community base (Mildred Hailey, TMC Executive Director).

Service recipients as well as agency support staff primarily came from the Bromley Heath community, and getting an on-site job served almost as a transitional work program that built self-esteem and job skills among residents, enabling them to move on to jobs off-site. Hailey explained that "as agencies expanded and their funding increased, they were expected to serve a wider area so that today, Bromley Heath is only a fraction of their concerns." The TMC conducted an informal survey of the on-site agencies in the summer of 1993 to find out what percentage of their current employee and client base was made up of Bromley Heath residents. Though lacking the baseline data with which to perform a comparison,\textsuperscript{4} the results still confirm that Bromley Heath agencies today tend to import both clients and personnel from surrounding communities.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{3}]The tenant management demonstration was funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in 1968. The BHA was awarded $168,000 to "develop a process to assume management responsibilities through a tenant organization with which BHA can contract management services" (TMC, 1972).
\item[\textsuperscript{4}]In an interview conducted in the summer of 1993, the day care providers at Bromley Heath stated that in the 1970s, approximately 80\% of their children would come from the development. This figure can serve as an indication of the types of resident participation on-site agencies saw in the past.
\end{itemize}
Table 3.1 Rates of Employing / Serving Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>% of Employees Residing at B-H</th>
<th>% of Participants Residing at B-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Heath TMC</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Heath Community Centers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper-Bromley Infant and Toddler Day Care</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain Head Start</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oficina Hispana*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Eliot Health Center</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain Family Day Care</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain Day Care</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No longer offering services at Bromley Heath.
NA: not available at time of survey.
(Source: Informal survey of on-site agencies conducted by the TMC in the summer of 1993.)

While the rates of resident employment are clearly the result of the hiring decisions made by agencies, rates of resident participation can be the outcome of any number of factors, including the size of the agency relative to the resident population, low levels of resident interest, restrictive eligibility criteria, and barriers to access. The next section examines these issues from the perspective of residents.

RESIDENT ATTITUDES AND UTILIZATION OF ON-SITE SERVICES

Bromley Heath Tenant Management Corporation

The only "service" established for the exclusive benefit of residents is the TMC, and all residents—by virtue of living at the development—automatically become members. David Worrell, TMC's Director of Community Services, likes to characterize the TMC as the only agency on site with "100% tenant participation."

Because of the unique position of the TMC in the social and political landscape of the Bromley Heath community, resident views on its services and programs will be presented separately.

Tenant management appears to be the management style of choice among Bromley Heath residents. Survey respondents were asked to choose between management by the TMC, the BHA and private management. The results show that the TMC was the
overwhelming favorite among the three: over three times as many respondents chose the TMC as chose management by the Boston Housing Authority, and over four times as many respondents preferred the TMC as preferred private management.

Table 3.2 Preferred Form of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you had a choice of management between the TMC, BHA or a private management company, which would you prefer?</th>
<th>All Respondents n=73</th>
<th>African American n=45</th>
<th>Latino n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prefer BHA</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer private management</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer tenant management</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

The supporting comments indicated that while residents acknowledge that the TMC is not perfect, they appreciate having direct access to management and believe that problems are better dealt with because of the proximity of management.

"In spite of everything, they've done a fine job and I'm proud to be part of it--but there's always room for improvement."

"BHA is a large place. You're just a name and number to them."

"TMC managers live here and can respond better to my needs."

"More compassionate and caring. I know them, they know me."

And at least one comment seemed to support the notion that tenant management leads to a greater measure of "community empowerment."

"It gives me an opportunity to do for myself. It gives the people that live here opportunities to give a lot."

When residents were asked how the TMC could improve its performance, the responses were surprising: as many people expressed a desire for more "community building" activities as did a call for more tangible improvements, such as in maintenance. Also, survey respondents stressed the need for better supervision of work
performed in the development and for a more rigorous screening of incoming residents (a task beyond the scope of TMC services).

**Table 3.3 TMC: Areas of Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How could the TMC could improve its performance?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improve community participation \ involvement</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better maintenance</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better security</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better screening of tenants</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better supervision of staff</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement of rules</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no need to improve</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Examples of the types of responses given regarding community participation, maintenance and supervision are listed below:

**Community Participation**
"[by getting more] feedback from tenants as well as from the seniors and young people--need to get youth invested in the care of the community by involving them in management."

"Look out into the community; do more surveys, talk to the tenants; ask people how they are doing."

**Maintenance**
"Do what they say they would do. They haven't done anything for this apartment in 25 years and I'm a heart patient and have arthritis."

"Well, not too much they can do but to do their job. They won't clean the hallways."

"Come out and survey apartments. Do what needs to be done in apartments and don't wait so long."

---

5 Table 3.3 was derived by assigning the qualitative responses to question 39 into each of nine categories listed in the table.
Supervision
"Supervisor need to get around more, need to be more present."

"They don't care if the work gets done or not. They're not even sure that the work is being done."

"Get people that would do the work. I'm not saying they're not doing it, but there is some dead weight on the list."

Of these three concerns, community participation has the most direct connection to the issue of economic self-sufficiency because it indicates that residents desire more input in decision making at the development. This has two implications for economic self-sufficiency: (1) Kane (1987) has argued that as people perceive increasing degrees of control over their circumstances, tendencies toward welfare dependency diminish; and (2) the underlying premise of HOPE 1 is that with homeownership comes a greater stake in the community on the part of residents, and the associated benefits such as improved property maintenance. Strong propensities toward community participation at Bromley Heath signal the possibility that the "stake" in the community can be fostered without homeownership. Therefore, the community development goals of HOPE 1 may be attainable apart from homeownership.

What are the participation patterns at Bromley Heath? Is there real evidence of "stronger propensities" for participation across a significant number of residents, or is there simply a small group of concerned activists? Table 3.4 shows that 61.6% of those surveyed had participated in community meetings, and that Latinos participated at higher than average rates. Table 3.5 shows that the planning meetings surrounding the

---

6HOPE 1 envisions homeownership as the endpoint of a process that involves increasing resident control of the development through the establishment of resident councils and resident management corporations. It could be argued that the HOPE 1 process first gives residents a greater stake in the community through resident management, which then makes homeownership a realistic and desirable option. Nevertheless, the spirit of HOPE 1 essentially places all faith for transforming public housing communities in the institution of privately owned property, and not in collective ownership or any collective "stake in the community." Furthermore, Peterman (1993) cites studies demonstrating that community empowerment cannot be "created" by tenant management: "Creating an RMC does not result in community empowerment, but an empowered community can create an RMC. Programs and policies that encourage the formation of TMCs in order to create community growth and development are therefore misguided."
new supermarket appeared to be an important catalyst for community participation, with 23% of respondents attending. The low percentage reporting attendance at TMC board meetings at first suggests that residents may not be as concerned with those decisions most central to operating the development. However, the most frequent response in the category "others" was attendance at "building meetings," where the most immediate issues facing residents are addressed.

Table 3.4 Resident Participation in Community Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you participated in any community meetings?</th>
<th>All Respondents n=67</th>
<th>African American n=40</th>
<th>Latino n=19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Table 3.5 Types of Meetings Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kinds of meetings?</th>
<th>TMC Board</th>
<th>Mod Rehab</th>
<th>SATF*</th>
<th>youth-oriented</th>
<th>supermarket</th>
<th>Healthy Boston</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Substance Abuse Task Force)

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

Further evidence that a "sense of community" or "community spirit" is present at Bromley Heath can be gleaned from resident comments to various survey questions. Question 100 asked, "If you were to move out of [Bromley Heath] tomorrow, what would you miss most?" Four people explicitly mention that they would miss the community, with one commentator particularly stressing the existence of "community"

7Numbers may not sum to 100% because respondents could give more than one answer. Out of 73 respondents, 29 gave no answer, 30 provided one answer, 12 provided two answers, and 2 provided three answers. The response pattern shows moderate levels of participation (1-2 meetings) for most respondents and higher levels (3 or more) for a very small segment of the sample.
at Bromley: "[I would miss] the people, the family--there's a lot of community and concerned people." Another respondent reported that the thing she likes most about Bromley Heath was the annual Family Day celebration, an event which takes place over a three day period in August and provides music, food, crafts, sports and other forms of entertainment for residents.

Even the comments in which respondents complain over a lack of community, seem to suggest that residents have higher expectations of community cohesion at Bromley Heath, and are particularly sensitive to any perceived erosion of community values:

"Until management of things change, I will be very dissatisfied. There's got to be a whole new program for everything to get back on as they used to be--we as a community, cause right now we have none."

Administers of a survey conducted in 1990 by Project Unity, a youth program based at the Martha Eliot Health Center, also concluded that Bromley Heath residents "like living at Bromley Heath and care about what goes on in the community."

Residents were asked to respond on a scale of "1" (strongly disagree) to "5" (strongly agree) to a number of questions about drug use, law enforcement, and the community. Several questions were directly posed to uncover the degree of community unity/spirit at Bromley Heath. The results of these questions, which are listed below, fell within a range between 2.6 and 3.5.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\)It is also important to know that for no question anywhere on the survey was there a response greater than 3.6. Either the group as a whole tended to avoid extreme responses, or there were polar responses, with those strongly agreeing typically outnumbering those who strongly disagreed. Project Unity set out to get a good cross section of resident opinions by sending interviewers door to door throughout the development. A total of 129 people participated in the survey.
In this housing development...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = strongly disagree,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a good place to live.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most residents care about what goes on here.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents have a say in what actions this community takes.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was a serious problem, people would get together and solve it.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When something needs to get done here, the whole community gets behind it.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can depend on each other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Everyone for himself&quot; is a good description of how people act.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am active and involved in this community.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been at least one problem in this community that I have had a part in solving.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one statement posed as a negative, "'Everyone for himself' is a good description of how people act," also received a fairly high agreement rating (2.9). However, the preceding statement, which conveys the opposite opinion ("People can depend on each other"), received a slightly stronger endorsement (3.0).

Community spirit, or a collective identity is one of those ethereal qualities whose presence can only be determined conclusively in the most extreme of circumstances. While Bromley Heath does not appear to represent such an extreme, evidence from both surveys would tend to support a characterization of Bromley Heath as a community whose residents share a concern for one another and for their collective state.
That a collective identity exists among residents most likely reflects the pervasive influence of the TMC as an organizing force within the development. Yet, survey respondents also revealed a tension between TMC's expressed vision of community, and a perception by some of exclusivity. Complaints of clannishness on TMC's part came up in occasional remarks to a variety of different questions:

"Management in TMC is biased because of managers being residents and giving jobs/favors to their friends, relations."

"[The things I like least about living here are the] favoritism, nepotism and having to fight for something that's your right."

"TMC could do much more and [there's] too much favoritism."

"TMC should talk to their tenants on a basic level--not having cliques."

"I think the tenants should have more say so in the management. After a few years they should select different people to serve on the committee, to get different input from new members. I don't think people should stay on the board for so long--two years is enough. Someone else should have a turn. You'll get more ideas and input and not so much favoritism."

There were no obvious distinguishing traits between those who viewed the TMC as exclusive and those did not: both groups have lived at Bromley Heath, on average, for 22 years, so it is not simply the case that newcomers feel like outsiders and that old-timers are "in" with the TMC. Neither was there a significant difference along racial/ethnic lines.

Charges of nepotism are not new to the TMC and in past interviews TMC Director Mildred Hailey has interpreted these forms of criticism as the inevitable result of effectively managing a development (Hexter, 1986). As long as the complaints are randomly distributed among the Bromley Heath population, this reading is appropriate. However, if a particular group tends to systematically share these views, it would indicate that there are pockets of community members who do not believe they have the
same access and influence with the TMC, and who therefore experience a measure of exclusion from community life.

Hailey speculated that two groups at Bromley Heath might experience some detachment from the community: (1) the cohort of young parents hardest hit by the "crack-cocaine epidemic" beginning in the mid-1980s; this generation, according to Hailey, became disconnected from their own families and lost out on the traditional cross-generational transference of parenting skills and values; and (2) the recent arrivals to the two buildings on Parker Street (buildings 5 and 6) rehabilitated under BHA's Turnkey program. Many of the newcomers were formerly homeless families who received apartments under HUD's homeless preference criteria. Hailey observed that these families needed substantial reorientation to independent living after staying in homeless shelters or welfare hotels for months at a time. Also, many of them arrived with very little in the way of furniture or other household items. Yet their presence provided an opportunity for TMC staff members to reach out on a personal level, which, according to Hailey, is not uncommon.

Someone from maintenance will take up a collection and buy the kids shoes or purchase groceries. Every staff member winds up being a social worker...Despite whatever animosity people may feel toward one another, if someone is in need, people rally around to support them. This is a very closely knit community (Mildred Hailey, TMC Executive Director).

The resident survey included six respondents from buildings 5 and 6, however, all but one were long time Bromley Heath residents. Although these six tended to have more moderate feelings about the TMC, their small representation in the sample prohibits making any generalizations to other residents in buildings 5 and 6.

---

9For example, 33% preferred management by the TMC, 33% preferred private management, 16.6% preferred BHA management, and 16.6% had no preference.
Heath Street and Bromley Park

Since the development is, strictly speaking, a union of three separate developments (Heath Street, Bromley Park, and the now vacant elderly building, Bickford Street) and since most of the TMC board members reside in Bromley Park, it is plausible that Heath Street residents would feel less connected to the TMC.\(^\text{10}\) On the other hand, the TMC is the only agency whose offices are actually sited in the Heath Street development, so residents of Heath Street have more immediate access to TMC staff.

The survey results indicated that the proximity-factor strongly outweighed whatever disconnection might stem from under representation on the TMC board. Table 3.6 below is a reproduction of Table 3.2 on preferred forms of management, separating out Bromley Park respondents from Heath Street respondents. Heath Street residents demonstrate significantly stronger support for the TMC than Bromley Park residents. In fact, it is the skewed preferences of Heath Street residents that generate the "majority" support for the TMC witnessed in the overall sample results.

Table 3.6  Management Preference by Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you had a choice of management between the TMC, BHA or a private management company, which would you prefer?</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Bromley Park Residents</th>
<th>Heath Street Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=73</td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>n=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer BHA</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer private management</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer tenant management</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

\(^{10}\)When the TMC board was initially established, six slots were designated for Bromley Park representatives, six for Heath Street and three for Bickford (TMC, 1972). The TMC board is now made up of twelve members and one "at-large" member, with no slots set aside by development part or any other category. Currently nine board members are from Bromley Park and four are from Heath Street. The following quote from a TMC fact sheet describes the evolution of Bromley Heath: "The three developments were constructed in three different time periods with three different density and unit mix programs. Heath Street was constructed in 1940 with 420 units in 17 three story walk-up buildings plus two 1 story administrative buildings....Bromley Park was constructed in 1954 with 732 units in 10 seven story elevator buildings and 6 three story walk-up buildings....Bickford Street was constructed in 1962, on the site of a former school, with 64 one-bedroom units in 1 nine story elevator building and was designed for elderly occupancy only."
Introducing a spatial dimension to resident attitudes raises questions about the present location of other services and its impact on perceptions and usage. Hailey did not think this was a significant issue because (1) most services are located on Bickford Street, which "separates" Bromley Park from Heath Street, and are therefore on the border of both development parts, (2) only the day care centers and the newly opening Project New Life substance abuse treatment center are deeper into Bromley Park, while all of TMC's offices are in the center of Heath Street, and (3) the current placement of services is the only practical location since Bickford Street is the only true through-street and therefore has the degree of accessibility necessary for social service agencies. Hailey acknowledged that the one resource lacking on the Heath Street side relative to Bromley Park is an outdoor playground for children--a necessity for parents who would prefer to keep an eye on their younger children as they play.

Other On-Site Agencies

If the TMC's influence at Bromley Heath is pervasive, the influence of other agencies among residents can tend to be incidental or spotty, especially with agencies such as the APAC that provide short-term advocacy and emergency services, or day care which is only relevant for those households with children in certain age groups. On the other hand, health care services and recreational activities, by nature, elicit more regular and broad based involvement. The objective of this section is to identify those services that seem to have the most effect in the lives of residents or that are most central to the process of attaining economic independence. According to the results from the "Bromley Heath Resident Survey" the most widely utilized services by residents are (1) the Martha Eliot Health Center, (2) the Jamaica Plain APAC, and (3) the Cave ("youth center"): 
Table 3.7 Resident Utilization of On-site Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>youth center (fun)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth center (tutoring)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daycare</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult education</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health center (Martha Eliot)</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAC</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994)

The high participation rate for the Martha Eliot Health Center testifies to the broad spectrum of services offered. However, relatively fewer residents exclusively use the health center to meet all of their health care needs: 30% of respondents reported that they receive all health care services within the neighborhood, while another 23% seek health care both inside and outside of the neighborhood.12

And as Table 3.1 demonstrated, of all the agencies located at Bromley Heath, the Health Center is the least dependent upon residents for its client base. As the largest of the on-site agencies, the Health Center is the most responsible for bringing outsiders into the development. It treats close to 8,400 non-resident patients annually. Because of their reputation for providing "culturally competent" health care, some of their Latino patients have come from as far away as Chelsea and even Lawrence, Massachusetts.

11 Numbers may not sum to 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.
12 These results are from question 43 in the Bromley Heath Resident Survey: "Where do you go [for health care]? Inside the neighborhood, outside of the neighborhood, or both?" "Inside the neighborhood" was defined as within two miles. Supporting comments made it clear that receiving health care "inside the neighborhood" effectively referred to the Martha Eliot Health Center. The most common source of health care outside of the neighborhood was the Brigham and Women's Hospital. Also, 45% reported that they received all health care services outside of the neighborhood, which is inconsistent with the 63% in Table 3.7 who claim to receive health services at Martha Eliot. The inconsistency may be the result of those who misinterpreted question 43 to ask "where do you receive most of your health care services?"
The second most widely used service, the Jamaica Plain APAC, also draws clients from both the development and the entire Jamaica Plain community. Each year they serve approximately 4,000 to 5,000 clients. Like the Health Center, their services span a number of age groups so that most households have members who are eligible for services. Also, by serving as the distribution center for USDA surplus food (such as cheese, flour, powdered milk and butter), virtually all families at Bromley Heath have at least some minimal contact with the Jamaica Plain APAC.

The high utilization rate for the Cave is not surprising given the large number of youths residing at Bromley Heath. The Cave focuses on teens 16 years and younger, who make up between 15 to 19% of the Bromley Heath population (TMC, 1993). The low participation in "tutoring" activities as compared to "fun" activities represents the priority that Bromley Heath Community Centers has placed on providing wholesome and safe recreational outlets for youth. The Cave is, however, currently expanding its offerings in the areas of tutoring and educational development in collaboration with the Jamaica Plain APAC.

SELF SUFFICIENCY SERVICES AT BROMLEY HEATH

Day Care Services

Among the services listed in Table 3.7, those typically associated with economic self-sufficiency programs are daycare, adult education, and transportation. Day care services at Bromley-Heath are provided by the three day care providers (Jamaica Plain Day Care, Jamaica Plain Family Day Care, and Cooper-Bromley Infant and Toddler Day Care) and Head Start. With 16.4% of respondents receiving services, day care is clearly Bromley Heath's strongest on-site service link to economic self-sufficiency. Yet, day care is a link to economic self-sufficiency only to the extent that unemployed parents are enabled to seek job training, education and employment placement assistance, which are not currently on-site service options.
Programs Formerly Offered On-Site: The Neighborhood Employment Center and Oficina Hispana

During the early 1970s the Neighborhood Employment Center, a program of the Jamaica Plain APAC, was based on Centre Street adjacent to Bromley Heath.\(^\text{13}\) It received substantial funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to assist residents of Bromley Heath and Hyde Square with many aspects of employment. The NEC provided job training, job readiness support (e.g., interviewing skills, tips on filling out job application), and job placement assistance. According to TMC Director Mildred Hailey, "many opportunities opened up for residents because of the NEC." Cutbacks in OEO funding and NEC's relocation (by the end of the 1970s) into another part of Jamaica Plain made the agency less of an economic development force among Bromley Heath residents. Today, the NEC is a small operation consisting of two staff members who give job referrals to "job ready" individuals.

More recently,\(^\text{14}\) an adult education course that was offered on-site by Oficina Hispana de la Communidad relocated outside of Bromley Heath. Oficina Hispana is an employment and job training agency that is open to all low-income Boston residents, but which targets Latinos. Oficina's main site, where the bulk of services are delivered, is less than one-quarter mile away from Bromley Heath. The one course sited at Bromley, "Basic Skills in Spanish," was essentially a literacy course conducted in Spanish. The very focused target population for this service--illiterate Spanish speakers--accounts for the relatively low rate of resident utilization reported for adult education (4.2%, from Table 3.7).

\(^{13}\) Interview with Mildred Hailey, April 8, 1994.
\(^{14}\) The most recent round of surveys was completed in October, 1993. Oficina Hispana left their classroom space at 964 Parker Street in December of 1993. The space is now designated for a substance abuse treatment program called Project New Life.
Transportation: The Bromley Heath Connector

While transportation is an important feature for many self-sufficiency programs, it is often provided as an auxiliary service rather than as a core program component. Like day care, transportation cannot stand alone without other coordinated services that help people get jobs. The TMC offers a van service called the Bromley-Heath Connector, intended to transport residents to suburban jobs (e.g., along Route 128) and to assist elderly residents with shopping and medical trips. Although the van service is currently used more in the latter capacity, it remains a potentially important resource for expanding employment opportunities among residents.

Summary

Bromley Heath is strong in the supportive services associated with self-sufficiency programs such as day care and transportation, but lacks the critical transitional and "human capital building" services, such as case management, education, and job training. And between day care and transportation, day care is the more formalized, consistent and widely used service on-site and is therefore included among the services profiled in the next section. In summary, the on-site services having the greatest impact on the quality of life at Bromley Heath are the Martha Eliot Health Center, the Jamaica Plain APAC, and the Cave, while on-site day care is the principal force among services common to self-sufficiency programs.

PROFILE OF SELECTED SERVICES AT BROMLEY HEATH

Service Goals of On-Site Services

The goals of each selected on-site service are summarized briefly below. The services span a range of philosophies (e.g., service brokering, "cultural competence," holistic services) and target populations (children, working parents, the Bromley Heath community, Jamaica Plain). The day care agencies come closest to articulating goals
consistent with family self-sufficiency, in providing services geared to help adults enter the work force.

**Martha Eliot Health Center**

**Goal:** quality, comprehensive health care delivered in a culturally competent manner. "The Center aspires to establish a model of excellence in family-centered primary health care services and to play a key role in the development of community based strategies to address public health issues."

**Bromley Heath Tenant Management Corporation**

**Goal:** to enhance the quality of the total living environment (physical and social); to apply an holistic approach to meeting people's needs through effective, responsive management and new program development. "The TMC is not only concerned with the efficient management of Bromley-Heath, but has as its major goal the improvement of the quality of the living environment within which its tenants live--both in physical and social terms...It manages in accord with the principle that management must be concerned with the whole of people's needs and respond to them as part of creating and maintaining a community."

**Head Start**

**Goal:** to promote childhood development during preschool years. Parents are strongly encouraged to become involved in program administration. Longer hours are a recent innovation to draw more families in and to give parents more time for work or school. "Head Start's primary goal is to aid preschool children in their social, intellectual, physical and emotional development in preparing for kindergarten and primary school."

**Day Care Providers (JP Day Care, JP Family Day Care, Cooper\Bromley Infant and Toddler Day Care)**

**Goal:** the day care services exist primarily to help the parents of young children by offering quality services for their child while enabling them to work or go to school. For example, a pamphlet describing the Cooper-Bromley Day Care states that "mothers can enter the labor market, receive job training or an education while their children are being cared for." The Jamaica Plain Family Day Care stresses flexibility both in scheduling and in age groups served, thereby helping parents who work odd shifts or who desire to keep their children in one setting regardless of age. All day cares provide certified staff who seek to promote healthy childhood nutritional and social development.

**Jamaica Plain APAC**

**Goal:** direct services that are responsive the needs of the Jamaica Plain community, and service advocacy (brokering) to local residents. "Linking people up with the resources they need is what we are all about."

---

15 Quote is from promotional literature published by the Hattie B. Cooper Community Center, Inc. Roxbury, Massachusetts.
Bromley Heath Community Centers

Goal: to provide educational and recreational programs for residents of Bromley Heath with an emphasis on youth; to organize community events that promote athletic, cultural and social enrichment for the Bromley Heath community.

The on-site agencies as Bromley Heath can be located on the family-community spectrum introduced in chapter one as follows:

Diagram 3.1 Family-Community Spectrum

- **Families alone**
- **Families in Communities**
- **Communities and their families**
- **Communities alone**

All other agencies

TMC & Bromley Heath Community Centers

The TMC and Bromley Heath Community Centers exist to produce a certain character or quality of life in the community. They serve families to the extent that the families reside at Bromley Heath and for the ultimate benefit of the community at large. All other agencies fall between "families in communities" and "communities and their families." They provide services to families, often regardless of whether the family resides at Bromley Heath or not, however, each agency seems to also share a special commitment to Bromley Heath residents. The agencies participate in community targeted initiatives to enhance the social environment, to educate Bromley Heath residents, and to celebrate community (such as Family Day, and other smaller cultural and educational fairs). For some agencies, this community commitment is likely due to the tradition of community-based service development that characterized their formation, whereas for others it is perhaps due more to a sense of obligation, simply by being located within such a well defined community.
MODES OF SERVICE DELIVERY

Outreach

The service providing community at Bromley Heath is particularly strong in the area of community outreach, which is extremely effective in a localized community setting such as a public housing development. Outreach is used as a means to educate residents, and to dispense information about specific events and programs. At least two programs train resident participants to conduct outreach within the development:

- POWER (Perinatal Outreach Workers Empowering Residents) operates out of the Martha Eliot Heath Center and focuses on all issues related to health and safety. The POWER workers are a genuine resource that have assisted on-site agencies to conduct joint projects and initiatives. Their presence in the development helps to foster a proactive and innovative climate among service providers.
- Youth Crisis Intervention Program, run by the TMC. Youth participating in the program receive training in conflict resolution from professional mediators. They then reach out to other youths living in the development, teaching them healthy alternatives to violence.

Case Management

The Martha Eliot Health Center provides comprehensive case management through its Human Services department. Five case managers maintain caseloads of 35 to 40 clients each, and receive referrals from the other medical departments at the Center including Pediatrics, Eye, Dental, Speech and Hearing, OB\GYN, Adult medicine, and Dermatology. Ana Ortiz, Director of Human Services, acknowledged that the content of case management depends on which department it falls under, but that most case managers help patients get needed services such as enrollment in GED (General Equivalency Diploma) courses, welfare benefits, SSI, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, translation assistance and mental health intervention. Martha Eliot's
Young Parents Program offers more intensive case management and counseling services to teen parents. Young parents receive advocacy for day care services, schools, and entitlement benefits (AFDC and Food Stamps). Also home visits are conducted to help teen parents create healthy home environments for their infants.

According to Ortiz, increasing the coordination between medical departments and case managers is an immediate goal of the Martha Eliot Health Center. She also felt that working more closely with the TMC would help more people access their case management services as well as avoid duplicating efforts.

**Drop-In Services**

Youth services and emergency services both lend themselves to the least structured forms of service delivery. The Cave is essentially a drop in recreational/multi-service center. It also serves as the meeting space for structured programs such as the Youth Crisis Intervention Program, but these are the exception. In contrast, the APAC primarily offers appointment based advocacy and structured programs, but can function on a drop-in basis for its emergency services and food pantry.

**SERVICE COORDINATION**

**Inter-Agency Council**

Administrative level coordination occurs across agencies through the recently revived Bromley Heath interagency council. Representatives from the TMC, Bromley Heath Community Centers, Head Start, Jamaica Plain APAC, the day care programs, the Boston Housing Authority and the Martha Eliot Health Center meet monthly to discuss development-wide concerns, administrative issues affecting service providers (such as the state of modernization plans), and to update one another on agency policy and programming. The Interagency Council has enabled the agencies to join forces to enhance the quality of special events at Bromley Heath.
An example is the success of Bromley Heath's recent participation in City Year's Serve-a-thon—a day long event bringing volunteers into designated sites across the city to perform tasks such as painting, cleaning and landscaping.16 The Jamaica Plain APAC was looking to participate in the Serve-a-thon and Director Mary Thomson brought the idea to the Inter-Agency Council to see if there was interest in making the entire development a designated site. Other agencies were responsive to the idea and worked together to compile a list of tasks, recruit resident volunteers, provide refreshments and conduct the orientation session for City Year volunteers. The event turned out to be an important community building activity that brought together residents, agency personnel, and outside volunteers for a common, practical purpose.

The Inter-agency council has also supported the creation of new coalitions such as the Early Childhood Coalition, which began in August of 1993. The goal of the Early Childhood Coalition is to better coordinate the early childhood development resources in the area. Several members of the Inter-agency council participate in this coalition, including the directors of the following agencies: Jamaica Plain Day Care, Jamaica Plain Family Day Care, Jamaica Plain Head Start, and the Martha Eliot Health Center. The Interagency Council helped these individuals to recognize their mutual concerns and to form the interpersonal connections that greatly facilitated coalition building activity.

Client Level Service Coordination

Despite the work of the interagency council in coordinating cross-agency projects and promoting new coalitions, no service coordination exists for individual families to help them identify service needs, access those services and stay involved with them over time. While the case management services under the Young Parents Program at

16The City Year Program is a Boston-based community service and education program for high school students throughout the Greater Boston area.
the Health Center serves this purpose for their target population, those adult patients who lack an obvious need for case management will often not get picked up by case managers at Martha Eliot.

The day care providers, in particular, expressed the need for case management services to help parents verify eligibility for day care vouchers. Day care slots are subsidized through vouchers issued by way of the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) for AFDC families, or through a direct subsidy to the day care providers from the Department of Social Services for working families.

In order to be eligible for a DPW day care voucher, the household head must either be enrolled in an educational or job training program approved by their MassJOBS\textsuperscript{17} (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) representative, or starting paid employment. Once the activity is approved, an initial voucher is issued by Child Care Choices (CCC), a program currently administered by Action for Boston Community Development.

The initial vouchers are typically short term, to discourage fraud. CCC Director Alan Platt stated that in the past vouchers were abused. People would enroll in a six month training program and drop out after one month, after having received a voucher good for six months. However, under the current system, the household head must make frequent appointments with MassJOBS and CCC staff to reverify eligibility, especially in the early stages. Families lacking motivation or facing severe barriers to self-sufficiency (such as recovering addicts) have the most difficulty negotiating the voucher system. Felicita Perez, Director of Jamaica Plain Family Day Care, said that their staff tries to provide support to women by accompanying them to the various offices and rescheduling appointments for them, but many of them fall through the cracks. Once the voucher is not renewed, the family cannot continue to participate in

\textsuperscript{17}Mass JOBS is a mandatory employment and training program for AFDC recipients. MassJOBS representatives are based out of local welfare offices and help their clients get into ESL, GED and job training courses, and ultimately get placed in a job.
day care. The day care providers believe that these kinds of obstacles contribute to the low rates of participation in day care for Bromley Heath residents.

**SERVICE GAPS AND BARRIERS**

A large fraction of Bromley Heath residents desire additional services on-site. African Americans especially seem to demand and expect more services from the TMC. These attitudes may stem from differing historical perspectives: on average the African American population at Bromley has a longer tenure than the Latino population, and is therefore more likely to have internalized the tradition of community-based service development that typified the community in the 1960s and 1970s.

**Table 3.8 Additional Services Desired by Residents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there other services or services provided in the past that you wish the Bromley Heath TMC would provide?</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: “Bromley Heath Resident Survey,” TMC, 1994)

Many of the services suggested by residents were geared toward youth in the development:

"The Cave needs to better their services. They should have the kids over there helping them with their homework, reading problems, math. They should help them with that—not just play."

"More teenage school drop-out [prevention] and drug programs for the kids."

"A gym on the 2-7 [Heath Street] side. Need more activities that are positive, to keep them off the street."

"Recreation for the children. Get something going for these kids."
Other popular responses included services for the elderly and recreational resources. A number of residents also expressed a need for education and employment related services.

"Would like more building meetings, service, human resources or job training information services."

"Better/more job placement services within the TMC for long time residents."

"Classes at night for GED and adult English classes for Spanish speakers so they can learn English and find a job."

"The APAC at one time used to have a more active role, but [doesn't] anymore. They had a jobs/tutorial program."

Residents' desire for on-site employment assistance is consistent with their belief that this service is presently inaccessible. The survey results clearly demonstrate a positive correlation between service accessibility and location on-site. Of the services listed in Table 3.9, which asks about service accessibility, only job training and after-school programs—the two services rated as least accessible—were not offered on-site at the time of the survey.¹⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.9 Barriers to Off-Site Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of these services that you don't have access to would you like to be able to use? ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bromley Heath Resident Survey, TMC, 1994)

²Numbers may not sum to 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.

¹⁸The APAC is reviving its after-school program in collaboration with staff of the Cave, although it is not as extensive as it has been in years past, according to APAC Director, Mary Thomson.
SUMMARY

The service mix at Bromley Heath is geared toward stabilization of the community and has largely succeed in creating a quality of life at the development that residents enjoy. Management services (including security and maintenance), health care, youth crisis intervention, recreation, advocacy and organizing, and substance abuse treatment exist to help Bromley Heath residents overcome the kinds of social and health deficits associated with poverty. Residents support the work of the TMC, and exhibit a strong sense of community identity that is probably a consequence of tenant management. However, residents want to see improvements on the part of the TMC, in the areas of community participation, maintenance and supervision of staff.

The depth of child care resources at Bromley Heath and the availability of transportation services through the Bromley Heath Connector have the potential to support the currently employed and highly motivated AFDC recipients in their economic pursuits. However, these services may not be sufficient for those most likely to experience long-term welfare dependency. Day care providers acknowledged that the most troubled families can easily get lost in the complex day care voucher system without additional supportive case management.

Two key elements are lacking in the Bromley Heath service mix that could go far toward transforming the current collection of on-site services into a bona fide self-sufficiency program.

- **Client Centered Service Coordination:** Bromley residents do not have focused case management that would follow them through a process of self-sufficiency. With the possible exception of the Young Parents Program, the case management services offered at Martha Eliot consist more of short-term intervention, helping clients to get discrete needs met rather than the kind of ongoing relationship having economic independence as its end goal, characteristic of self-sufficiency programs.
- **Education/Job Training on-site:** Without a case manager to link residents to off-site resources, education and job training remain the least accessible of services for residents and constitute the primary on-site service gap.

Case management and skills training are at the heart of most economic self-sufficiency programs. Adding these features to the existing day care and transportation resources at Bromley Heath would qualitatively change the nature of service delivery by greatly increasing accessibility and by giving direction and focus to residents' attempts to seek self-sufficiency. The following chapter looks in more detail at the kinds of skills training that might be appropriate, and considers other policies that would support economic advancement throughout the development.
CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDED PROGRAM AND POLICY FEATURES TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY AT BROMLEY HEATH

Four critical conclusions emerge from the resident and service profiles presented in chapters 2 and 3: (1) Bromley Heath offers a supportive environment to the employed, who tend to exhibit strong attachments to the community; (2) some groups at Bromley Heath have exceptional needs for support and service intervention, especially younger families affected by rising drug activity and formerly homeless families; (3) there are many residents who may not be employed, but who participate in community life, feel connected to the TMC, and have career ambitions, but who need help with skills development; and (4) there is a discernible sense of community and a collective identity shared by many residents of Bromley Heath.

These four findings can be collapsed into two main characteristics of Bromley Heath: (1) the presence of economically and motivationally distinct sub-populations, and (2) a sense of community identity and cohesion. This chapter will consider the implications for a self-sufficiency program at Bromley Heath in light of these community characteristics, starting with its location on the family-community spectrum from chapter one.

Communities and Their Families: A Bromley Heath Self-Sufficiency Program

After examining the evidence raised in the resident and service profiles of Bromley Heath, a very strong case can be made that a "communities and their families" orientation is most consistent with the goals, values and collective identity in place at Bromley Heath. From TMC's philosophy, summed up by Mildred Hailey in a recent interview:1 "it takes a village to raise a child;" to the attitudes repeatedly expressed by survey respondents testifying to a concern, identification and connection with

---

community life, it is clear that the experiment in tenant management has produced a
development-wide "sense of community." It is fitting then, that a self-sufficiency
program at Bromley Heath approach the issue as it relates to the entire community, and
therein seek out ways to promote a community environment that best leads to
progressive economic advancement.

Diagram 4.1 Family-Community Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families alone</th>
<th>Families in Communities</th>
<th>Communities and their families</th>
<th>Communities alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All other TMC, BHCC, and agencies</td>
<td>Bromley Heath</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the very distinct sub-groups within the Bromley Heath community, the
challenge becomes designing a program or policy that meets the unique needs of each
group: the employed/highly motivated, the totally disconnected, and the group in the
middle that represents the "core" of tenants, made up of people with career ambitions
as well as people who lack motivation. A community focus recognizes and attempts to
exploit the "spillover" effects that these groups have on one another by supporting the
positive effects and minimizing the negative ones. For example, it is important that the
employed continue to feel that Bromley Heath is a desirable place to live, because their
presence promotes connections to the labor market and provides role models of
working adults which helps to counter the attraction of drug dealing among
impressionable youth.
The Bromley Heath Resident Survey provides a way to approximate the breakdown of the population by economic and motivational factors illustrated in the pie chart above. Question 78 asked survey participants, "Would you like to be working?" and, "What is keeping you from working?" Of the 71 residents who answered that question, 21 were already employed (29%); 4 respondents (6%) were not working but clearly indicated some kind of job search, educational or job training activity in which they were engaged. Examples of the responses that placed people in the "motivated" category included,

"when I finish school"

"after receiving my GED"

"I'm going to get a job"

A total of 7 people indicated a disability or health problem that prevented them from working, and another 6 people were estimated as elderly, making a total number of 13 people (18%) in the elderly and disabled category. The unmotivated group included the 5 respondents (7%) who answered "no" to the question, "would you like to be working?" without offering any particular explanation. This figure may
DISCLAIMER

MISSING PAGE(S)

Page 98 does not exist due to a pagination error by the author.
overestimate the unmotivated population if people had good reasons for not desiring work but neglected to express them. Also, there is no way of knowing whether these 5 people include any families struggling with drug problems or formerly homeless families. However, the assumption here is that families facing pressing crises would tend to offer similar responses to this question, simply because recovery from drug addiction or re-adjustment to independent living becomes a higher priority than employment.

Finally, the residual group, the core, was made up of people who (1) were unemployed, (2) stated that they wished to be working, but (3) were not involved in any activity to improve their skills or employability. This group accounted for 40% of those answering this question. Even though each respondent in the core group expressed a desire to work, it is not presumed that they share identical attitudes toward work. The intensity of the desire to work may vary substantially throughout this group.

This breakdown is, again, a very rough approximation of these groups at Bromley Heath. However, with this approach it is immediately evident that the core and the unmotivated represent 47% of the sample who could remain economically dependent without some type of intervention. The motivated and employed, who account for 35% of the sample, are either working or actively seeking work. This group needs to be supported at Bromley Heath as well, although they may not require much service intervention. Therefore, Bromley Heath's self-sufficiency "program" may in practice consist of a combination of services and policies that attempt to both directly intervene in individual families' progression toward self-sufficiency (particularly families in the core and unmotivated groups) and indirectly support income enhancing activity by non-service recipients (i.e., employed families and motivated families already receiving educational and training support elsewhere). A fitting way to approach service development is to
• gear most services toward the core group,

• supplement those basic services with special resources for the unmotivated group, and

• incorporate policies (and possibly minimal support services) that will primarily benefit the employed and motivated groups.

The following section considers specific services and policies that will most benefit these populations.

SERVICES

Chapter two demonstrated that core residents have the most demand for and least access to job training services. Access can be improved by bringing a job training program on-site, or by offering case management services to help residents enroll in off-site programs. Since case management should be pursued in any event, as an essential component of a coordinated service delivery system, the question becomes whether job training be offered on-site or not? Three issues need to be considered in deciding this question: (1) the effectiveness of MassJOBS (an employment and training program for AFDC recipients), (2) the extent of job training resources in the surrounding community, and (3) the benefit of on-site job training versus on-site Adult Basic Education (ABE) and GED (General Equivalency Diploma) courses.

MassJOBS

MassJOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) is a statewide welfare-to-work program. Services include case management, educational assessment, goal development, referral to education and job training programs, subsidized day care, transportation assistance, job readiness and job placement for AFDC recipients.

Participation is mandatory for households with children over three years of age, and for young parents under the age of 20 without a high school diploma regardless of the age
of the child. Vivian Stern, MassJOBS representative at the Roxbury Crossing welfare office, explained that monitoring households for participation is not a high priority at present because MassJOBS wants to ensure that sufficient attention is given to participating households. Therefore, many welfare recipients are not participating but have not yet had their public assistance threatened. The only current enforcement priority for the welfare department is monitoring the AFDC-UP (unemployed parent) program. Participants in AFDC-UP are two-parent households with an unemployed "primary wage earner" who is expected to be actively seeking employment as a precondition of the household's initial eligibility. The current lack of enforcement for typical AFDC families leaves the MassJOBS program without any "stick" and subsequently non-exempt households at Bromley Heath can avoid participation in MassJOBS without fearing any repercussions.

MassJOBS can be a useful resource for the motivated group at Bromley Heath: it offers those with the initiative to pursue services access to GED, ABE, and other skills development programs. Vivian Stern recalled a success story from Bromley in which the individual completed two skill development courses and now has found fulfilling and gainful employment. In general, however, Bromley Heath residents are not participating in large numbers.

Another feature of MassJOBS which tends to work better for the motivated is the "one course of study leading to employment" policy, defined in the statement below:

One Course of Study: The specific occupational area in which the Participant chooses to obtain a job. The Participant's MassJOBS activities must be directly related to his/her One Course of Study." Once officially selected, a Participant may not change the One Course of Study for three (3) years.

The intent of this restriction is to ensure that sufficient attention is given to a specific training pursuit so that participants do not change employment goals every few months.

---

2 Interview with MassJOBS administrators, Elida Crowley and Elaine Frawley, Department of Public Welfare, August, 1993.
3 Quoted from MassJOBS program description, untitled, Department of Public Welfare.
and waste training resources in the process. At the same time, it introduces a measure of inflexibility to the self-sufficiency process—which can be particularly constricting for the families most in danger of welfare dependency. Flexibility was a key aspect of the success of Project Match and the Lincoln Action JOBS demonstration—both of which successfully served an "unmotivated" population. As the evaluators of the Lincoln JOBS demonstration discovered, "effective case management is circular, not linear or sequential. No one piece of case management alone can help a family learn goal planning and implementation skills that are necessary to become successful." 4

Thus, MassJOBS is an important resource that all eligible Bromley Heath residents can use to gain greater access to job training, but in practice, it may work best for the roughly 6% of motivated families with well formulated career ambitions. The core group would desire the kinds of assistance and resources offered by MassJOBS, but might need some kind of on-site support to get them started, while the unmotivated would resist participation in MassJOBS altogether.

**Job Training Resources in Surrounding Communities**

The nearby neighborhoods of Egleston Square and the South End have a number of job training/job readiness courses that Bromley Heath residents could access with help from MassJOBS or an on-site case management program. These programs are outlined below:

- **Dimock Community Health Center**

  Pre-vocational training: development of study skills, communication skills, and medical terminology; helps student transition into skills training.

  Vocational training: courses for occupations in the medical field including surgical technician and dental assistant.

---

• **Oficina Hispana**

  Prevocational training: development of basic communication and math skills; correct oral and written use of English language.

  Vocational training: training in business technology, including record keeping, basic bookkeeping, and general office procedures; also training in engineering technology which focuses on drafting, reading blueprints, and construction cost estimation; computer literacy.

• **United South End Settlements**

  Pre-vocational training: tutorial/educational instruction, life skills training, computer assisted activities.

  MassJOBS purchases slots in many of these programs and can directly refer their own clients. Others may be eligible for JTPA\(^5\) slots, available to low-income people over 25 years of age who face a serious impediment to employment. JTPA eligibility is determined by agency staff upon application to the specific program.

  While these services may only be sought by the most motivated families, on-site case management could draw in members of the core group, who might lack the initiative to pursue MassJOBS, but who *would* walk over to an on-site self-sufficiency program for services. Likewise, the JTPA eligible people within the core group, who cannot utilize MassJOBS and therefore lack any referral assistance, could more readily access these resource with case management.

**On-Site GED and ABE or Job training?**

  Job training represents an intermediate stage in the process toward self-sufficiency. Unless the training candidate appears with a high school diploma or GED in hand, job training is rarely a first step in a skills development program. A typical sequence for the least skilled among the population would consist of courses in English as a Second

---

\(^5\)The Job Training Partnership Act was effective as of 1983 and replaced the earlier CETA program (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act). The act was designed to increase private sector involvement in federal employment and training policy, in response to criticism that CETA relied too heavily on public sector "make work."
Language (if applicable), literacy, Adult Basic Education, GED, and then ultimately job training. Presumably by the time the individual is at the stage at which job training is appropriate, he or she is also more capable of venturing outside of the development for instruction if necessary: career ambitions have been awakened and personal initiative takes effect. On the other hand, the least skilled residents in the core group (and especially among the unmotivated) who begin a self-sufficiency process are very likely to (1) need ESL, ABE or GED, and (2) benefit from having them nearby, as they begin to transform habits and patterns that have in the past contributed to dependency.

Another argument for on-site education is the chronic shortage of available slots in these courses. Susanne Forgione, the coordinator for Family Self-Sufficiency at the Boston Housing Authority, described GED and adult literacy in Boston as "service bottlenecks." Despite the fact that her clients have a priority as participants in Family Self-Sufficiency, they sometimes wait six to eighteen months for openings, which can obviously make it difficult to sustain motivation among participants. Even Chicago’s Project Match, which is firmly committed to the service brokering model, found that the one service they had to bring on-site was basic education.6

Forgione also noted that the most effective GED programs are integrated with some vocational training so that the goal of employment is kept in the forefront. She offered WAITT’S (We’re All In This Together) GED program as a model of this approach. An integrated GED program could be an important means of providing services that begin to span a wider range of skills and interest.

**Services Summary**

Case management will make MassJOBS resources and off-site training courses more accessible to those "job-training ready" individuals in the core group. The scarce on-  

6“[A] limitation we now recognize of Project Match is that there are few available high quality basic skill and GED preparation programs. Thus to address this deficiency we have taken steps to see if we can develop our own on-site GED preparation and basic skills program” (Olson and Herr, 1989, p. 14).
site office space would be better used to house a basic educational course or course sequence that could serve as an entry point for the least skilled in the core group and for the unmotivated group.

These are the only two new services needed at Bromley Heath to get families started in the process of self-sufficiency. These services will complement the wealth of resources in the areas of day care, health care, parental support, and addiction recovery already available on-site. Self-sufficiency caseworkers will be able to create service plans meeting the needs of many families through the use of on-site services alone. Thus, case management and on-site educational resources will meet much of the need articulated by the core residents.

OTHER SERVICE FEATURES

As important as which services are offered is how they are offered and the process by which they are established. Lessons from the economic self-sufficiency programs profiled in chapter one and insights gained in the resident and agency profiles suggest certain approaches and methods that would be most appropriate for a Bromley Heath program. These issues are briefly outlined below.

Self-Sufficiency Case Management Coordination

It is important to involve all on-site agencies in the process of self-sufficiency program development, but it is especially crucial to work closely with the case management staff at Martha Eliot as new case management services are planned for Bromley Heath. Bringing the Health Center's case management personnel in at the formative stage of service development would accomplish three important functions: it would (1) help to avoid service redundancy, particularly since Martha Eliot staff may already have files on the very residents targeted by the self-sufficiency program, (2) promote a collaborative relationship where the "health care hook" could be used to
draw the least motivated residents into education and job training, and (3) enable staff of the self-sufficiency initiative and the Health Center to explore early on any possibilities for establishing computer networking capabilities. Taking advantage of on-site expertise in case management at Martha Eliot will also be essential in finding creative ways to supplement on-site services with initiatives geared to help those on either side of the core group: the most motivated and the most troubled.

**Supplemental Services for Population Extremes: Troubled Families and Motivated/Employed Families**

**Troubled Families**

In-home case management is particularly helpful with severely isolated or troubled families and could be an effective means of reaching the formerly homeless families in the Turnkey buildings. Here, consultation and possibly collaboration with City Life/Vida Urbana's Healthy Homes program, where an advocate meets with families both at the Martha Eliot health center and in their apartments, would be useful. Also the recent arrival of Project New Life (an on-site substance abuse treatment program) offers the availability of full drug screening and treatment for those families with members in recovery from alcohol or drug addiction.

**Employed / Motivated Families**

Some kind of intervention for employed and motivated families is needed to offset the perception that only the most distressed families get help, a sentiment clearly expressed by one Bromley Heath resident:

I am not into drugs and I am a struggling single parent. Around here, if you been on drugs, you get more help than a person who's trying to better themselves.

If there is a demand for post secondary education among the employed, a scholarship fund for Bromley Heath working adults would be a good place to start reaching out to this group. Mary Thomson, Director of the Jamaica Plain APAC, has
noted that there are presently no city or state programs that offer special scholarships to the working poor, and that many working families want to pursue higher education but cannot afford it.

Another possibility is to provide transportation assistance for working residents. For example, starting a late night run by the Bromley Heath Connector, that would pick up residents wary of taking the subways at night and transport them to or from work. Given the findings from the resident survey that many residents feel very unsafe taking the T after dark, such a service could find widespread support from employed, car-less residents.

These services would both signal to employed residents that the TMC appreciates their continued presence, as well as constitute practical support. Focus group meetings with employed residents, Martha Eliot case management staff, and self-sufficiency program developers to effectively address the unique concerns and needs of the employed would be extremely helpful in this process.

**Peer support and Outreach**

The economic self-sufficiency program should incorporate peer support mechanisms and outreach training. This is in line with residents' positive attitudes toward self-help approaches, and the exceptional outreach skills and resources already in place at the development. Peer support groups can serve as a vehicle to help offset isolation, therefore it would supplement in-home case management for the most troubled households, as well as others in the development who are likely to face isolation. Outreach will be increasingly important as modernization proceeds and units are made available to newcomers. Over the next 2 years, an estimated 150-200 additional units will be occupied at Bromley Heath. The need to integrate the new arrivals to both

---

7 For example, the Bromley Heath Resident Survey found that Latinos had less extensive social networks within the development. See Table 2.7.
community life and the self-sufficiency program suggests that outreach capacity should be expanded in the immediate future.

"Culturally Competent" Services

Recent immigrants to America bring attitudes and traditions about education and employment, as well as perceptions about social services from their native cultures. Alternatively, they may wholly lack any frame of reference for the kinds of programs available here. The Martha Eliot Health Center’s emphasis on culturally competent service provision is a good model for any self-sufficiency initiative at Bromley Heath. Counselors who can communicate to participants from a common cultural frame of reference are needed not only to translate American words but also American institutions and labor market practices in a meaningful way. Considering the unique traits of the Latino population uncovered in the resident surveys (e.g., higher "meeting participation" rates, more labor market estrangement, fewer friends at development), competent intervention is all the more critical.

DEVELOPMENT WIDE POLICIES

While services act as the actual vehicle that "transports" participating families to the destination of gainful employment, development-wide policies serve more as the road--it can be full of potholes, totally unpaved, or leading to a different endpoint and therefore hinder the family's progress. On the other hand, policies can be developed that are consistent with the goals of self-sufficiency and which provide a context where participating families as well as non-participants are better enabled to reach employment--i.e., the "road" can be repaved and rerouted if need be. This section considers how development-wide policies can best be modified to promote economic progress within the Bromley Heath community. The following policies are considered: tenant selection, rent ceilings, security, homeownership, and enterprise development.
Tenant Selection Policy

The intent of HUD's federal preference criteria for Section 8 and public housing was to ensure that the nation's subsidized housing resources go to those most in need—especially in the wake of the crisis of homelessness that hit the U.S. in the 1980s. Spence (1993) has argued that the unintended consequence of these policies was to create the very conditions responsible for the "urban underclass" phenomenon. While this policy gave the homeless their most basic survival need—decent shelter—it denied them access to what Spence refers to as "social capital," required for a healthy community life.

"Social capital" refers to features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Social capital enhances the benefits of investments in physical and human capital. (Spence, 1993, quoting Putnam, 1993, emphasis added)

For the past decade, the nation's public housing policy has systematically set about creating public housing neighborhoods that are utterly devoid of social capital. The consequence is precisely what the theory of social capital would predict: an accelerating social alienation and distress. (Spence, 1993)

As noted in chapter one, HUD has recently modified its tenant selection criteria to offset the detrimental effects of concentrated poverty in public housing. In line with the direction of federal policy, the Boston Housing Authority has recently revised its Tenant Selection Assignment and Transfer Plan (TSAP) so that half of all vacancies go to the working poor, while the other half will continue to be offered to those meeting the federal emergency and homeless preference criteria.² In a cover letter sent out during the review process, BHA Administrator David Cortiella stated that the new TSAP "enhances the economic diversity of its residents and the stability of its

---
²The Boston Globe, April 15, 1994, p. 29.
communities by guaranteeing access to a range of applicants, including those with varying housing needs and incomes.\textsuperscript{9}

BHA's new tenant selection policy should help to preserve and improve the income-mix currently in place at Bromley Heath, which includes a majority of very low-income households, as well as a roughly equal proportion of low-income (presumably the working poor) and moderate-income households. The income distribution and a rough approximation of the income mix at Bromley Heath are presented in tables 4.1 and 4.2 below.

\textbf{Table 4.1 Bromley Heath Income Distribution}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Frequency % households (N = 498)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $4,999</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,000</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 +</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993)

\textbf{Table 4.2 Approximation of Bromley Heath Income Mix*}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency % of households N = 498</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of median income and less (very low income)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 50% and 80% of median income (low-income)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 80% of median income (moderate-income)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Boston median household income of $29,180, from 1990 Census Data.  
(Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993)

\textsuperscript{9}Letter by David Cortiella, dated March 15, 1994.
Opening up more units for occupancy by low-income, working households will help to sustain a supportive climate for the employed residents of Bromley Heath. It will also eliminate the possibility that pockets of intense poverty are created within the development (e.g., the Turnkey buildings) as vacant buildings currently undergoing modernization become ready for occupancy.

**Overcoming Disincentives to Earning Income**

Unlike private sector housing, where rents are established annually with a lease agreement based on market conditions and remain fixed as income rises, rent in subsidized housing is determined by calculating 30% of total household income. Residents are required to annually report increases in income, so that rent can be appropriately adjusted upward. The rent increases can serve to discourage residents from earning additional income, since they only see 70 cents of every new dollar earned after paying rent (and as little as 55 cents after taxes). Adding to the frustration is the fact that housing quality typically remains fixed in the face of rent increases. The following comments from the Bromley Heath Resident Survey (TMC, 1994) illustrate the dissatisfaction working residents have with rent policy:

"I pay the working people's rent now and I was paying welfare rent. Everything's the same in my place, regardless that I'm paying more. When I first moved in, everybody was paying $75 per month."

"I don't like [Bromley Heath] because of the rent. When I moved into this place I was planning on saving money and moving to my own place. But the way they're charging rent now...when other people moved in before they had low income rent. Once black and Spanish moved in they set it at 30%. I have to pay $630, which is a lot of money. They should have a limit according to what you make."

HUD's Family Self-Sufficiency regulations address the earnings disincentive issue through the escrow account--families save the incremental increases in rent (caused by increased earnings) in an escrow account that they later have access to. Provisions for
escrow accounts are, in effect, rent ceilings for participating families, although it constrains them to save what they would have spent on rent.

The escrow account policy is not appropriate for a Bromley Heath self-sufficiency program: (1) it complicates service intervention in ways not immediately useful for the average family, (2) it is excessively complex to administer, particularly for a relatively small, site-based program, and (3) it assists those families who are in the process of self-sufficiency, but does nothing for families who have already established stable careers and therefore will not participate in self-sufficiency services. Two options are available for alleviating and possibly remedying disincentives to earning income in public housing: (1) phasing in rent increases at a gradual or deferred pace for those just starting out and likely to be program participants, and (2) establishing a rent ceiling policy throughout the development, effective for the employed members of the community.10

A provision allowing public housing authorities to phase-in rent increases for residents of public housing moving from unemployment to employment was included in the 1990 Housing Act.11 Although rents must be fully adjusted within a three year period, discretion is left with the public housing authority as to the "phase-in" structure. This policy allows for a fairly direct, simple way to offset income disincentives in the critical early years of employment for those participating in a Bromley Heath self-sufficiency program.

At present rent ceilings can only be obtained by waiver application to HUD, however, HUD is in the process of exploring new policies to permit a more flexible

10 A voluntary savings program could be established for those starting out who are interested in saving for homeownership or who simply want to open a savings or checking account. This is not inconsistent with the spirit of HUD's FSS regulations which places no limitation on how families spend their escrow account funds.

11 "The 1990 Housing Act provides that a family living in federally assisted housing and moving from unemployment to employment, can have any rent increase resulting from increased income phased in over three years. It is the PHA's decision as to how to phase in the increases" (Corporation for Enterprise Development, 1993).
application of rent ceilings in public housing. In July of 1993 the HUD Senate Subcommittee heard testimony from the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities (CLPHA), in favor of legislation supporting rent ceilings. Mary Ann Russ, Executive Director of CLPHA, offered two possible suggestions for determining the "reasonable rental value of the unit," previously unspecified by HUD regulations: (1) use average rents of comparable housing in the neighborhood, or (2) cap rents at the highest 5% of rents at each development.12

If rent ceilings are not administered circumspectly, they can become vulnerable to the worst abuses endured under rent control--namely, enabling relatively wealthy people to live in quality housing at a negligible cost. CLPHA also recommended that the ceiling be phased out as the resident's income rises above 80% of median: "It seems unfair to keep such families on ceiling rents for any extended period of time when the need for public housing is so great."13

**Homeownership**

If, as CLPHA representatives suggest, rent ceilings should be gradually phased out for those earning in excess of 80% of area median income, approximately 15% of Bromley Heath's current residents would be ineligible, and perhaps rightly so. However, given the sizable fraction of households having incomes well into the moderate range, a small scale homeownership program could provide the additional incentives for them to increase earnings while remaining within bounds of the community. While homeownership as envisioned by the HOPE 1 program is unreasonable (i.e., all current public housing residents eventually becoming homeowners), homeownership could be used to preserve and further diversify the income mix at Bromley Heath.

---

12From testimony of Mary Ann Russ, Executive Director of the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, July 29, 1993.
13Ibid.
Such a project is only feasible to the extent that residents possess both the means and the interest to pursue on-site homeownership. The resident survey found that 60% of respondents would be interested in purchasing their current apartment at Bromley Heath. Therefore, approximately 45 moderate-income households at Bromley Heath could conceivably be interested in on-site homeownership. For these families, homeownership would provide the ultimate "ceiling" on shelter costs—not only would costs not increase as income rises, but some limited amount of equity build up may be possible under HOPE 1 regulations. However, the resident survey results are a double-edged sword regarding homeownership: the high stability, and satisfaction ratings for life in the development suggest that the HOPE 1 goals have largely been attained through tenant management. Also, homeownership could actually undermine community stability to the extent that introducing a new form of tenure forms the basis for divisions among residents. Perhaps part of the shared identity of Bromley Heath residents stems from a shared experience as public housing tenants. If homeowners suddenly appeared on the scene receiving different maintenance services and conducting separate meetings, they could eventually be perceived as marginal community members.

With these caveats in mind, a small scale homeownership program could be carried out in one of two ways: by (1) allowing eligible residents\textsuperscript{14} to purchase either their current units or newly modernized units suitable for purchase; or (2) rehabilitating vacant buildings and selling individual units off to eligible residents. While the former approach is appealing because moderate income residents remain dispersed throughout the development, maximizing the potential for positive peer effects, when survey respondents were asked about their interest in owning at Bromley Heath, they indicated

\textsuperscript{14}"Eligible" here refers to those for whom homeownership is financially feasible.
that an important part of ownership is some measure of stability and control regarding their neighbors.15

**Interested in owning current unit:**

"I like the neighborhood, I like the building I live in. I would be able to have a say in who lives here and who won't."

**Interested in owning unit if changes were made:**

"If they fix the apartments like a regular house. Everybody can clean the hallways; have kids in another building--I don't want no kids. I want nice quiet people. We would have a model building."

"If they made it to look more like a house with a lot of space and better selection process of the tenants."

Residents are not eager to get locked into homeownership when there is a high level of uncertainty about who their neighbors are from year to year. Thus devoting a single building or two for purchase by residents is the more realistic option.

Homeownership on-site is a feasible solution to the earnings disincentives issue for moderate income households, but it is not clear that homeownership is necessary to keep moderate income families residing at Bromley Heath. Given the additional risks to community unity associated with on-site homeownership for an elite income class, this strategy should be seriously revisited only if moderate income households begin to demonstrate an unwillingness to continue residing at the development under the current rent policies.

---

15 Responses are to questions 90 and 91 in the Bromley Heath Resident Survey. Question 90: Would you like to be able to own an apartment here at Bromley Heath? Question 91: If no, are there specific changes that would make you more interested in owning an apartment at Bromley Heath? What are they? (TMC, 1993).
Security

The resident survey found that Bromley Heath residents feel moderately safe throughout most places in the development at most times of day. However, references to gangs, drugs and violence were prominent in complaints about the community environment and its suitability for raising children. In chapter 2 we concluded that these forces exist but have not overtaken the development. Nevertheless, addressing these sources of fear will help to diminish whatever "downward pull" life in the development may have on residents, creating an environment where economic progress is more easily sought.

The resident survey explored the question of fear with participants and found that gang activity is the single greatest source of fear for residents. Also, to the extent that some participants answered "young people" (the third most frequent response) but really meant youth gangs, the impact is even more striking. Table 4.3 below shows that 56% of respondents feared either gang members or young people. Drug dealers ranked low in terms of personal fear, however as table 4.4 shows, getting rid of drug dealers ranks high on the list of actions that would make residents feel safer. This suggests that most residents have no personal fear of drug dealers, however, the presence of drug dealing contributes to a climate of fear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whom do you fear most?</th>
<th>Why do you fear them?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gang members</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobody</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young people</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people at development</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug dealers</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "Bromley Heath Resident Survey," TMC, 1994
Table 4.4 Changes that Would Increase Feelings of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kinds of things would make you feel safer?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>greater police presence</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private security force</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal of drug dealers</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security doors locked</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting rid of gangs</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stronger community</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better lighting</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveillance by residents</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video cameras</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bromley Heath Resident Survey, TMC, 1994

The 1990 survey conducted by the Project Unity youth program looked further into the issue of drugs at the development. The survey found that residents considered the most serious problems involving drugs or contributing to the drug crisis at Bromley Heath to be:

- drug use and dealing by adults, by teens and in the streets;
- unemployment among adults and teens;
- the lack of constructive activities for kids; and
- the lack of positive role models.

Project Unity offered a series of recommendations in response to the strategies suggested by residents. These included providing more organized recreational and educational programs for teens; increasing awareness of and access to drug and alcohol treatment programs for teens; giving youth alternatives to gang membership; and working with the police, courts and school personnel to better enforce drug laws in the neighborhood (Project Unity, 1990).

Because the problem plagues Bromley Heath and other neighboring communities, countering drugs and violence must involve an inter-neighborhood effort. It is not enough to simply develop new programs within the bounds of the development when
rival gangs or drug dealers from other neighborhoods are persistent facts of life. The recently established Committee for A Better Bromley Heath,\textsuperscript{16} made up of representatives from several agencies based at Bromley Heath and in Jamaica Plain, the Boston Housing Authority, and the Children's Hospital, is in an excellent position to both implement local programs and to form an even broader coalition with other area agencies. The committee members possess an extraordinary amount of expertise in the areas of drug counseling and treatment resources, youth counseling, and health care, as well as an intimate knowledge of the Bromley Heath community. The inter-neighborhood effort could work to (1) increase access to existing drug treatment facilities and advocate for additional programs; (2) work with the Bromley Heath Housing Police, the Boston Police department and other law enforcement agencies in a true community policing anti-drug initiative; and (3) coordinate youth programs across neighborhoods to counter the ongoing, lethal gang wars.

Reducing fear caused by gangs and drug dealing will help to further strengthen the connection working people have to the community, since it is the people with the most options who are likely to abandon the community when these forces take over. Intervening at this stage would constitute preventive, proactive measures, since these problems are not yet severe and do not seem to presently threaten community stability.

**Microenterprise Development**

Policies at Bromley Heath must counter local forces, such as gang violence and drug dealing described above, as well as the global forces that impact residents' economic prospects, such as economic restructuring. Economic restructuring refers to the decline of the manufacturing sector in the United States since the early 1970s and

\textsuperscript{16}The Committee for A Better Bromley Heath, formed on March 18, 1994, was started by the staff members of community agencies who were meeting to organize a drug awareness week for the development. The committee was formed to extend organizing around drug prevention, treatment and eradication beyond the week long event (to be held in June of 1994).
the subsequent rise of service sector jobs. The service sector jobs available today tend
to be polarized, either toward very high paying jobs in law, finance, banking, real
estate and other professional services, or very low-paying jobs in hospitals, restaurants,
retail sales and other personal service professions. Many of these low paying jobs
provide very little in benefits or long-term job security, with the result that working
people are less able to fully rely on the traditional labor market to provide a stable
income stream over their life times. Microenterprise development has been a strategy
promoted by economic development practitioners since the middle of the 1980s in
response to the current economic climate.

Microenterprises have traditionally targeted AFDC mothers, particularly those who
have skills used to bring in additional "under-the-table" money (Sevron, 1992).
Community development corporations, and community based finance institutions make
micro-loans (typically under $5000) that allow these women to expand their production
or increase marketing efforts and, ideally, enable their small businesses to generate
enough income so that AFDC dependency is reduced. While this may be an
appropriate strategy for a small segment of AFDC recipients, the more promising use
of micro enterprise development is to supplement the incomes of those working in low-
paying service sector jobs.

Working Capital, a Boston based microenterprise development agency, estimates
that 10% of any community’s population are conducting small, productive operations
suitable for micro-loans. In Bromley Heath, this would mean that close to 50
households could participate in a micro-enterprise development program. Working
Capital’s peer lending model is well suited to the peer support and community-minded
values of Bromley Heath residents. A lending group consists of no more than five
people who are screened and approved by Working Capital. Each member must have

17The Corporation for Enterprise Development estimates that 5 to 10% of AFDC recipients may, with the
proper regulatory and technical support, use self-employment as a route to self-sufficiency (Feit and
Das).
some service or product they are currently providing and must require only a minimal amount of technical assistance. The lending group members determine who gets the first loan, which is typically a small amount (e.g., $500). No further loans are made until the first loan is repaid, therefore it is in the group's interest to lend only to the most reliable people, and peer pressure helps monitor loan performance. As group members take out loans and repay them, in the next round they are allowed to request larger loans until the $5000 upper limit is reached. Thus peer lending also enables members to establish a credit history should they wish to pursue small business loans from traditional lending sources later on.

Microenterprise development has the potential to help residents earn extra income and provide needed goods and services to Bromley Heath residents. Approximately 19% of the respondents in the Bromley Heath Resident Survey expressed an interest in self-employment. Also, residents were asked what new businesses were needed in their community. Most businesses suggested were not suitable for self-employment (e.g., supermarket, pharmacy, bank, clothing stores). However, the request for a local Laundromat came up repeatedly, which could easily work as a small business opportunity for some entrepreneurial resident. Other responses of interest included the following:

"all kinds for the tenants"

"any and all businesses are needed"

"barber shop"

"beauty salon for black community"

TMC Director Mildred Hailey sees enterprise development as a key aspect of TMC's vision for the social and economic future of Bromley Heath:

I want to see residents start their own businesses. There are lots of skills right here in the development. Kenilworth-Parkside is a good example. Residents there started a barbershop, a convenience store, trash removal...At the time they had support from
the housing authority and the local government. There is not the same enthusiasm
and support for resident empowerment here in Boston...We want to set up a snack
bar at the Cave so kids don’t have to venture out to Centre Street just to get candy or
an icee. Now people [sell ices] illegally and there’s no regulation and no
monitoring (Mildred Hailey, TMC Executive Director).

Regulatory Barriers to Self Employment

The local support for resident empowerment that Hailey refers to is essential for
increasing self-employment among public housing residents, particularly for those who
may receive some form of public assistance. Regulations governing both public
housing and public benefits can present obstacles for those seeking to increase income
through self-employment. Thus, local and federal support from welfare and public
housing agencies is needed to suspend regulations found to be prohibitive.

The Self Employment Investment Demonstration (SEID) project, undertaken by the
Corporation for Enterprise Development (CfED) identified several regulatory barriers
to self-employment for recipients of AFDC, and Food Stamps. The regulations listed
below are effective in Massachusetts at the time of this writing.18 Many of these
regulations will prove to impede residents' ability to pursue self-employment,
especially as a means to reduce welfare dependency.

Regulatory Barriers  (CfED, 1993)

AFDC
• $1000 limit on assets without distinction between business and personal assets. Inability to
  save for taxes and insurance or maintain working capital.

• $1500 limit on value of vehicle. Self employed may require reliable transportation valued
  in excess of $1500.

• Inability to deduct costs of capital purchases, depreciation, and repayments of loan principal
  in calculating gross countable income. Can lead to ineligibility or reduced grant amount.

• Households eligible under the AFDC-UP program are not allowed to work more than 100
  per month. Self-employed must typically work more than 100 hours per month.

18Based on a phone interview with Deborah Harris of Mass Law Reform on April 28, 1994.
Food Stamps

- The following expenses are not allowed to be disregarded when calculating gross countable income: capital purchases, principal payments on capital purchases, federal and state taxes, work related expenses, and depreciation. Results in overstatement of income and therefore ineligibility or reduced food stamp allotment.

- Some states require that all food stamp recipients register with the employment office (in Massachusetts, the Division of Employment Security). Self-employment is not recognized as an allowable activity.

Residents may also face zoning and public housing regulations that restrict their ability to operate certain kinds of businesses or store certain types of supplies and equipment within their apartments. The researchers with the CfED suggested that local program developers work with legal experts to reinterpret existing federal welfare regulations in ways allowing for self-employment rather than seeking waivers of regulations, which they describe as an excessively complex process for small demonstration projects to take on.

"CfED and the SEID states have found the waiver application process, the related reporting to OFA [the Office of Family Assistance], renewals, and the revenue neutrality requirements to be time consuming, expensive and cumbersome. Additional burdens include the paperwork connected with the project evaluation and the need to train welfare eligibility workers--who have a high turnover rate--how to apply waivers to individual clients" (Feit and Das, 1992).

Overcoming these regulations will therefore require a combined effort from those parties interested in promoting economic development initiatives for welfare recipients in Massachusetts. Self-sufficiency program developers at Bromley Heath should provide support to advocates who have been seeking reform of these regulations, such as Women for Economic Justice, and Mass Law Reform, and in the meantime, work with sympathetic public benefits attorneys to reinterpret those regulatory barriers that program participants actually encounter.

19 Obviously, some of these restrictions are necessary to ensure the health and safety of all public housing residents. Reasonable exceptions to these limitations will generally be easier to come by given (1) HUD's desire to promote microenterprise development among public housing residents, and (2) the anticipated lack of opposition from neighbors in Jamaica Plain to small scale enterprise contained fully within a public housing development.
SUMMARY

A self-sufficiency program that only serves some families and not others is inconsistent with the values and community spirit expressed by residents and staff at Bromley Heath. The core of self-sufficiency services should be directed toward the core group of residents. This group expresses an interest in work, but needs on-site support in the form of case management and adult education programs. With slight modifications, these services could be adapted to meet the needs of the unmotivated in the population: these are able bodied people who have no employment or educational goals. Outreach and in-home case management are examples of more aggressive measures that could be directed toward this group.

The presence of working people (and those actively pursuing education and job training) at Bromley Heath contributes to its stability and establishes positive role models for young people. Strengthening their ties to the community and to the labor market should be a goal of any self-sufficiency initiative. This could be accomplished through a combination of supportive gestures and policies designed to encourage the employed to remain as residents. These services could include late night van pools for those without automobiles who work the night shift and scholarships for college.

Self-sufficiency services should be developed with the cooperation of all on-site agencies. Case managers at the Martha Eliot Health Center will be particularly helpful in coordinating new services with their existing case management services. Other important features of service development include fully utilizing peer support mechanisms and outreach resources, and making "culturally competent" service provision a priority.

In addition to new services, development-wide policies can work to foster a climate where self-sufficiency is more readily obtainable. These policies are briefly summarized below:
• Use the new **tenant selection** policy to preserve and improve the income-mix;

• **Overcome disincentives to earning income** in public housing by (1) activating the provision in the 1990 Housing Act for gradually phasing-in rent increases for residents of public housing who move from unemployment to employment; (2) seek rent ceilings that will be effective for employed residents;

• Continuing work to **eliminate the influence of drug dealing and youth gangs** through partnerships between the Committee for a Better Bromley Heath, the Bromley Heath Housing Police, local anti-gang organizations, and the local law enforcement community;

• **Overcome barriers to self-employment** for residents through legal advocacy; work with coalitions in the Boston area lobbying for longer term legislative changes in AFDC and Food Stamps regulations.

Developing self-sufficiency services for the Bromley Heath community is a complex endeavor, precisely because of the diverse nature of the community and the collective spirit that suggests no one should be left out. However, the strength, competence, and variety of the on-site service providers gives Bromley Heath a rich base from which to start and almost guarantees that a self-sufficiency program would experience success. And success for this program would mean greater access to educational and job training resources for many residents, a more supportive climate for working and increasing earnings for others, and overall, a safer and even more cohesive environment for all residents.
Site-based self-sufficiency programs will always recognize the community context, but they must choose between promoting (1) the individual family’s economic progress or (2) the entire community’s economic health. The former option can serve to restore a transitional character to public housing communities. They become stepping stones in which a family is provided affordable housing and supportive services during a short-term spell of poverty with the understanding that upon recovering economically, the family will depart--to make place for the next family in temporary crisis. The latter approach seeks to make public housing communities more like healthy communities elsewhere in society, where matters such as cohesion, stability, role models, and income diversity create an environment that supports economic achievement. In these communities, attrition occurs naturally but is neither imposed nor expected.

Review of Recommended Strategies for Bromley Heath

After examining the collective values and the prevailing social and economic conditions of the Bromley Heath community, we have concluded that its self-sufficiency program should seek to improve the total community environment and reinforce the existing stability and cohesion. Service intervention should be provided for the core group of families that want to make economic progress but need support. More intensive services should be provided for those families who have no desire to reduce welfare dependency and families facing severe personal crises. Development-wide policies should be initiated to support work incentives and the retention of employed and nearly-employed residents. These policies could include rent ceilings, anti-drug and anti-gang measures, and support for self-employment.

Because some level of cohesion is evident at Bromley Heath, an appropriate economic self-sufficiency program should possess similar community oriented goals.
But what accounts for the existing "stability and cohesion" at Bromley Heath? Two unique and possibly related features of the community are likely candidates: the first is tenant management, and the second is the relatively diverse income mix.

**The Role of Tenant Management in Community Cohesion**

The tenant management question is complex because, as TMC Director Mildred Hailey explained, tenant management did not bring activism to Bromley Heath. Instead, tenant management was the *outcome* of an activist environment that seems to have spontaneously arisen at Bromley Heath during the 1960s (Tommy, 1979). Prior to the TMC's formation, there was already an organized group of residents that sincerely cared for the community and worked to improve services and the quality of life. The TMC has since served to institutionalize the values motivating the early activists, thereby perpetuating the practice of acting in the community's collective interest. The TMC has, therefore, been a vehicle that preserved a community cohesion already present at Bromley Heath (Hexter, 1986). Peterson (1993) has contended that this pattern is typical of successful resident management corporations (RMC) around the country.

**The Role of Income Diversity in Community Cohesion**

In order to promote community cohesion, it is not necessary to create a host of RMCs, but instead to support resident participation and activism in public housing communities. But what are the ingredients that lead to a community in which the kind of organizing, inter-communication, and networking needed to bring about positive change are present? Spence (1993) suggests that the foundation for community cohesion lies in the skills, contacts and resources that residents bring to the community. If intense poverty is associated with a deficiency of skills, contacts, and resources, then communities characterized by concentrated and intense poverty will ultimately be less
capable of this cohesion. This raises the second unique feature of Bromley Heath: the relatively diverse income mix.

Chapter two noted that approximately 26% of Bromley Heath's adult, non-elderly residents were employed full-time, compared to 17.8% at nearby Orchard Park. However, the true basis for Bromley Heath's diverse income mix is the strong attachments to the community exhibited by the employed. Any development might have a fairly large employed population at one time or another. The key question is, do working residents desire to remain once they obtain the financial means to go elsewhere? If so, income diversity that persists over time is possible.

The following two tables compare the income distributions and approximate income mixes for Bromley Heath, Orchard Park and Franklin Field. In table 5.1, it is immediately apparent that 22% of Bromley Heath's households earn in excess of $20,000, while only 8.3% of Orchard Park's households and 6.3% of Franklin Field's households earn these amounts. Table 5.2 also illustrates that most of the difference lies at the extremes of the income mix: Bromley Heath has a significantly smaller proportion of very low-income households than Orchard Park or Franklin Field, but a comparable proportion of low-income households. The income mix at Bromley Heath does not exhibit the pattern envisioned by HUD's new tenant selection policy (equal proportions of very low- and low-income households) but instead displays a lower fraction of very low-income households and a higher fraction of moderate income households.

1These data reflect "reported" rather than "actual" incomes of public housing residents. They come from information gathered during the annual "tenant status review" (TSR) process, where public housing residents report earnings in order to redetermine rent each year.
Table 5.1 Income Distributions: Bromley Heath, Orchard Park, and Franklin Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Bromley Heath*</th>
<th>Orchard Parka</th>
<th>Franklin Fielda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 498)</td>
<td>(N = 357)</td>
<td>(N = 330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $4,999</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,000</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 +</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993
aSource: BHA Tenant Demographics, October 1993

Table 5.2 Approximate Income Mix: Bromley Heath, Orchard Park and Franklin Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Bromley Heath*</th>
<th>Orchard Parka</th>
<th>Franklin Fielda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of median income and less (very low income)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 50% and 80% of median income (low-income)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 80% of median income (moderate-income)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Boston median household income of $29,180, from 1990 Census Data.
*Source: Bromley Heath TMC Demographics Report, TMC, 1993
aSource: BHA Tenant Demographics, October 1993

The substantial presence of moderate income households at Bromley Heath is further evidence of the attachment working people have to the community, since these are families who were of low-income when they moved in and who decided to stay even after their increased earnings made other options possible. By comparison, only a slight fraction of moderate income households choose to continue residing at Orchard Park or Franklin Field.

2Families earning 80% of median income are not eligible applicants for public housing, although once a low-income family moves in, its income can rise above 80% of median (i.e., there is no income limit for public housing residents, only for applicants).
Thus, Bromley Heath's income mix reflects two simultaneous trends: past tenant selection policies that have given very low-income households preference over low-income households, and enduring ties to the community exhibited by working families as they move into moderate-income categories. These two forces work to both increase the proportion of very low-income households relative to low-income, and increase the proportion of moderate income families relative to other housing developments. The income-mixes at Orchard Park and Franklin Field reflect the past tenant selection policy (for both developments 80% of households are very low-income, and only 15 - 17% low-income), but not the community loyalties of working households (as evidenced in sizable proportions of moderate-income households).

HUD's tenant selection reforms, allowing 50% of vacancies to go to the working poor, are designed to immediately counter the high proportion of very low-income residents in public housing, and to create "stable" communities, presumably where those who are employed desire to continue living. Thus, the net effect of the tenant selection reforms should be an immediate rise in the proportion of low-income residents, an immediate decline in the proportion of very low-income residents, and over the long run, a rise in the proportion of moderate-income households--if income diversity indeed leads to activism, participation and ultimately, community cohesion.

Implications for Site-Based Self-Sufficiency Programs

Bromley Heath cultivated community cohesion through basic grassroots activism. Out of this activism came both the TMC and the endogenous roots of income diversity--i.e., the community attachments displayed by working families. Both the TMC and the income mix work to help preserve community cohesion by respectively perpetuating a community identity, and protecting the development from some of the negative consequences associated with concentrated poverty. Thus, tenant management
and income diversity are at once effects and causes of community cohesion at Bromley Heath.

The favorable light in which working residents view Bromley Heath helps to ensure that, as very low-income families pursue self-sufficiency, many will choose to continue living there. In other words, even a family-focused self-sufficiency program at Bromley Heath could serve to further diversify the income-mix.

If the presence of moderate-income households indeed offers any evidence of the degree of attachment working families feel to the community, this attachment may be a feature unique to Bromley Heath. This suggests that family-based self-sufficiency programs at housing developments lacking this feature may, without additional offsetting measures, tend to result in the "transitory community" model discussed above. The new tenant selection policy hopes to introduce such an offsetting measure by bringing community stability to public housing communities—in the bodily form of stable, working families.

**Challenges for National Housing Policy**

While federal housing policy, in looking to produce stable public housing communities, appears to be abandoning the transitory community model, there is no consensus that this is the appropriate policy direction. Advocates for homeless families and welfare recipients argue that there is still a need for transitional communities—where families in financial and personal crises are provided decent shelter, support services and sufficient time to restabilize. There is absolutely no denying the critical need for these resources: tenant selection reforms without additional housing for those in crisis will impose intolerable fiscal and social costs upon our nation including more families living in expensive "welfare hotels"—demoralized by long-term homelessness,

---

3 Perhaps not unique among public housing development everywhere, but among similarly large developments in racially/ethnically segregated urban neighborhoods.
and more women unable to escape domestic violence. However, the sheer scale of many large public housing developments suggests that they are not practically suited to exclusively house or "warehouse" families in desperate circumstances.

This is the bleak reality underlying the family-community dichotomy permeating this study. There are both desperate families and desperate communities in dire need of intervention and resources. Because recent housing policy had been family-focused and perhaps anti-community, the current move toward community level intervention is much needed. Community level interventions promise to make a profound difference in the quality of life in public housing developments. The challenge facing HUD is to ensure that these improvements are not at the expense of those very low-income and homeless families who continue to demonstrate a real need for more transitional forms of housing and supportive services.
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