

# **The Road Half Traveled**

## **University Engagement at a Crossroads**

*Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb*

The Democracy Collaborative  
at the University of Maryland

December 2010

## Executive Summary

*Universities and colleges, which simultaneously constitute preeminent international, national, and local institutions, potentially represent by far the most powerful partners, 'anchors,' and creative catalysts for change and improvement in the quality of life in American cities and communities. For universities and colleges to fulfill their great potential and more effectively contribute to positive change in their communities, cities, and metropolitan areas, however, they will have to critically examine and change their organizational cultures and structures and embed civic engagement across all components of the institution.*

Ira Harkavy et al., Anchor Institutions Task Force, *Retooling HUD*, 2009.<sup>1</sup>

Colleges and universities are place-based institutions anchored within their communities, and they are increasingly recognized as key contributors to urban and community development. Their economic impact cannot be overstated. Nationwide, universities employ over two million full-time workers and another million part-time workers, as well as enroll more than 18 million students. In 2006 alone, the nation's colleges and universities purchased over \$373 billion in goods and services — or more than two percent of the nation's gross domestic product.<sup>2</sup> Universities, of course, are much more than economic engines. They are first and foremost intellectual centers with enormous knowledge-producing and problem-solving abilities, and they have come to an increasing recognition that by helping to solve real-world problems as they are manifested locally, they can advance their core missions of research, teaching, and service.<sup>3</sup>

By definition, anchor institutions are tied to a certain location "by reason of mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers or employees."<sup>4</sup> Put simply, anchor institutions cannot move. As a result, the well-being of the anchor institution is inextricably tied to the welfare of the community in which it is located. As the United States has shifted from a manufacturing to a service- and knowledge-based economy, the economic weight of these anchor institutions

has grown. And, in nearly all urban and metropolitan areas, universities and hospitals are the largest such institutions. For example, a 1999 Brookings Institution paper found that in each of the 20 largest cities in the United States, a higher education or medical institution was among the top ten private employers.<sup>5</sup>

A number of universities, spurred by a variety of factors, have embraced their role as anchors, which has included making substantial investments to help develop the neighborhoods surrounding their campuses in the last two decades. In some cases, these efforts have been spurred by urban crime that has encroached directly onto the university campus. But there are also many broader factors encouraging universities to increase their community investment including an intellectual movement that identifies “engaged scholarship” as contributing to the university’s core mission, growing pressure to fill social service and infrastructure gaps that stem in part from the declining revenue base of state and local government, and, last, but not least, universities’ increasingly powerful role as economic institutions in their own right. In addition to engaging their academic resources and developing partnership programs, many universities have also leveraged their business or “corporate” practices (real estate development, procurement, endowment investment, hiring, and so forth) to help underwrite the costs of large community revitalization efforts. There are valuable lessons to be learned from the experience to date, but unless implemented well, there is also a real danger that anchor institution strategies will fail to meet the challenge, set forth in the Anchor Institutions Task Force report cited above, of improving the quality of life in American cities and communities.

Two risks are worth highlighting. One is that anchor institution strategies may improve the quality of life in target neighborhoods, but without markedly improving the welfare of long-time neighborhood residents — frequently low-income and people of color — some of whom may move out of the neighborhoods due to increased rental values or rising property taxes. In short, absent provision up front to maintain mixed-income neighborhoods (through such means as inclusionary zoning, community land trusts, and/or a broader policy commitment to mixed-income development), anchor institution strategies bear the risk of promoting, albeit without intending to, gentrification and less diverse communities.

A second, and perhaps more subtle, risk is to fail to maintain an appropriate balance institution-wide between technology transfer, economic clusters and related programs, on the one hand — and low-income neighborhood partnership work, on the other. Although the focus of this report is on anchor institution strategies that aim to improve the welfare of low-income communities, we find much to praise in university technology transfer programs. Nonetheless, there is a risk of “community engagement” being exclusively defined in such terms. If such unbalanced community investment were to occur, anchor institutions, by focusing their capital on jobs with educational requirements beyond the reach of most area residents, might inadvertently contribute to and deepen a growing U.S. class divide. As Congressional Budget Office data affirm, from 1979 to 2007 the share of U.S. after-tax income of the top one percent of Americans more than doubled from 7.5 percent of total income to 17.1 percent, while the share going to the bottom 80 percent fell from 58 percent to 48 percent. In short, universities,

in developing their strategies to improve the conditions in distressed communities, must recognize that they are often in the position of “swimming upstream.”<sup>6</sup>

By understanding the successes and limitations of current efforts, we can better ensure that the needs of the poor are built into the design of these initiatives from the beginning. Moreover, we can provide valuable tools and practices to those implementing anchor strategies so that they will not have to reinvent the wheel, but can build on lessons already learned.

This study was designed to examine a cross-section of ten urban colleges and universities in an attempt to assess: 1) the degree to which anchor-based development initiatives take into account critical issues of economic inclusion; 2) how such programs are organized, including goals and targets, the degree of community involvement in decision-making, and the establishment of internal incentives and metrics; and 3) promising practices that have the greatest chance to contribute to building individual and community wealth in distressed and underserved neighborhoods.<sup>7</sup>

The ten institutions profiled here — 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. Taken together, we believe we are on the verge of an important new vision of what might be possible if urban universities seek to **fully achieve their anchor institution mission** — that is, to *consciously apply their long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with their human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the communities in which they reside.*

The concept of an anchor institution mission is related to, yet distinct from, the broader concept of community engagement. Community engagement, understood in its broadest sense, involves universities interacting with the outside world in a “problem-solving” framework and can be applied to any scale of problems — be they local, regional, national, or even global. By contrast, an anchor institution mission implies a specific engagement of the institution with its surrounding community.

In the past two decades, a number of universities have taken significant steps toward adopting conscious, place-based anchor institution strategies. Nevertheless, even among the leaders, the road to fully achieving this anchor institution mission remains only half traveled. Through this report, we hope to present both a challenge to the field — to realize this mission — as well as an illumination to policymakers, foundation officers, community partners and practitioners of the potential of this emerging movement.

To begin, we examined a list of approximately 25 higher education institutions in urban locations that are nationally recognized for their community partnership and community development efforts. After careful review, 10 of these institutions were selected to study in further detail. For more universally applicable findings, we included institutions diverse in size and locale, as well as a mix of private and public universities. Even more specifically, we intentionally selected at least one Ivy League research university, one land-grant institution, one historically black college and one community college. Demonstrating their prominence in the field of study, nine of the ten colleges selected for this study were recognized by the President’s

2008 Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, many with distinction. Eight of these institutions qualified for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's new voluntary Community Engagement Classification. Westfield State College President Evan S. Dobelle named five of these schools as being among the nation's top 25 "best neighbor" colleges and universities in 2009.

The 10 colleges and universities selected for this study are:

**Emory University:** private research university in Atlanta, GA

**Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis:** public comprehensive university in Indianapolis, IN

**LeMoyne-Owen College:** private historically black college and liberal arts institution affiliated with the United Church of Christ in Memphis, TN

**Miami Dade College:** public college offering two-year and four-year degrees and Hispanic supporting institution in Miami, FL

**Portland State University:** public comprehensive university in Portland, OR

**Syracuse University:** private research university in Syracuse, NY

**The University of Cincinnati:** public comprehensive university in Cincinnati, OH

**The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities:** public comprehensive university and land-grant institution in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN

**The University of Pennsylvania:** Ivy League, private research university in Philadelphia, PA

**Yale University:** Ivy League, private research university in New Haven, CT

From May to October 2009, we conducted site visits to the selected 10 institutions, spending two days on average at each location. At most locations, meetings included a mix of university faculty, staff, and administration, as well as representatives from community-based organizations, foundations, businesses, and local government. Several follow-up interviews were also conducted by telephone. The focus for these visits was deconstructing the existing models of anchor-based and anchor-driven community development in a way that could inform practices going forward.

We wish to recognize many leading community development efforts underway by colleges and universities that were not included in this study such as University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Duke University, University of Southern California, Trinity College, University of Akron and Ohio State University. The experience of these universities would add much to the wealth of knowledge of anchor-based community development. Another limitation of this study is

insufficient representation and quotes from residents of the communities studied. While we did meet with community partners at each site, and though efforts were made to reach out directly to such individuals, many of the organizations and opinions represented here are strongly connected to the higher education institutions' initiatives.



In the first section of this report, we provide a consolidated history of university engagement with their communities. We make a case for the deep relationship between higher education and economic development, and the role that the federal government has played in influencing this connection over the last 150 years, beginning with the Morrill Act of 1862. We also discuss the growth of service-learning and the particular role that urban deterioration and crime played in spurring universities to act in more strategic ways and increasingly recognize their role as anchors in their communities. We present key questions as the work moves forward regarding institutionalization, accountability, and true impact on those most in need. Key anchor strategies and tools for leveraging university resources for community development are introduced, based on the practices we saw at the ten institutions studied. These anchor strategies include comprehensive neighborhood revitalization; community economic development through corporate investment; local capacity building; education and health partnerships; scholarly engagement; and multi-anchor, city and regional partnerships. In addition, we discuss intricacies of this work including the challenges of creating an engaged community, establishing partnership programs and goals, institutionalizing an anchor vision, securing funding and leveraging resources, building a culture of economic inclusion, sustaining participatory planning and robust community relationships, and meeting the needs of low-income residents and neighborhoods who are partners in these efforts.

The second section of this report delves into the stories of the ten profiled colleges and universities. We discuss the various and multi-faceted strategies, as well as significant commitments of resources and time, to community development that these ten sites revealed. These efforts ranged from service-learning courses and community-based research, on the one hand, to local procurement and contracting policies, on the other, and from in-kind trainings and facilities, to millions of dollars invested in real estate development designed to achieve community development objectives.

In studying these 10 universities, the goal was neither to praise nor find fault with existing efforts, but to move beyond promotion, public relations, and anecdotes to assess how these initiatives affect (positively and negatively) those most in need, and how such strategies can be focused for the greatest impact. In doing this analysis, we found three principal patterns emerging among the institutions' policies and practices. In accord with these patterns, this report identifies each university as taking one of three general roles in anchor-based community development. One pattern we found was exemplified by large, public institutions where the university served as a *facilitator* in broad efforts for local and regional development. IUPUI,

Miami Dade College, and Portland State provide examples of this approach. At these universities, educational opportunity, service-learning experiences, and in-kind resources are emphasized, due in large part to their limited resources. While they engage many community partners, there is only limited geographic or thematic focus of institution-wide investment. In other schools, we found the university serving as the *leader* in community development efforts, with a focus on revitalization of a particular neighborhood(s) that is often adjacent to campus and whose deteriorating conditions threatens the university's ability to maintain its rank or stature. Demonstrating this approach are Cincinnati, Penn, and Yale. These schools tend to dedicate significant institution-wide resources (i.e., academic, corporate, and human) towards comprehensive community development efforts, but while community stakeholders are regularly consulted, they often have only a moderate degree of control over the content of the "community partnership" decisions made. In the remaining schools, we found that the university was not as neutral or as focused as were those in the other patterns, but instead served as a *convener*, working to forge coalitions with community stakeholders in a collaborative fashion. Examples of this approach are Emory, LeMoyne-Owen, Minnesota, and Syracuse. Largely free from direct threats of crime and deterioration (as seen near or on the borders of the *leaders'* campuses), these institutions have the opportunity to make a more strategic choice for their investment. The choice for these schools is to invest somewhat limited institutional resources, while leveraging significant external funding, towards economic development and capacity building of particularly challenged neighborhoods.

Figure 1 provides a list of characteristics typical to each of the three roles we have defined, in order to provide a clear distinction between them. However, no one university perfectly fits all of these characteristics. Each institution simply fell into one pattern more than the other two, each with its own mixture of strengths and shortfalls. This framework, or distinction of university roles, allowed us to further deconstruct the various manifestations of anchor institution strategies among a diverse cross-section of cases. In Section Two, the case studies and comparative analyses allow for greater understanding of the complexity and variation among individual university approaches. It is critical to note that we do not prescribe any one approach but rather seek to explore the promising practices at each of these institutions that have the greatest potential to contribute to improving the quality of life, as well as building individual and community wealth, in distressed and underserved neighborhoods.

Throughout the report, and particularly in Section Two, the ten sites are divided into three clusters according to which of three general roles they have taken towards anchor-based community development: facilitator, leader, or convener. We now briefly introduce the cases in this fashion with further explanation of the three clusters.

## University as Facilitator

Facilitator universities are often young, large, public institutions with limited funding. Strong administrative leadership supports a civic engagement mission but corporate investments directed at community development (i.e., local purchasing, hiring, investment and real estate) are limited. Educational opportunity is a focal point of these schools' community development efforts; thus, they seek to provide engaging, supportive learning environments for both their students and the broader community. Due, in part, to their lack of financial strength to contribute to comprehensive neighborhood development, relationships play a particularly strong role in these schools' anchor strategies. They aim to build capacity for community organizations by providing in-kind facilities and facilitating community forums. These institutions also emphasize service-learning opportunities as well as public education and health partnerships, with large numbers of students and faculty involved. These efforts tend to reach a significant number of community partners, with the work typically dispersed throughout the greater community rather than focused on a specific neighborhood.

### Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) is a large, public institution established in 1969 with approximately 22,000 undergraduates and 8,000 graduate students. The institution prioritizes service-learning, community work-study, volunteer, and internship opportunities for its students that also provide benefit to community partners. For many years, IUPUI has sustained strong K-12 relationships based on the community school model. Coordinated by its Office of Neighborhood Partnerships (ONP), the university is now a key partner in comprehensive revitalization of the Near Westside community through the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative. ONP and its umbrella organization, the Center for Service and Learning, receive strong support from university administration; however, corporate investments have not been aligned with the Center's partnerships.

### Miami Dade College

Miami Dade College (MDC) enrolls over 170,000 students each year at its eight campuses in Miami-Dade County, Florida. MDC began as a community college in 1960, and in 2003, expanded to offer a four-year bachelor's degree program. The College has an open-door policy for enrollment, reflecting the administration's view that educational access is the largest contributor to economic development. The College provides many in-kind resources to residents and local nonprofits, particularly through educational programs, as well as an array of cultural programs for the broader community. The Center for Community Involvement oversees service-learning opportunities for 5,000 students each year as well as one of the largest literacy tutoring

Figure 1: Three Roles of Universities in Anchor-Based Community Development

Key Issues	University as Facilitator	University as Leader	University as Convener
<b>The Engaged Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispersed partnerships rather than geographic focus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on adjacent neighborhood</li> <li>Revitalization often initiated in response to crisis or threatening conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted efforts often focus on non-adjacent neighborhood</li> <li>Strategic choice to engage (not required by history or immediate threat)</li> </ul>
<b>Partnership Programs and Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on scholarly engagement, education and health partnerships, and in-kind resources to build local capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on comprehensive neighborhood revitalization — especially education, health, and community development — through academic and non-academic resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on capacity building, as part of neighborhood revitalization</li> <li>Education and health partnerships often part of broader agenda</li> </ul>
<b>Institutional Support and Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong administrative support for broad civic engagement mission</li> <li>Designated community partnership center with focus often on scholarly engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong administrative support often directly overseeing revitalization efforts</li> <li>Additional partnership centers promote university-wide engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high administrative support often with designated, high-powered staff to oversee revitalization efforts</li> <li>Additional partnership centers promote university-wide engagement</li> </ul>
<b>Funding and Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low endowment</li> <li>Limited budget</li> <li>Limited corporate investments</li> <li>Moderate leveraging of external resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high endowment</li> <li>High budget</li> <li>Significant corporate investments</li> <li>Internal investment leverages considerable external resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high endowment</li> <li>Moderate budget</li> <li>Moderate corporate investments</li> <li>Significant leveraging of external resources</li> </ul>
<b>Principles of Economic Inclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize access to education</li> <li>Limited but focused efforts towards support of small and local business owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize innovative corporate practices for community economic development (e.g., local purchasing, real estate development)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize capacity building</li> <li>Developing targeted corporate practices that support diversity, with increasing focus on local community</li> </ul>
<b>Nature of Community Relationships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good neighbor: responsive to community's or city's agenda</li> <li>Typically reactive (partnership "taker," not "maker")</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University agenda setting</li> <li>Strong community dialogue, but plans often presented "to them" rather than developed "with them"</li> <li>Hire from within rather than from community</li> <li>Create stand-alone organizations to pursue agenda; heavily brand efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-agenda setting among university and community partners</li> <li>Hire community people to work in partnership centers — translator function</li> <li>Partner with new or existing community organizations with shared leadership; low-key branding</li> </ul>
<b>Impacts on Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large-number of nonprofits benefit from partnerships</li> <li>Neighborhood-wide impacts difficult to measure due to extensive geography of effort</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant university interventions in community development, public health and K-12 schooling show promising indicators</li> <li>Major improvements in public safety</li> <li>Often result in higher real estate values in target areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial increase in nonprofit and community capacity</li> <li>Efforts centered on target neighborhood(s) relatively new, making long-term impact difficult to assess</li> </ul>

programs in the nation. Several College programs provide workforce training and small business development in low-income areas, although little focus has been given to an institution-wide, place-based approach to community development.

### Portland State University

Portland State University is the largest university in the state of Oregon, enrolling approximately 20,000 undergraduates and 8,000 graduate students. It is a public institution, established in 1946 to serve returning World War II veterans. In the 1990s, Portland State worked closely with city and business officials to redevelop the area immediately surrounding campus, primarily through real estate development. In recent years, it has consciously taken a broader approach to community engagement rather than focus on development of a specific neighborhood. Still, it has continued its collaboration with city partners, investing in transit and sustainable, regional development. The Center for Academic Excellence oversees a large service-learning program as well as senior capstone program, with significant academic resources dispersed throughout the region.

### University as Leader

Universities who serve as leaders in community development agendas generally act in response to crisis, most often urban crime or the *perception* of crime. Improving conditions in their adjacent neighborhood is necessary for a cleaner, safer environment that will attract top students and faculty and maintain the university's stature. These institutions are older, often private, universities with large endowments and the capacity to make significant investments in their communities. In response to threatening conditions, top administration directly oversees — and commits significant institutional resources towards — these efforts. In turn, this often attracts significant external resources and support. Although the community is frequently consulted, universities as leaders primarily set the community development agenda, with programmatic focus often on the “big three” issues — public health, K-12 education, and community development. As the crisis subsides, these institutions often take steps towards more collaborative initiatives.

### University of Cincinnati

The University of Cincinnati is a public institution established in 1819 in Cincinnati, OH. It enrolls over 30,000 undergraduate students and 9,000 graduate students. Since 2003, it has been engaged in a partnership involving the area's largest anchor institutions (originally partnering with three health organizations and the zoo; today, only two health organizations are involved) to create the Uptown Consortium, an anchor-based approach to community development. To date, the trustees of the University of Cincinnati alone have allocated \$150 million from the

university's \$833 million endowment to support real estate development — an investment that the administration views as “patient capital.” Much of the development through the Consortium generally has been focused on real estate, although partners hope to address broader socioeconomic goals going forward. The university is also a leader in the Strive educational partnership and several other local school initiatives.

### University of Pennsylvania

The University of Pennsylvania is an Ivy League, private research university in Philadelphia, PA. Established in 1740, it now enrolls approximately 10,000 undergraduates and 10,000 graduate students. It has made significant one-time and ongoing financial commitments to community development. Penn maintains the nation's largest and most successful university local purchasing program, and emphasizes economic inclusion practices in its contracting and hiring. The Netter Center for Community Partnerships leads a multi-faceted approach that galvanizes resources to improve local schools, urban nutrition, and community development; this work has been sustained for over 20 years and across three different university presidents. Under the leadership of the Netter Center and the School of Education, the university has emphasized K-12 educational partnerships, as well as public health partnerships with Penn's professional schools.

### Yale University

Yale University is an Ivy League, private research university established in 1701. Located in New Haven, Connecticut, it enrolls approximately 5,000 undergraduate and 7,000 graduate students each year. Yale has helped to dramatically improve safety in New Haven, with its largest contribution made through payments in lieu of taxes (PILOTs) to the City. It has also leveraged its real estate assets to achieve ancillary public safety and marketing goals. Yale provides more direct neighborhood assistance by operating one of the nation's largest university employer-assisted housing programs, as well as partnering with twenty New Haven public schools, with a focus on science education.

### University as Convener

Universities serving as conveners in anchor-based community development make strategic choices to engage in neighborhood revitalization. Typically working in a non-adjacent neighborhood, community development is not required by history or immediate threat but rather is seen as part of their institutional mission. Indeed, a focused “urban agenda” or “place-based strategy” is often just a portion of these universities' broader engagement agendas. Administrative support is strong but institutional investment in targeted neighborhood projects often limited; thus, significant external resources are leveraged to carry out community development plans. As

conveners, universities view the community as co-participants in leadership and agenda setting and give significant focus to building community and resident capacity. Education and health partnerships are often in support of the broader community engagement agenda.

### Emory University

Emory University is a private research university established in 1836 in Atlanta, Georgia, with approximately 7,000 undergraduates and 6,000 graduate students. Each year more than 200 courses in dozens of departments engage 4,000 students in community work as part of their course requirements. The Office of University-Community Partnerships has sustained strong relationships with local community organizations and has been effective in building nonprofit capacity. One key program is a 12-month fellowship program that involves student teams working with nonprofit partners, and is accompanied by group seminars and faculty support. As an anchor institution, Emory has been fairly modest in resource commitment towards community economic development but there is promise of more sustained, place-based initiatives ahead.

### Lemoyne-Owen College

LeMoyne-Owen College is a private historically black college and liberal arts institution in Memphis, TN that enrolls around 1,000 students. It was formed in 1968 through the merger of LeMoyne College (1862) and Owen College (1947). Service-learning and numerous other partnerships connect the campus to the community, although resources and capacity are limited — LeMoyne-Owen has faced grave fiscal challenges in recent years. Despite such challenges, the College has continued to attract significant federal funding to support the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, which it established in 1989 to institutionalize its commitment to the surrounding community. The CDC, which operates as a private, not-for-profit 501(c)3, is now a lead partner in revitalizing the Soulsville community through workforce training, small business development and increased homeownership. Establishing the CDC as an autonomous organization focused on community development has allowed LeMoyne-Owen College to focus on its primary mission of education, and more recently, rebuild its enrollment numbers.

### Syracuse University

Syracuse University is a private research university established in 1860 in Syracuse, NY that enrolls 13,000 undergraduates and 6,000 graduate students. Its multi-faceted engagement effort focuses on K-12 education, urban revitalization, and green development. The University is a lead partner in the Near West Side Initiative, an effort to rehabilitate and revitalize the Near West Side community through arts, culture, and technology. Syracuse is also the catalyst for a citywide initiative to create a signature strip of cutting-edge cultural development that connects University Hill with downtown Syracuse, known as the Connective Corridor. Through

such initiatives, Syracuse has strategically leveraged its intellectual resources to stimulate redevelopment in its local community under the vision "Scholarship in Action." The corporate side of the university is also philosophically committed to community economic development and continues to develop programs and policies to support this effort.

### University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities is a large, public research university and land-grant college established in 1851 in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN. It enrolls more than 33,000 undergraduates and 18,000 graduate students. In recent years, Minnesota has aimed to redefine its land-grant mission with a public agenda, more strategically aligning university resources with its community. With this agenda, Minnesota has given particular attention to community collaboration and capacity building, as well as institutional infrastructure to support engagement. In regards to urban engagement, the University Northside Partnership and the new Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center are key efforts focused on bringing stakeholders together to work on education, health, and economic development in North Minneapolis. The Office of Business and Community Economic Development oversees significant efforts in minority contracting as well as small business development. A university-wide Office of Public Engagement facilitates the advancement of the community engagement agenda across the university's research, teaching, and outreach missions, although many partnership initiatives across the campus still remain diffuse and disconnected.



Looking exclusively at the ten profiled institutions, in Section Three we highlight a number of promising practices that have the greatest chance to contribute to building individual and community wealth in distressed and underserved neighborhoods.

By diving deeper into the experiences of these universities and their partners, including specific policies adopted and roadblocks faced, we hope to provide valuable tools for other universities implementing anchor-based community development strategies. Figure 2 briefly presents the best practices we have highlighted from the ten schools in this study; specific strategies used and lessons learned from each practice are described in the third section.

Section Four — "Envisioning the Road *To Be Taken*: Embracing the Anchor Institution Mission" — then asks the question, *provided a university acknowledges its role as an anchor, how does it achieve its anchor institution mission?* This section discusses universities' roles in leveraging their resources for community development and analyzes the potential for higher education institutions to fully realize their mission as anchors. Drawing on the experience of the ten profiled institutions, as well as our own, we produce a vision of a comprehensive strategy linking promising practices for maximum impact and sustainability. Specifically, we discuss the role of internal constituencies, philanthropy and policy in supporting the anchor institution mission.

**Figure 2: Best Practices among Anchor Strategies – Select Features**

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization at Penn	➔	Create institution-wide engagement (academic, corporate, human resources) in focused geographic area
Revitalization through Coalition Building at Syracuse	➔	Draw collaborators from all sectors (business, government, neighborhood, schools, nonprofits) and build on existing strengths
Leveraging Contracting Dollars at Minnesota	➔	Require general contractors to establish levels of participation for targeted businesses and raise targets when opportunities arise
Local Purchasing at Penn	➔	Establish robust local purchasing goals and compensate staff on performance
Community Capacity Building at Emory	➔	Engage partners in extensive front-end planning, and be proactive in designing collaborative interventions at critical moments
Supporting Community Schools at IUPUI	➔	Adapt programming to fit needs and interests of students, families, and the broader community
Science Education Partnerships at Yale	➔	Build sustainable partnerships through trust, in-kind resources, and creative leveraging of external funds
Scholarly Engagement at IUPUI	➔	Direct academic resources to collectively identified areas of need in community
City and Regional Partnerships at Portland State	➔	Collaborate with city departments on long-term real estate and economic development plans to leverage additional resources as well as achieve broader community goals
Multi-Anchor Partnerships at Cincinnati	➔	Work with other local anchors to pool resources
Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision at Syracuse	➔	Create supportive policy, both in academic reward structure and in business practices
Community Investment of Endowment Assets at Cincinnati	➔	Employ endowment to finance community investment, and create understanding of long-term financial and social return
Leveraging Resources through an Independent Entity at LeMoyne-Owen	➔	Seek investment from a wide variety of public and private sources (e.g. New Market Tax Credits, federal appropriation, private developers)
Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion at Miami Dade College	➔	Provide workforce training to low-income residents and connect to actual jobs, and direct existing resources to local investment
Sustaining Inclusive Planning and Robust Relationships at Minnesota	➔	Enter into genuine dialogue to reach a shared vision, and engage stakeholders in strategic planning process

These recommendations (summarized in Figure 3) are intended to inform university leaders, community-based organizations, funders, and policy-makers of how they can work together to promote anchor institution strategies based on a “win/win/win” formula — i.e., one that that benefits the anchor institution(s); the overall community; and low-income neighborhoods in particular.

For internal transformation, our recommendations focus on the need for greater institution-wide investment and collaboration. In particular, we call for a more conscious linking of the corporate and academic sides of the university, to work with its community in democratic, mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships. Further, we believe that adopting a strategic, place-based approach to community development can help ensure that existing institutional resources have much greater impact.

Foundations, we suggest, can best encourage universities to pursue their anchor institution mission by using their convening power to bring practitioners together to develop a common voice, as well as promote comprehensive initiatives. In the case of the latter, a funders’ group could lead a collaboration among multiple constituencies — anchor institutions, foundations, federal departments and local government — to provide incentives and support to individual, or groups of, universities to fully realize their anchor institution mission.

We then discuss how public policy is needed to help 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. Specifically, our recommendations call for identifying specific opportunities to direct federal funds towards anchor institution strategies. This may include working within new government policy initiatives, such as the Obama Administration’s Choice Neighborhoods and Promise Neighborhoods programs or Sustainable Communities Initiative (all of which specify universities as eligible recipients for funding). We also support the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities’ proposal for establishing a federal “Urban Grant” program — modeled after the USDA’s “land-grant” and cooperative extension programs — with an express focus on meeting the needs of urban areas, and which incorporates partnership principles (such as splitting funding between universities and community partners). We further suggest federal funding for higher education engagement that specifically leverages universities’ economic power for community benefit. Finally, we recommend that government convene a multi-stakeholder group that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts through a competitive grant program. Suggestions for future areas of research are also presented.



In 1990, former president of Harvard University Derek Bok wrote, “All things considered, then, in the constant interplay between universities and the outside world, neither side has done a satisfactory job of promoting the nation’s long-term interests. University leaders have not worked sufficiently hard to bring their institutions to attend to our most important national problems. At the same time, neither trustees, nor the professors, nor foundation officers nor public officials, nor anyone else concerned with higher education has done enough to urge universities

**Figure 3: Recommendations for Realizing the Anchor Institution Mission**

<b>University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Institute high-level administrative commitment.</li><li>• Employ the university's resources fully —human, academic, cultural, and economic.</li><li>• Link university hiring, real estate, purchasing, and investment strategies to community partnership goals.</li><li>• Promote scholarship of engagement.</li><li>• Engage community residents and groups in mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships.</li><li>• Learn from "best practices," from each other.</li><li>• Adopt a strategic, place-based approach to capitalize on existing resources.</li><li>• Leverage university economic power to support jobs for community members at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale.</li><li>• Ensure Carnegie "engagement" classification takes into account community-supportive practices in the corporate areas of purchasing, hiring, investment, and real estate.</li></ul>
<b>Philanthropy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support information sharing and networks that promote the work (e.g., Coalition of Urban Serving Universities).</li><li>• Create incentives to encourage structural changes, including policy amendments and internal collaboration that support an anchor institution mission.</li><li>• Provide pre-development and capital support for community job creation strategies linked to anchor institutions (e.g., The Cleveland Foundation's Evergreen Initiative).</li><li>• Develop a funders' group that can support long-term, comprehensive, multi-modal initiatives at leading campuses.</li></ul>
<b>Policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Fund specialized programs that match anchor resources to critical public objectives in specific areas (e.g., affordable housing, business development, K-12 education, etc.).</li><li>• Create anchor-based community development programs that leverage universities' economic power (e.g., purchasing, investment, hiring, etc.) for community benefit.</li><li>• Convene a multi-stakeholder group that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts through a competitive grant program.</li><li>• Utilize local government to incentivize universities to invest in comprehensive community development efforts, as well as provide matching grants.</li><li>• Award prizes like NSF does to provide recognition for exemplary university efforts and help legitimize the work.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

to make greater efforts along these lines or to help them mobilize resources sufficient for the task. There is good reason now to contemplate a fresh attempt to improve on this record.”

In the twenty years since this statement, higher education leaders have come a long way — as have funders and policy makers — in acknowledging universities’ roles as anchor institutions with great potential to impact urban and regional development. Still, most colleges and universities have yet to fully realize their anchor institution mission and work to solve our nation’s most pressing social problems. In the meantime, and particularly as our nation struggles to recover from the recent financial crash, Bok’s words have only gained more urgency: “Observing our difficulties competing abroad, our millions of people in poverty, our drug-ridden communities, our disintegrating families, our ineffective schools, those who help to shape our universities have reason to ask whether they too have any time to lose.”<sup>8</sup>

As America’s urban and metropolitan communities continue to struggle, higher education institutions are at a crossroads where they must choose between leveraging their assets to improve the quality of life of their surrounding community, or retreating to their ivory tower. Actively pursuing a comprehensive anchor institution strategy will not be easy, but few would have imagined that universities would have gotten as far as they have today. Perhaps in the years to come — by following such a path as the one illuminated in the pages ahead — universities will begin to realize this mission. There is no time to lose.