

# **The Road Half Traveled**

## **University Engagement at a Crossroads**

*Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb*

The Democracy Collaborative  
at the University of Maryland

December 2010

## **Section Four:**

### **Envisioning the Road *To Be Taken*— Realizing the Anchor Institution Mission**

*We need to be . . . on-the-ground, strategically focused and understand the task of changing neighborhoods, but we have to be organically connected back up to administrative levels that will provide us with resources and support to help us develop our capacity—grow, strengthen, protect, and work with us.*

Henry Louis Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo<sup>373</sup>

## Steps on the Road: Building Internal Constituencies for Partnership Work

As Taylor notes above, leadership is critical to growing a movement. In the fall 2009 issue of *The Presidency*, a journal of the American Council on Education, Chancellor Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University implores her colleagues to heed the call of President Barack Obama that higher education work to address the needs of urban communities. Cantor contends that universities today could play an equally important role for 21st century urban America as land-grant colleges did for rural America following the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862.<sup>374</sup>

In calling for a "New Morrill Act," Cantor posits, "One might think that a global financial crisis would be no time for college and university presidents to think expansively. Hunkering down is the more natural reaction to a threat of the magnitude that the economy continues to present. But expansive thought is exactly what we need right now — not necessarily the kind that grows our physical plant or our list of program offerings, but a fundamental re-examination of what American higher education is all about and where each of our institutions fits into that ideal."<sup>375</sup>

Cantor calls for three critical elements for pursuing an anchor institution mission in today's economy: 1) developing "reciprocal" partnerships that "constitute 'communities of experts' composed of scholars, professionals, and citizens from public, private, and nonprofit sectors"; 2) "building corresponding values into our institutional infrastructure, such as mechanisms to reward publicly engaged scholarship"; and 3) ensuring the university is "investing [its] time, resources, and intellectual capital optimally" by playing to institutional strengths and the strengths of its partners.<sup>376</sup>

Even the most well developed examples of higher education institutions working with their communities — a number of them, of course, profiled here — have fallen short of these lofty goals. In other words, while successes in individual program areas are widespread, few efforts have had across-the-board success on such common community development challenges as poverty, health disparities, educational achievement gaps, and/or affordable housing. "There are great examples of [university] investment — [but] this is [only] a *pre-cursor* to wealth development," comments urban policy analyst Rosalind Greenstein.<sup>377</sup> Even less have universities achieved what Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett from Penn pose as the "Dewey Problem" of "what *specifically* is to be done beyond theoretical advocacy to transform American society and other developed societies into participatory democracies capable of helping to transform the world into a 'Great Community'?"<sup>378</sup>

Of course, context matters: the fact that universities have fallen short in developing fully effective and comprehensive approaches to community development reflects a broader national failure to address these issues. Harry Boyte of Minnesota observes that, "Civic engagement in one university' is impossible — the fate of the university efforts are tied to much broader change, because the university is intricately embedded in systems and cultures across the world."<sup>379</sup>

At the same time, universities are not *merely* reflective of broader social trends either. Rather, they both reflect upon and can push back against their environment. As Boyte notes, Minnesota between 1997 and 2005 was able to achieve “notable cultural and institutional changes . . . that create[d] foundations for continuing civic innovation and leadership.” In Boyte’s view, what is needed is “an institutional commitment to public purposes and responsibilities intended to strengthen a democratic way of life in the rapidly changing information age of the 21st century.” Benson et al. also conclude their analysis of “Dewey’s Dream” on an optimistic note. “The Dewey Problem *is* solvable,” they claim, “if democratically minded academics throughout the world work continuously, *collaboratively*, and creatively to solve it. . . to developing and *effectively implementing* the practical means required to realize John Dewey’s utopian theory of participatory democracy.”<sup>380</sup>

One key area where creativity and collaboration are required is in the coordination of community engagement work with broader university institutional strategies. In particular, university hiring, real estate, purchasing, and investment strategies need to be more effectively linked to community partnership programs as well as scholarly engagement. Sometimes, of course, the failure to coordinate community work with other university priorities has actually served to undermine the relationships that the community partnership programs helped to build. To cite a couple of prominent examples: expansion projects by Harvard in the Allston neighborhood of Boston and by Columbia in the “Manhattanville” section of Harlem have raised the ire of many community residents, effectively costing those universities a considerable part of the goodwill gained through their community partnership efforts.<sup>381</sup> This subject also points to the importance of building a commitment to an anchor institution mission throughout the university, which requires engaging faculty and staff leaders in addition to presidential/administrative leaders. Put somewhat differently, this requires having both administrative commitment to engaged scholarship as well as faculty buy-in on more corporate (investment, hiring, purchasing, real estate) focused or institution-wide initiatives. As Rubin argues, “Often, the key faculty members [engaged in the community] have very different approaches, attitudes and community relationships than the administrators.” One critical measure of impact when implementing anchor strategies, Rubin argues, must be “the strengthened connection of engaged scholarship and teaching to the overall university-community focus.”<sup>382</sup>

As noted throughout, the ten institutions profiled in this study—and many others across the country—have demonstrated a variety of innovative ways universities can partner with their local communities, organizations and government to *begin* to address problems of poverty, unemployment, inadequate schooling, affordable housing, crime, and other social issues. The specific building blocks, which can be integrated into a comprehensive model of an effective anchor institution strategy, are now available around the nation. Taken together, we believe we are on the verge of an important new vision of what might be possible.

The question then becomes, **provided a university acknowledges its role as an anchor, how does it achieve its *anchor institution mission*?** We believe the answer, in part, lies in combining and building from university best practices, such as the ones described throughout this report and particularly in the last section. Specifically, we are calling for a more conscious

linking of the corporate and academic sides of the university in order to help solve significant urban problems as they are manifested locally. Further, to make significant contributions to their communities and cities requires higher education institutions to take their anchor institution mission seriously. As we described with our colleagues in the Anchor Institutions Task Force, universities poised to take on this mission are “working on multiple issues, such as housing, economic development, employment, education, and culture, that involve the corporate as well as academic sides of the university, including the significant commitment of senior leadership.”<sup>383</sup> These “fully vested” institutions, as called by Perry and Wiewel, seek to “achieve the multiple interests of cities and communities, as well as universities, in ways that are mutually agreeable.”<sup>384</sup>

We believe that this path must also lead to economic development in a way that benefits a broader swath of society. The point is *not* that universities can, by themselves, bring about an end to poverty, but it *is* about universities exercising at least as much energy in generating jobs and wealth for community members at the *low* end of the socioeconomic scale (i.e., developing jobs and industries for residents who lack college degrees and may not even have completed high school), as universities currently put into developing “biotech corridors,” “technology parks,” and the like. The challenge, in short, for 21st-century American universities wishing to pursue an anchor institution mission is to get back to the land-grant mission of economic development that benefits the greater society. In the words of Andrew Hahn et al., for greatest impact, universities must “*think about these economic anchor roles in a cohesive and coordinated manner, that is, as an integrated cluster of activities and practices, and not as piecemeal and separate phenomena.*” The specific economic roles Hahn refers to include: purchaser, employer, workforce developer, real estate developer, incubator, advisor and network builder, and community service and advocacy.<sup>385</sup>

The roadmap to a university achieving its anchor institution mission, then, requires putting together, piece by piece, a comprehensive community development strategy that engages the university’s resources fully and consciously—human, academic, cultural, and economic—with its community in democratic, mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships. It requires teasing out the best practices among existing initiatives, so that there is a clearer vision of what this model *could* look like. Building this roadmap is one of the objectives of this report. In other words, we believe that by linking the promising strategies found among the colleges and universities profiled in this report, a vision of a fully engaged anchor institution

### Figure 30: Internal Steps to Build an Anchor Institution Mission

- Institute high-level administrative commitment.
- Employ the university’s resources fully and consciously—human, academic, cultural, and especially economic.
- Link university hiring, real estate, purchasing, and investment strategies to community partnership goals.
- Engage community residents and groups in mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships.
- Learn from “best practices,” from each other.
- Adopt a strategic, place-based approach to capitalize on existing resources.
- Leverage university economic power to support jobs for community members at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale.
- Ensure Carnegie “engagement” classification takes into account community-supportive practices in the corporate areas of purchasing, hiring, investment, and real estate.

begins to emerge. . . Imagine a university with the local purchasing practices of Penn, the education and health partnerships of Yale and IUPUI, the presidential leadership of Syracuse, the endowment-funded loan pool of Cincinnati, the leveraging power of LeMoyne-Owen College's CDC, the educational and job opportunities provided by Miami Dade College, the city collaboration of Portland State, the capacity building of Emory, and the participatory planning model of Minnesota.

Of course, building an anchor institution vision requires more thought than just adding together the best traits from each university's program. In this work, we divided the ten universities we analyzed into three clusters, in accord with the patterns we found as we examined their practices. Each set of schools has a mixture of strengths and shortfalls. Some, such as IUPUI, Miami Dade College, and Portland State, have a high degree of engagement with community groups, but have made relatively small investments on the corporate side and have undertaken only limited efforts towards strategically focused community development. Others, such as Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati have made impressively large corporate investments and have engaged in comprehensive community development efforts, but often these efforts have been limited in terms of their partnership aspect (i.e., while community groups have been regularly "consulted," they have rarely been true partners in university partnership program creation). Often too such university efforts, while undoubtedly improving the lives of many residents, have had greater success at creating a safe shared corridor than at alleviating urban poverty or building capacity among community groups. Still others, such as Emory, Minnesota, Syracuse, and LeMoyne-Owen have been more thoughtful in building community capacity and involving community groups at the front end, but have made relatively modest resource commitments.

To be sure, the different approaches reflect the different nature of the institutions themselves. IUPUI, Portland State, and Miami Dade College are all large (and often largely under-funded) public institutions with limited resources. Their achievements, such as the level of participation in community-based research at Portland State, the level of service-learning participation by students at IUPUI, or the success in diversity hiring at Miami Dade, are very impressive. Still, the corporate component of these efforts is very limited. Moreover, even when resources are restricted, adopting a strategic, place-based approach to community development can help ensure that existing resources can have much greater impact. The power of doing so is illustrated by LeMoyne-Owen, a historically black college with very limited resources which, nonetheless — by creating an associated CDC that has leveraged significant external resources — has been able to effectively employ a similar approach to the much wealthier schools of Syracuse, Minnesota, and Emory *because* of its very focused use of the limited resources it does have.

The patterns of the other six schools we examine provide an interesting contrast, since all of these schools have significant (albeit not equal) resources, yet have proceeded to follow two rather distinctive paths. Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati all initiated comprehensive community partnership efforts in response to threatening conditions. The "crisis response" framework helped galvanize the university leadership and broader university community to deploy large amounts of money, staff, and attention, but it also meant that many of their "university-community partnerships" were implemented quickly and were largely of the university's design. By contrast,

the partnerships at Emory, Syracuse, and Minnesota place considerably more emphasis on building nonprofit capacity and mutual goal setting, but the level of resource commitment by these schools remains — relative to Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale — considerably less. We believe there is a chance for organizational learning on both sides of the spectrum. Universities that initiate programs in response to a crisis can become more collaborative. Indeed, Cincinnati, Penn, and Yale have all taken steps in that direction. Conversely, schools that have developed more collaborative approaches but have failed to align their institutional resources to support the community partnership objectives have much to learn from schools that have made more extensive use of the full gamut of available university resources. Again, Minnesota, Emory, and Syracuse have taken deliberate steps in this direction.

## ‡ Catalyzing Change with Philanthropy

The impact an integrated anchor strategy might achieve over time cannot properly be gauged by focusing only on academic institutions alone. A key matter is the nexus of funders, local and state governments, and the federal government, and how these can bring about sweeping policy changes to provide new incentives and motivations to higher education.

In our case studies, we have focused primarily on the *internal* dynamics that have led to the development of university-community partnership efforts. We think this focus is appropriate given the central role played by the actors involved — i.e., community members, university staff and administrators, faculty, and students. However, this is not meant to obscure the important role played by external funders. For example, the Netter Center at the University of Pennsylvania in 2007–2008 received over \$944,000 in funding from Penn, but had a total budget of \$5.47 million, more than half of which (\$2.86 million) came from grants (with the remaining third of the budget financed largely through the support of individual donors). Clearly, the ability of the Netter Center to secure external resources is crucial to the success of its work. Foundations thus have considerable influence over the direction of the community partnership movement.<sup>386</sup>

But to extend the Netter Center example further and state the obvious, the \$2.86 million in grants that Netter received in 2007–2008 came in a bunch of smaller packages. The messy process through which external funds are secured can complicate overall effectiveness. As Cory Bowman, Associate Director at the Netter Center, noted, “Every grant requires some form of evaluation: [metrics like] literacy, attendance, college acceptance. One school publicly held us responsible for achieving their ‘Adequate Yearly Progress’ targets from No Child Left Behind. So, ‘slice by slice’ we can show results. But what we’re really interested in at Netter is systemic university-community change . . . [We would like to] identify the best way to advance teaching and research for real-world problem-solving.”<sup>387</sup>

A few years ago, when The Democracy Collaborative surveyed university faculty, administrators and staff, as well as some foundation leaders, regarding where interviewees felt that foundations could best contribute to leveraging universities to be effective in pursuing their anchor institution mission, two themes stood out: 1) promoting networking by using the convening power of foundations to bring practitioners together to develop a common voice; and 2) promoting comprehensive, multi-modal initiatives to create engaged campuses or groups of campuses, which would then be emulated by others.<sup>388</sup>

To develop a common voice, foundations can play an important role through support for networking organizations like the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU). Elizabeth Hollander, former President of Campus Compact, notes that, “foundations always do well when they invest in getting exchanges — developing the practice, getting the publications — trade association functions. This worked in service-learning. It started with connecting people at the bottom as well as at the top.”<sup>389</sup> Broader convening of groups can also facilitate this organizing

process. Harry Boyte highlights that one place "where foundations have a role, an important role, is as colleagues and peers of people in faculty positions. . . Foundation officials are public intellectuals and can help broaden the discussion."<sup>390</sup>

Comprehensive foundation initiatives, however, are also important. Several years ago, John Burkhardt, director of the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good at the University of Michigan and a former program officer for the Kellogg Foundation observed, "We have so many good examples out there. So the priority now is less about trying to fund new programs. It's more about structural and systemic changes that need to occur."<sup>391</sup>

Foundations have begun to support development in this direction. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, for example, made a small grant (\$20,000) to the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) to assemble information on partnership best practices, evaluate partnership impact, and support the development of advocacy work. In 2009, Living Cities made a larger investment of nearly \$1 million supporting the replication of the "Strive" educational model from Cincinnati (profiled above) at four other schools: California State University, East Bay; IUPUI; University of Houston; and Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia. Living Cities in 2009 also provided a \$250,000 capacity-building grant to USU to support "the advancement of universities as transformational community anchors."<sup>392</sup>

A funders' group committed to steadily advancing a coherent overall agenda could prove decisive in making such a comprehensive initiative possible and focusing the economic might of universities for the benefit of their communities. One model might be the original Living Cities Consortium, which began as a 10-year commitment in 1991 by foundations and an insurance company to expand the work of community development corporations in 23 cities, and received significant support from the federal departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health and Human Services. Presumably, an anchor institution funders' initiative would have different players. (For example, one might expect the U.S. Department of Education to play a role.) The newly established Social Innovation Fund in the Corporation for National and Community Service, which was set up to fund intermediaries such as this kind of consortium, might also play a role. Regardless of the specific structure of a funders' group, it must be understood that this is no "quick fix" campaign: an initiative of this import and magnitude should not be undertaken unless understood as at least a ten-year effort.<sup>393</sup>

To be successful, a strategic philanthropic initiative would require adequate dedicated staff to organize the effort and to implement a two-track strategy working both within and outside of the higher education system: 1) a systematic, step-by-step strategy directed at developing and promoting federal and state policies that can provide the right mix of incentives to bring about a major reorientation in some of higher education's goals; and 2) a parallel strategy aimed at building up the internal capacity of universities to fully realize their anchor institution mission.

Success would also depend on individual foundations giving consideration to what they can do in their own grant-making to influence and motivate university engagement. This need not depend on using limited community development grant funds. In 2007, only 3.8 percent of foundation giving went to community economic development; that same year, 22.8 percent of all foundation funding was disbursed to colleges and universities.<sup>394</sup> Re-focusing some of

the latter to provide incentives for university engagement could have a substantial impact. For example, the Kellogg Foundation initiated the “Engaged Institutions” project in 2005, which seeks to discover how colleges and universities can more thoroughly integrate “civic engagement within their organizational structures and practices, and their research, teaching, and outreach activities.” In partnership with PolicyLink (a national research and action institute based in Oakland, California), the Engaged Institutions project has supported university-community partnership efforts at four schools: the University of Texas, El Paso; Penn State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; and the University of California, Santa Cruz. Each partnership is different, but all foster the goals of improving the lives of local youth and increasing civic engagement within their institutions through a focused project that has broad lessons.<sup>395</sup>

Organizational transformation also requires significant *internal* collaboration. Burkhardt describes the challenge here: “The funding basis that allows for this work is organized most frequently by disciplines, and doesn’t really foster collaboration. Key faculty members working in the same community may even be competing.” External funding, such as from foundations, may be able to support universities in organizing a more coordinated strategy towards community development. However, Burkhardt senses that foundations are not taking as strong of a role in university-community partnerships as they once were: “My sense is that foundations are more focused on community-led initiatives — the community is the initiator and setting the standards. This is more than a subtle shift; it really changes the outcomes. I think it’s a positive thing, though it probably means some of the efforts that originated in schools and colleges no longer take place; instead, there may be more resources finding their way to the community level, creating more community empowerment.”<sup>396</sup> Again, re-focusing foundation dollars dispersed to higher education institutions in a way that provides incentives not only for engagement but also for shared ownership of program initiatives with the community could significantly enhance the sustainability of anchor efforts.

Another innovative role foundations can play in helping universities leverage their assets towards community economic development is illustrated by the example of The Cleveland Foundation’s leadership in redeveloping Cleveland’s Greater University Circle neighborhoods. The Cleveland Foundation took the lead in convening stakeholders from the community’s nonprofits, anchor institutions, and city government, as well as community development consultants — including the Democracy Collaborative — which led to the development of the Evergreen Cooperative Initiative. While drawing on precedents and experience gained in cities around the country, this is the first attempt to bring together anchor institution economic

### Figure 31: Building the Anchor Institution Mission through Philanthropy

- Support information-sharing and networks that promote the work (e.g., Coalition of Urban Serving Universities).
- Develop a funders’ group that can support long-term, comprehensive, multi-modal initiatives at leading campuses.
- Create incentives to encourage structural changes, including policy amendments and internal collaboration, that support an anchor institution mission.
- Provide pre-development and capital support for community job creation strategies linked to anchor institutions, as in Cleveland.

power to create widely shared and owned assets and capital in low-income neighborhoods. It is also the first significant effort to create green jobs that not only pay a decent wage, but also build assets and wealth for employees through ownership mechanisms (with a focus on worker-owned cooperatives). A central element of the Evergreen strategy has been to work closely with Cleveland's largest anchors (in particular, the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, and Case Western Reserve University) to devise ways in which their business decisions, particularly procurement, could be focused to produce greater neighborhood and city-wide benefit.

The Evergreen Initiative made a conscious decision at the outset to pursue a model of economic development that would not require ongoing subsidy. Philanthropic dollars are used to provide *initial* seed funding for each cooperative business, but the businesses are then expected to be able to turn a profit and stand on their own. Importantly, foundation resources are also used to leverage additional sources of financing (e.g., bank loans, New Markets Tax Credits, U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) funds, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) funds, and State of Ohio renewable energy investments). By way of example, \$750,000 in grant funds from The Cleveland Foundation leveraged a total of \$5.7 million in public, private, and philanthropic dollars to launch the Evergreen Cooperative Laundry in October 2009. The Initiative's flagship effort, this laundry will operate with the smallest carbon footprint of any industrial-scale laundry in northeast Ohio while taking advantage of the growing laundry needs of the area's health industry.

To expand its scale and impact, The Cleveland Foundation also established the Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund, a non-profit revolving loan fund. The Fund was capitalized with \$3 million in grants and expects to raise an additional \$10–12 million. The Fund hopes to use this money, in turn, to leverage as much as \$100 million in additional public, private, and philanthropic investment. To date, the Fund has helped to launch two additional employee-owned businesses. One of these, Ohio Cooperative Solar, opened in the fall of 2009 and does weatherization work, including installation of solar panels on the roofs of the city's largest hospitals, universities, and government buildings. The third business to be developed, Green City Growers, is designed to be a 230,000 square-foot urban greenhouse. Each cooperative that receives initial financing from the Fund will re-pay the loan over time so that financing is available to other start-ups. Importantly, each of the Evergreen cooperatives is also obligated to pay 10 percent of its pre-tax profits back into the Fund to help seed the development of new jobs through additional cooperatives. "Thus, each business has a commitment to its workers (through living wage jobs, affordable health benefits and asset accumulation) and to the general community (by creating new businesses that can provide stability to neighborhoods)."<sup>397</sup>

## ⋮ **Policy Support for the Anchor Institution Mission**

By engaging their resources fully, strategically, and collaboratively, we believe universities can improve the quality of life in their local communities as well as build opportunities for individual and community wealth. We also believe that there lies great potential in gaining significant public support for universities who respond to the broader economic needs of society. As Henry Taylor puts it, "It's an inside-outside game. First, we need to make sure [government] understands the types of the things the university is capable of doing. . . Then, they can put incentives into place to help universities move [further] in this direction."<sup>398</sup>

As described throughout this report, internally, a number of universities have chosen to assume greater roles in developing their anchor institution mission, but most of this action has taken place in the absence of significant policy support. Of course, this is not to deny that universities receive very substantial levels of federal support. Not counting indirect federal support (e.g., U.S. Department of Education financing for student subsidized loan and grant programs), in Fiscal Year 2010, universities were the beneficiaries of over \$24.99 billion in National Institutes of Health grant funding, \$6.532 billion in National Science Foundation grant funding, and \$1.358 billion in National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) or "land-grant" support. By contrast, federal funding of anchor institution strategies has been paltry. In FY 2010, the Office of University Partnerships program at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the leading federal program in this area, received an allocation of \$25 million.<sup>399</sup>

The first element of a serious external strategy should be to identify specific state and federal opportunities for immediate action. Some opportunities may involve working within new government policy initiatives, such as the Obama Administration's Choice Neighborhoods and Promise Neighborhoods programs and, indeed, universities have been made eligible recipients for this funding. The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative, funded at \$65 million in FY 2010, seeks to integrate public housing revitalization and social service provision. The Promise Neighborhoods planning grants, funded at \$10 million in FY 2010, represents a small step toward federal efforts to replicate the highly touted Harlem Children's Zone program that applies a comprehensive "cradle through college" academic support system for children in targeted geographic zones as a poverty alleviation strategy. Although the outcome of the FY 2011 budget remains highly uncertain (at the time of publication), the Obama Administration has proposed sizeable increases in funding for both of these programs: \$250 million for Choice Neighborhoods and \$210 million for Promise Neighborhoods. Another Obama administration initiative, the Sustainable Communities Initiative at the Department of Housing & Urban Development, funded at \$150 million in FY 2010 (with another \$150 million requested for FY 2011), aims to integrate housing, environmental, and transportation planning; here, too, anchor institutions, have an important role to play. This is not merely a matter of universities seeking out new sources of funding. Rather, the federal government has an incentive for universities to

participate, since small amounts of federal investment can leverage considerable additional university resources. Given that the Harlem Children's Zone costs \$70 million a year, federal funding alone is highly unlikely to achieve significant replication *without* anchor institution participation and investment.<sup>400</sup>

At the same time, while opportunities to promote an anchor institution mission within existing funding streams exist, this should not distract from the broader policy need to develop comprehensive longer-term legislation, based on the idea of a 21st century anchor institution vision comparable to the land-grant vision. The emerging new model would be largely based on a collaborative approach to problem-solving—a two-way street in which practitioners and community members contribute to shaping the research, teaching, and service agenda of the university. Another critical element of this strategy is promoting and publicizing the best examples of community-building programs of universities, with priority given to the “economic engine” impact that universities are making on their communities. In addition, more case studies and training materials based on these models should be developed for use by other universities and policy makers. Ultimately, an anchor institution mission has the potential to become a core function of universities just as community health clinics have become a mainstay at most non-profit hospitals or service-learning has become a standard practice at our nation's high schools and universities.

As noted above, after the election of Barack Obama as President in November 2008, Ira Harkavy and a team of community partnership practitioners, researchers, and university presidents came together to address how public policy could help leverage the existing movement within the university community to take on an anchor institution mission that could achieve greater community impact. The Task Force's charge was to advise incoming Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Shaun Donovan, which gave the recommendations a HUD tilt. Nonetheless, in thinking about how public policy might strengthen and deepen universities' anchor institution mission work, the principles behind the recommendations are worth examining in more detail.

A key principle behind the Task Force's work was that public resources are required to move faculty and university administrators to make the kinds of changes needed to embed and sustain an anchor institution mission across all components of the institution. Universities receive considerable federal support, but the federal funds received direct universities more to lab research, rather than fulfilling their anchor institution mission. As noted above, in FY 2010, universities received over \$6.5 billion from the National Science Foundation, roughly \$25 billion from the National Institutes of Health, \$1.358 billion from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's land-grant programs, and \$25 million from the HUD Office of University Partnerships.

The federal allocation for university partnerships has been tiny, yet it is important to note that nine of the ten schools profiled here—all but Syracuse—have been OUP (Office of University Partnerships) grant recipients.<sup>401</sup> At critical points, this federal support, limited though it has been (while grants vary in size, a standard grant amount has been in the \$400,000–\$700,000 range), has often proven catalytic in the development of the much larger initiatives profiled here. A 2002 study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development

found that the typical \$400,000 "Community Outreach and Partnership Centers" grant leveraged \$475,000 in external funding. Moreover, if one considers that many partnership centers persist in their work for years or even over a decade after the initial grant has expired, the actual leveraging effect of federal investment has been far greater.<sup>402</sup>

Nevertheless, it is hard to imagine the funding disparities outlined above *not* influencing the allocation of university faculty, students, staff and resources. A serious federal government strategy to encourage urban universities to adopt an anchor institution strategy needs to contribute appropriate resources to do so. A reasonable goal, the Task Force felt, would be to gradually increase federal "anchor institution" funds for urban universities to match the current level of support given "land-grant" programs. This would mean an annual allocation of \$1.2 billion — an amount that is equivalent to \$4 per U.S. citizen or 0.03 percent of total federal expenditures. Roughly speaking, these funds would be used in three key areas: 1) comprehensive "partnership" type programs, including both expanding current OUP programs, as well as creating an "Urban Grant" program, modeled after the USDA's "land-grant" and cooperative extension programs, but incorporating partnership principles (such as splitting funding between universities and community partners) with an express focus on meeting the needs of urban areas — an idea originally promoted by the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities; 2) specialized programs that leverage anchor institution resources to meet critical public objectives in specific areas, such as affordable housing, workforce development, public health, K-12 education, culture-based development, and community-based research; and 3) anchor-based community development programs that systematically leverage universities' economic power (purchasing, investment, hiring, etc.) for community benefit. (A more specific breakdown of how the Anchor Institutions Task Force envisioned the funds being used is provided in Appendix A.)<sup>403</sup>

For the last of these areas, one central idea is to convene a multi-stakeholder group, which the Task Force labeled an Integrated Community Anchor Network (I-CAN) that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts such as the Uptown Consortium in Cincinnati profiled here. Partners at the federal level might include: Health and Human Services, the White House Office of Urban Affairs, the Office of Social Innovation in the Corporation for National and Community Service, the HUD-DOT-EPA (Housing-Transportation-Environmental Protection Agency) Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities, and university and hospital associations.<sup>404</sup> Partners at the local level might include: the city government, a local community development financial institution (CDFI), a business development technical assistance group, a workforce development nonprofit, the local public schools, a community foundation, and area hospitals and universities. A competitive grant program that selected an initial slate of I-CAN cities might include the following as criteria in the initial request-for-proposal (RFP) document: a) clear community building objectives in terms of local investment, local purchasing, hiring in low-income communities, business incubation, green job development, and wealth creation; b) clear delineation of how economic development objectives will connect with core institutional programs — e.g., education for universities; c) indication of institutional support at the CEO/Presidential level and of a commitment of internal funds and in-kind support; d) evidence of state and local government matching support; e) inclusion of

community development corporations and other local community groups in the development of goals and objectives as well as implementation; and f) clear metrics to track the impact anchor institution investments in community building have over time. To insure institutionalization of the process, the RFP might require that a high-level unit for engagement be established in either the President's or Provost's office and that a university-wide strategic planning process be undertaken with clear, measurable community-building outcomes.<sup>405</sup>

"HUD's approach has always been to provide seed money so that universities would continually seek their own money to sustain [partnership] programs. We have to find a comfort level for providing long-term support, so universities can continue the work, and not have to quit when they just get going," says Rubin (who also served as a former director of HUD's Office of University Partnerships).<sup>406</sup> State and federal financing can continue to keep pushing universities forward, but according to Rubin, they need to have criteria in place to prevent gentrification and encourage equitable development. PolicyLink defines equitable development as "an approach to creating healthy, vibrant, communities of opportunity. Equitable outcomes come about when smart, intentional strategies are put in place to ensure that low-income communities and communities of color participate in and benefit from decisions that shape their neighborhoods and regions."<sup>407</sup> David Cox also emphasizes the role of federal dollars for greatest leverage: "With federal funding, first, there is greater probability of [university-community partnerships] being sustainable and going to scale—they could support several hundred universities. Second, if we have a federal program, foundations can play an important role in providing funding that supports the spirit of engagement within the federal framework. The reality is that higher education, especially research universities, carries a cache that it's important to legitimize this work." This legitimacy, Cox says, results in support for tenure and promotion policies that recognize knowledge produced from community engagement.<sup>408</sup>

For this purpose, as proposed by the Task Force, prestigious national awards should be given to outstanding universities, and their community partners, which have embraced their anchor institution mission to improve the "quality of life in the community and the quality of research, teaching and service on campus." In addition, "a

### Figure 32: Policy Measures to Support the Anchor Institution Mission

- Support comprehensive programs through collaboration with new government policy initiatives (e.g. Promise Neighborhoods), expansion of current Office of University Partnership programs and creation of an "Urban Grant" program.
- Fund specialized programs that match anchor resources to critical public objectives in specific areas (e.g., affordable housing, business development, K-12 education, etc.).
- Create anchor-based community development programs that leverage universities' economic power (e.g., purchasing, investment, hiring, etc.) for community benefit.
- Convene a multi-stakeholder group that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts through a competitive grant program.
- Utilize local government to incentivize universities to invest in comprehensive community development efforts, as well as provide matching grants.
- Award prizes like NSF does to provide recognition for exemplary university efforts and help legitimize the work.
- Develop a national consultation team of faculty and staff from institutions that have been successful in their work with the community to aid in training and technical assistance.

consultation team comprised of faculty and staff from institutions that have been successful in their work with the community” could help provide training and technical assistance for other universities and communities who are looking to develop anchor-based strategies for community economic development.<sup>409</sup> These efforts can promote more rigorous evaluation and monitoring of anchor strategies as well.

On the local level, universities can be part of a constellation of development, which city departments and elected officials should encourage. Rosalind Greenstein suggests that city government should “help guide universities’ development initiatives” in ways that they can be successfully integrated with city-wide “goals for jobs, real estate development, etc.”<sup>410</sup> Henry Taylor at SUNY-Buffalo also talks about incentivizing universities to leverage their resources in ways that will support community development strategies: “We’re in the early stages of this, so we’ll see, but we’re trying to get elected officials, especially at the state and city level, to buy into the central notion of [universities’ role in] local development. They can then use every university lobbying effort to push back on the university to work in these areas. This is especially important if your state legislatures are working with you, because there are lots of state policies that the university needs in order to do what they want to do; so the elected officials are in a position to put external pressures on the university.” As suggested by the Task Force, the federal government could “provide a pool of capital — grants and loans — that can supply matching funding” for state, regional, and local governments that “encourage anchor institutions to leverage their assets,” such as credit enhancements that leverage university endowment funds. Taylor speaks about the federal level as well. “We have to arm HUD to push for some of these policies to get the *whole* university involved. . . we’ve got to show the connection between building a prosperous urban region and redeveloping distressed areas. The secret to a vibrant city that can anchor urban regional development is transformation of the distressed areas, because distressed areas are a repellent, as long as there is crime, decaying house values, etc.”<sup>411</sup>

One challenge for funders of university-community partnerships, whether foundations or government, is to provide support for the development of lasting infrastructure and not just programs. This includes both internal infrastructure (coordination, administrative support) as well as external infrastructure (engagement process and building relationships).<sup>412</sup> In some visions, pursuing the anchor institution mission, which has often gone by the name “the engaged university,” seems almost like a social work or business development agency — with little or no relationship to its educational and research mission. We disagree. Indeed, we think both the educational and research functions of the university can be greatly enhanced by anchor institution work — if, that is, the concept is taken seriously.

## Thinking Forward

In Section One, we underscored that historically such an effort for anchor-based community development is not unprecedented, but rather stems from the tradition of the land-grant colleges, first created in 1862. In Sections Two and Three, we examined in depth the renewed movement over the past few decades by a number of universities from a range of different backgrounds (community colleges, historically black colleges and universities, state comprehensive universities, land-grant colleges, and private research universities) to adopt innovative anchor institution strategies, even in an environment characterized by a relative *lack* of philanthropic and public support.

In this Final Section, we have focused on the roles university leadership, philanthropy and public policy can play to deepen and consolidate the idea that universities have an *anchor institution mission* as a key part of the work they do. In other words, universities should think of themselves as having an education mission, a research mission (if a research university) and an anchor institution mission. In many schools, especially land-grant institutions, “public service” has frequently been identified as the third mission, but the term is often left highly undefined. Here we have suggested that an anchor institution mission should involve *the conscious application of the long-term, place-based economic power of the institution, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the community in which it resides*. In addition, we have advanced a series of proposals that outline an approach which promises to: a) achieve this shift, and b) even more importantly, help universities fulfill their potential to improve the quality of life in communities across the United States. We firmly believe — and we believe the evidence in this report supports our contentions — that there is great potential benefit to adopting this approach.

At the same time, it is worth emphasizing that while philanthropy and public policy have a role to play, the university community itself must play the central role. In this report, we have purposefully not addressed many issues that have consumed considerable academic debate — the benefits to education of scholarly engagement and the efficacy of community-based participatory research being two obvious areas. This is not because such issues are unimportant (and, indeed, we have written about these issues in the past). However, we felt it was important to make the case for an anchor institution mission, not, as is usually done, *solely* on the basis of

how it helps universities realize their educational and research missions, but rather as being important *in its own right*.

This, naturally, poses a number of research challenges that extend beyond the scope of this report. One area where data is particularly lacking is quantitative community impact data. Here, it is important to highlight, however, what we are not calling for. These days nearly every university can cite the gross economic impact of its spending and purchasing, but as Chancellor Steven Diner of Rutgers University notes, "Economic impact data is *not* what anchor institution research is about. It's about the impact of partnerships." And here the data is, frankly, more limited. In 2009 and 2010, the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities conducted an initial survey of 39 of its 46 members—with promising indicators from the 26 respondents—but systemic collection of this data remains in its infancy. Case study data, as illustrated herein, is rich on the success of programs, but we readily acknowledge that quantitative cross-program, overall effectiveness data remains very hard to come by.<sup>413</sup>

A June 2010 meeting of the Anchor Institutions Task Force outlined some additional research challenges. These include such issues as: 1) Are there tensions between democratic and effective partnerships, and, if so, how can those challenges be addressed? 2) What are the effects of different partnership structures on outcomes? 3) How does the community agenda fit into anchor institution work? 4) How can universities make their assets and resources more accessible to the community? 5) How does university type—community college, state comprehensive school, land-grant, historically black college or university, liberal arts college, research university, etc.—impact the type of anchor institution work it can do? While we would like to believe this report makes a contribution to all of these questions, we hardly claim to have the final word on these matters.<sup>414</sup>

Thinking about an anchor institution mission as being part of what universities do has implications in other areas beyond research, however. While we have only briefly mentioned faculty tenure and promotion in some of the case studies of this report, if a university accepts that it has an anchor institution mission, then clearly faculty that help it achieve that mission have to be rewarded in some way.<sup>415</sup> To be clear, an anchor institution mission demands that academic *and* non-academic resources be directly and strategically connected to improving the quality of life in the university's local community.

Thinking of an anchor institution mission as being part of what universities do also has implications for how those actively involved in community partnerships think about their work. For example, in December 2006, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched its elective "community engagement" classification, which represented a huge step forward for the field. For the first time, universities can compete to be nationally recognized for their community partnership work. In the second round in 2008, 217 schools initially sought recognition for their community partnership work, with 120 schools ultimately receiving a form of "community engagement" classification. Yet the standards for "engagement" fail to take into account many of the corporate factors—hiring, purchasing, investment, and so on—that are part and parcel of an anchor institution approach. Adopting an anchor institution mission

thus requires not only a rethinking of philanthropy and public policy, but a rethinking by those working in the field and evaluating the field as well.<sup>416</sup>

In short, the challenge remains broad. As Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett acknowledge, "For universities and colleges to fulfill their greatest potential. . . they will have to do things very differently than they do now. . . To become part of the solution, higher eds must give full-hearted, full-minded devotion to the painfully difficult task of transforming themselves into socially responsible *civic universities and colleges*."<sup>417</sup> The obstacles are considerable, but the opportunity is also great. We hope this report deepens the discussion of how to overcome these obstacles — and sheds some light on the *road to be taken*, one in which urban universities actively pursue their anchor institution mission and work with city and community partners for the benefit of all.