THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL

Eds, Meds, and the Feds

How the Federal Government Can Foster the Role of Anchor Institutions in Community Revitalization

By Tracey Ross   October 2014

Center for American Progress

Eds, Meds, and the Feds

How the Federal Government Can Foster the Role of Anchor Institutions in Community Revitalization

By Tracey Ross   October 2014

Contents

Introduction and summary

The growth of U.S. cities is largely rooted in the nation's industrial past. As industry boomed, local governments constructed roads, sewers, and water systems, making it easier to live and work in densely populated areas. An increasing number of factories opened, public transportation expanded, and workers formed neighborhoods nearby. In short, cities grew alongside their businesses, and these firms employed workers, paid taxes, and purchased goods and services from other businesses. Not only did businesses make economic contributions to these cities, their owners and management teams provided civic leadership that, in some cases, served as a powerful enabler for taking on visionary projects.

The role of businesses in cities has become markedly different over the past few decades. Suburbanization, technological innovations, and globalization have each shifted the idea that businesses are rooted in communities.[1] Communities across the country continue to experience the devastating effects of factory closings, and many of the jobs lost during the 2007 Great Recession will not return as businesses are forced to adapt to a new economic climate. Furthermore, only about one-quarter of low- and middle-skill jobs are accessible within a 90 minute-commute in metropolitan areas.[2]

However, some institutions—including colleges, universities, and hospitals—maintain and foster strong connections to the places where they are located and serve many of the same functions as early industry leaders. They participate in local and national markets, employ hundreds—if not thousands—of workers, and purchase from other businesses. These institutions are often referred to collectively as "Eds and Meds," or anchor institutions, as they are rooted in the communities where they are located.[3]

As entities that control vast economic, human, and intellectual resources, anchor institutions have the potential to be important partners in community and economic development work. Universities represent roughly 3 percent of U.S. gross domestic product and employ more than 3 million people annually.[4] The hospital industry

is even larger: 5 million Americans work for hospitals and, in aggregate, hospital-sector procurement is in excess of $600 million annually.[5] According to the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, or ICIC, in 66 of the 100 largest inner cities, an anchor institution is the largest employer. Some 925 colleges and universities—roughly one in eight—are based in an inner city,[6] and about 350 hospitals—roughly 1 in 15 of the nation's largest hospitals—call an inner city home.[7] U.S. hospitals and universities spend a combined $1 trillion per year and employ 8 percent of the labor force.[8]

Local leaders increasingly understand the critical importance of anchor institutions within their own cities' economic development strategies. For example, Baltimore Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake (D) recently announced partnership agreements with Baltimore's major higher-education and medical institutions to advance economic development, public safety, local hiring, local purchasing, and quality-of-life goals.[9]

As momentum gathers among mayors to leverage their cities' anchor institutions, the federal government can help further this process. The federal government has a history of supporting the work of such institutions and has a vested interest in exploring strategies that harness the power of anchors to increase community revitalization and economic growth. While anchor institutions have many resources, they are still institutions focused on their own goals and thus may not readily align their priorities with those of a greater community strategy. Furthermore, anchor institutions are no silver bullet for addressing the socioeconomic challenges that low-income communities face.

Still, anchor institutions can play an important role in this work, and the federal government should help encourage it. This report proposes a number of recommendations for how the federal government can do this, including:

- **Giving greater weight to place-based grant applicants that have strong partnerships with anchors.** Federal leaders should ensure that initiatives better outline the possible roles anchors can take and better assess the strength of these partnerships to spur greater anchor involvement.

- **Rebuilding the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's, or HUD's, Office of University Partnerships, or OUP.** This office should assist anchors located in communities that have been awarded federal grants for place-based work by providing research and technical assistance around their roles.

- **Ensuring HUD helps develop tools to measure anchor performance.** HUD should work to improve anchor performance by encouraging the creation of dashboard indicators that demonstrate community impact and can be reported to Congress and other stakeholders.

- **Encouraging HUD to work with anchors to promote affordable housing development.** OUP should engage anchors around HUD's housing development goals and offer matching funds for employee-assisted housing and AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps VISTA housing.

- **Encouraging colleges to better utilize the Federal Work-Study, or FWS, program for service learning.** The U.S. Department of Education should outline ways in which colleges and universities can better leverage the community service requirement to enhance educational and leadership experiences while benefiting the broader community.

- **Ensuring a greater impact from the community benefit requirement under the Affordable Care Act, or ACA.** Federal leaders should expand the definition of community benefit and direct hospitals to work with local leaders to collaborate around the community health needs assessment, or CHNA, to ensure resources are spent on shared priorities.

- **Fostering small-business partnerships and mentoring.** The federal government should encourage institutions receiving funding for research to implement programs that mentor local, disadvantaged businesses through additional funding opportunities. In addition, the Small Business Administration, or SBA, should support small-business intermediaries in identifying local and disadvantaged businesses that have the potential to work with anchor clients.

- **Helping align community and technical college courses with apprenticeship programs.** A previous Center for American Progress report recommends that the Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Labor work with policymakers, accrediting bodies, and colleges and universities to greatly expand the number of effective articulation agreements in place.[10]

This report provides an overview of how the federal government has worked with anchor institutions over the years, the potential roles anchors can play in communities, and how to measure the community benefits of this work. It concludes with detailed recommendations for federal officials to further enhance the role of anchor institutions in communities and to promote communities' economic development.

The federal government's history of working with anchors

The federal government has a long precedent of working with anchor institutions to foster local and national prosperity. The Morrill Act, or the Land-Grant College Act of 1862, is one of the earliest examples of federal policy shaping the direction of higher education. The act directed federal resources to establish a network of colleges to provide practical education in agriculture and industry, expanding educational opportunities and—in subsequent decades—focusing on the needs of people in each state.[11]

Following World War II, two major policy changes further transformed the federal role in colleges and universities. First was the 1944 GI Bill, which provided a tuition subsidy for returning veterans, resulting in a rapid increase in enrollments and setting a precedent of using federal aid to support higher education. The second was the formation of the National Science Foundation in 1950, which shifted the focus of university research from addressing state agricultural and industry needs to pursuing scientific research in the wake of the Cold War.[12]

The Cold War stimulated the first comprehensive federal education legislation when Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, or NDEA, in 1958 in response to the Soviet launch of Sputnik. To help ensure that highly trained individuals would be available to help America compete with the Soviet Union in the scientific and technical fields, the NDEA included financial support for college students in the form of loans; the improvement of science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools; graduate fellowships; foreign language and area studies, or studies in interdisciplinary fields focused on particular geographic or cultural regions; and vocational-technical training.[13]

Historically black colleges and universities as anchor institutions

In 1890, the Morrill Act provided additional annual funding for land-grant colleges and required that Southern states establish and fund what today are known as historically black colleges and universities, or HBCUs.[14] The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, defines an HBCU as "any historically black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of black Americans."[15]

HBCUs have been a source of pride and accomplishment for the African American community. However, the majority of the nation's HBCUs are located in areas of high poverty and low economic well-being. Of the 99 HBCUs that participate in the federal programs authorized by the Higher Education Act, two-thirds—which serve more than 260,000 African American students every year—are located in urban communities.[16] Most HBCUs are also located in communities that are predominantly African American,[17] where HBCUs are more than educational institutions—they are also regarded as community anchors that provide cultural, recreational, and learning centers for local residents.[18]

For example, in 2010, Atlanta, Georgia, was chosen as one of the first grantees for a Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant for work in the Atlanta University Center neighborhood, home to the country's largest concentration of HBCUs. This area is characterized by poverty, lack of jobs, troubled public schools, and poor-quality housing, including the now-demolished University Homes public housing development. The Atlanta Housing Authority and its partners have a vision of transforming the area into a thriving college town. The plan was a finalist for a Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant last year but ultimately was not selected. However, stakeholders around the plan are moving forward in conjunction with the Morehouse School of Medicine's Promise Neighborhoods planning effort to transform the area.[19]

The anti-poverty and civil rights laws of the 1960s and 1970s brought about a dramatic emergence of the Department of Education's equal-access mission. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act launched a comprehensive set of programs in 1965—including the Title I program, which provided federal aid to disadvantaged children to address the challenges of accessing quality education in poor urban and rural areas. In that same year, the Higher Education Act authorized financial assistance to ease access to postsecondary education, including financial aid programs for needy college students.[20] In addition, the act authorized funds to enhance HBCUs.

By 1980, the Bayh-Dole Act encouraged universities to patent and earn revenue from their research's innovative discoveries. While some critics argue that this law can cause universities to be preoccupied with earning profits, Bayh-Dole helps universities foster local industry partnerships and regional economic development.[21] Annual patents issued to universities increased from 250 to 3,000 between 1980 and 2000, contributing more than $40 billion to the U.S. economy and providing 270,000 jobs nationwide.[22]

The federal government also helped transform the role of nonprofit hospitals in the United States. In 1946, the Hill-Burton Act provided the first large-scale federal financing of private, nonprofit hospitals.[23] Over the following decades, the law directed $3.6 billion toward the construction of nonprofit and municipal hospitals in mostly rural and lower-income communities. Furthermore, the legislation dramatically affected hospital employment, bolstering hospitals' roles as important economic engines in their communities. For example, by 1960, short-term hospital employment doubled to 1 million, and it increased further to 2 million jobs by 1972.[24] Hill-Burton also set the precedent of community benefit requirements, which require hospital grant recipients to provide a "reasonable volume" of free or discounted care to those in their communities.[25] In the 1970s, amendments were passed to ensure better compliance with community benefit requirements.[26]

These laws laid the foundation for the federal government to work with universities and hospitals to achieve a number of national goals. Today, the federal government seeks to continue such partnerships, with a focus on creating local opportunities as well.

Current federal efforts for anchor participation

Many current federal efforts call on anchor institutions to play a role in community and economic development work by participating as a partner in the Obama administration's place-based initiatives, which are comprehensive federal programs aimed at improving a specific community. The following programs illustrate the roles anchors are playing in this work.

Promise Neighborhoods

Based on the widely celebrated Harlem Children's Zone,[27] Promise Neighborhoods is a federal program designed to support children and youth growing up in distressed urban and rural communities by creating access to great schools and strong systems of family and community support that will help them transition to college and careers. Entities eligible to apply include nonprofits, Indian tribes, and institutions of higher education.[28]

For example, in December 2012, Texas Tech University and the Lubbock Independent School District—along with multiple community partners—were awarded a $24.5 million Promise Neighborhoods grant.[29] Texas Tech will serve as the anchor institution for the East Lubbock Promise Neighborhood, helping build the collective capacity of partner institutions to serve and develop the historically underserved potential of children, families, and communities in the area.[30]

Choice Neighborhoods

The Choice Neighborhoods program addresses struggling neighborhoods with underinvested public or HUD-assisted housing by supporting comprehensive approaches to neighborhood revitalization.[31] Among other criteria, applicants are assessed on their "anchor institution engagement," demonstrated by how anchor institutions in the community are part of the strategy to revitalize the neighborhood or create opportunities for residents.[32]

In a Seattle-based Choice Neighborhood, Seattle University is the lead education partner and works with the Seattle Housing Authority and the Neighborhood House and College Success Foundation, in collaboration with Catholic Community Services of Western Washington, the YMCA, and Seattle Public Schools, to provide supports and services for student residents to improve their academic achievements. For children ages 2 to 18, education services are provided in their homes, schools, and community locations[33] and also include early learning programs, youth tutoring, and mentoring activities.[34] Initial research suggests that quality housing not only helps meet children's basic needs but also can be a platform to improve educational outcomes.[35] There are further examples of programs for high school students that have increased college enrollment numbers.[36]

Promise Zones

The Obama administration's newest place-based initiative—Promise Zones—is designed to revitalize high-poverty communities through comprehensive, evidence-based strategies. Promise Zones designees receive priority access to federal resources to support job creation, increase economic security, expand educational opportunities, increase access to quality and affordable housing, and improve public safety.[37]

As part of the first round of applications, potential designees had to demonstrate the strength of local partnerships, including "local anchor institution commitment."[38] In the Philadelphia-based Promise Zone, Drexel University and the William Penn Foundation are two prestigious institutions that will focus on improving education quality through teacher professional development, college access and readiness for middle school and high school students, and parental engagement.[39]

The Affordable Care Act

The ACA clarified and expanded the community benefit requirements for federally tax-exempt nonprofit hospitals.

First, hospitals must conduct a community health needs assessment at least every three years and develop a strategy to meet those needs. They must adopt and publicize a written financial assistance policy and limit charges, billing, and debt-collection practices aimed at individuals who qualify for financial assistance. Community benefits that qualify nonprofit hospitals for federal tax exemption include:[40]

- Free and discounted care to uninsured and low-income patients

- Unreimbursed cost of care for Medicaid patients

- Activities to improve health in the community where the hospital serves

- Programs to increase access to care, such as subsidized health services

- Medical research

- Education of health professionals

The hope is that with more insured patients the hospital can devote more resources toward addressing some of the social determinants of health, such as living in highly polluted neighborhoods.

Despite the recognition that anchor institutions are a valuable partner in community revitalization efforts, there is little guidance around how these institutions fit into these initiatives or how community leaders can better engage anchor leaders. Fortunately, there are a number of universities and hospitals leading the way in this work and demonstrating the various roles anchors are naturally equipped to take.

Some of the main roles anchor institutions already play within their communities are detailed in the next section.

Anchor roles within communities

The Initiative for a Competitive Inner City released a report titled "Anchor Institutions and Urban Economic Development: From Community Benefit to Shared Value" that outlines a number of roles that anchors already play as part of their normal course of doing business.[41] Below is a brief description of these roles, as well as best practices from anchor leaders across the country.

Real estate developer

Anchor institutions have access to real estate and the ability to leverage private development money. As a result, when anchor institutions expand, they have the potential to develop distressed areas, promote mixed-use projects, and enhance public safety in the process.

This is a role in which anchors will have to be particularly mindful of community engagement, as in the past this type of development has frequently been for the sole benefit of the institution and has left communities out of the planning process. For example, Columbia University's expansion into Harlem has been met with opposition over the years, including a court battle that ultimately upheld Columbia's right to seize private property through eminent domain.[42]

Real estate development in Baltimore

East Baltimore is home to Johns Hopkins Hospital and Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. It is also made up of low-income, mostly African American neighborhoods. In 2000, the neighborhood's vacancy rate was 70 percent; poverty was twice the city's average; and crime, infant mortality, and unemployment were all high.[43] As a result, then-Mayor Martin O'Malley (D) convened business and community leaders to address this problem. What emerged was a comprehensive plan to revitalize the community using federal, state, local, and private money, with Johns Hopkins playing a central role.[44] A key component of the plan is the Henderson-Hopkins K-8 school and the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Early Childhood Center—the first public school building built in East Baltimore in more than 20 years. The school, which opened in January 2014, emphasizes individualized learning supported by wraparound services, as well as family and community involvement.[45]

A few years ago, the renewal plan called for clearing dozens of acres and evicting 742 families, 240 of whom owned homes valued at $35,000 on average. The homeowners and some of the renters were able to upgrade to houses out of the neighborhood, valued at $150,000 on average. Other families relocated into rehabilitated row houses or new subsidized apartments within the area. The long-term goal of the plan is for one-third of housing in the neighborhood to remain set aside for low-income residents. In addition, children of evicted residents who left the neighborhood were guaranteed spots at Henderson-Hopkins with all transportation expenses paid.[46]

According to Ronald R. Peterson, president of the Johns Hopkins Hospital and Health System and executive vice president of Johns Hopkins Medicine:

> *The vibrancy of the surrounding area is certainly important to us as we recruit staff, faculty, and students, and for the patients and families who come to our hospital. There is no denying we have an important institutional interest in this area … But having a more livable, vibrant community is good for the residents of this area. We are eager to demonstrate to young and old alike our commitment to this project.*[47]

Employer

Roughly two-thirds of jobs at hospitals and one-third of jobs at colleges and universities require less than a bachelor's degree.[48] Despite this fact, inner-city residents are often underrepresented as employees at these institutions.

Anchors can capitalize on local talent by identifying careers that can be targeted for local residents, mapping out the possibilities for career advancement, and working with local organizations and community colleges to identify qualified candidates. In the area of leveraging employment, Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit has created incentives for managers to hire locally, basing 7 percent of senior executives' bonuses on achieving defined diversity goals.[49]

Workforce developer

Once anchors identify the jobs that need to be filled and the education and training needed for these positions, anchors can match them against the community's education and job-training systems. However, achieving this goal will require a well-functioning workforce-development system, while coordination between employers, policymakers, and training providers is often fragmented.

Anchors can partner with other employers and organizations focused on education and training initiatives to develop a pipeline for local residents to be trained and move into jobs within their institutions. In addition, anchors can collaborate with other anchor institutions to build a system of pipelines to jobs.

Workforce development in Boston

Partners HealthCare is a nonprofit organization that owns several hospitals in the Boston area, including Massachusetts General Hospital and Brigham and Women's Hospital. Partners HealthCare focuses on workforce development efforts for youth, community residents, and current employees.[50] The program has a particular focus on targeting low-income residents for four-week training and classroom programs that include introduction to the health care environment, résumé preparation, interviewing skills, medical terminology, customer-service skills, office computer skills, job-placement assistance, supportive services, and financial literacy.[51] Participants earn positions such as front-desk receptionists, clerical assistants, registration coordinators, operating-room assistants, and laboratory aides.[52] Successful graduates also have an opportunity to receive a stipend for up to eight weeks while they look for permanent work.[53]

To date, thousands of Partners HealthCare employees have participated in skill-development opportunities, and more than 425 community residents have graduated from the health care training and education program in the past 10 years, with 86 percent having been placed in careers within the Partners HealthCare system.[54]

Purchaser

Anchors spend a significant amount of money on procuring goods and services. As a result, anchor institutions can create value for the surrounding community by increasing spending at locally based suppliers, particularly with minority- and women-owned firms. According to ICIC:

> Anchors can help local firms compete by unbundling large contracts or requiring prime contractors to use local subcontractors. They can also encourage local firms to partner with each other or with larger vendors and can provide business advice and mentorship.[55]

Some critics express concern that focusing on buying locally will drive up costs for anchors. For example, Philadelphia's Temple University's Chief Financial Officer Kenneth Kaiser cautioned that although he "would welcome more opportunities to support city firms," as a public university "our first responsibility is always to control costs in order to keep Temple affordable."[56] Despite this rhetoric, Temple University spent $44 million—around 5 percent of its operational spending[57]— with Philadelphia businesses last year alone, a relatively small percentage of spending that makes a huge difference to the local economy.[58]

In fact, colleges and hospitals have seen cost savings and increased quality of service by patronizing local businesses. For example, several anchors in Minnesota signed a joint snow-removal contract with a local firm and cut costs by 38 percent.[59] As part of its new procurement practices, Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit also has implemented a policy of paying local vendors one month in advance to provide working capital.[60]

Buying locally in Cleveland

Founded in 2005, the Greater University Circle Initiative, or GUCI, is a collaboration between the Cleveland Clinic; University Hospitals, or UH; Case Western Reserve University; Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center; the city of Cleveland; and local philanthropy.[61] GUCI has developed innovative strategies to promote economic inclusion through anchor-institution procurement with its Evergreen Cooperatives— small, worker-owned businesses that seek to serve anchors while creating upwardly mobile local jobs. For example, Evergreen Cooperative Laundry provides linen services for Cleveland hospitals, nursing homes, and other businesses.[62]

Individual anchors have also developed strategies for using their purchasing power to benefit the Cleveland community. For example, UH has taken extensive steps to institutionalize procurement from local minority-owned and women-owned businesses. UH establishes clear goals for sourcing products and developed a contractor assistance program to prepare local businesses to work with it. UH ensures accountability by tying the procurement staff's compensation to these goals, as well as reporting annually to the board of directors about this work. In 2005, UH set out to source 80 percent of its capital projects locally, and in 2010, it met this goal and demonstrated that sourcing locally can be a cheaper alternative. UH's construction costs came in $20 million under budget, and it notes that the proximity of suppliers—as well as being a supplier's largest client—are both advantages in the quality, speed, and flexibility of service.[63]

Cluster anchor

Anchors can have a profound, positive effect on industry clusters—interconnected businesses or suppliers—spearheading their growth throughout the region. By collaborating with other institutions and businesses, anchors can attract talent, funding, and new companies, as well as help drive innovative research and commercialization. Anchors can help young firms with high growth potential by serving as incubators.

Core products or services providers

One of the most direct ways for anchors to engage their neighbors is by cultivating them as customers, particularly for medical institutions. This requires some anchors to address issues of access and affordability and to develop new approaches and products tailored specifically for these constituents. For example, the Cleveland Clinic has begun to leverage its expertise and resources to address the high rates of smoking and obesity in the surrounding community.

In addition, anchors can do a better job of recruiting students from the local community. For example, through its Baltimore Scholars program, Johns Hopkins offers full scholarships to about 20 public school students from the city of Baltimore each year and offers informational sessions on the program in Baltimore public high schools.[64]

Community infrastructure builder

Today, most anchors commonly play the role of community infrastructure builder. In this capacity, anchors respond daily to a constant stream of requests for their resources to address the many issues that affect their communities—from requests for faculty expertise and student interns to grants and volunteers for local nonprofits. However, anchors can be more strategic in where they offer their resources, ensuring they align with a broader strategy for community development.

'Place-making' in Detroit: Live Midtown

The Woodward Corridor Initiative in Detroit seeks to connect and integrate place-based strategies along Detroit's main thoroughfare in order to stabilize neighborhoods, increase investment, and attract new residents.[65] The initiative is "working to fight the out-migration of the city's population to the suburbs and is seeking to 'redensify' the urban core by improving safety, schools, employment, and small-business opportunities."[66] Specifically, the Woodward Corridor Initiative seeks to align anchor-institution hiring and procurement, land-use planning, transit-corridor development, and neighborhood revitalization in ways that secure direct benefits for residents while attracting new investment.[67]

In 2011, the Live Midtown program launched as a partnership with Henry Ford Health System, Wayne State University, and Detroit Medical Center as a way to create incentives for employees to live in the revitalizing midtown neighborhood. Its goal was to boost neighborhood density, improving the vitality, safety, and economy of the community. This was supported by the fact that where people live is where they have the greatest economic impact. In addition, there is a direct benefit in productivity to employers if employees live close to where they work.[68]

Live Midtown was able to secure matching dollars from philanthropic foundations dedicated to the revitalization of the area. In three years, the Live Midtown program has spent nearly $3 million in direct subsidies.[69] The incentives included a $20,000 down payment toward buying a home, $5,000 in matching funds offered to homeowners for home-improvement projects, $1,000 for renters who renewed existing leases, and $2,500 for new Midtown renters the first year and an additional $1,000 for the second year. The length of the program window was shortened during its first year due to an overwhelming number of applicants for the limited resources.[70]

The success of Live Midtown sparked a similar program, Live Downtown, which encouraged employees of five downtown businesses to move to the area.[71] While many factors affect community change, 40 new businesses have opened in Midtown since the incentive program was initiated, with an additional 20 openings pending as of April 2014.[72] Live Downtown and Live Midtown have enticed nearly 1,500 workers to rent apartments or buy condos in the central part of the city.

Some critics argue that this program has contributed to a rise in rents in the area, highlighting the inherent tension in such programs. As a result, affordability is an increased priority.[73] Some of the new residential developments have set aside 20 percent or more of their units for low- and moderate-income residents. There also are a handful of 100 percent below-market rental buildings in the construction pipeline.[74]

These key roles and the examples of best practices require a large commitment of time and resources from anchor leaders and can lead the heads of smaller institutions to conclude that these models might not work for them.[75] However, the evidence shows that smaller institutions can have a significant local impact through incremental engagement and long-term commitment at a relatively modest institutional cost. Engaging in local activities that improve the quality of life is popular among employees, alumni, and contributors. For instance, Trinity College in Connecticut found an increase in contributions from alumni and supporters who were impressed with the college's community development activities throughout the 1990s, which included development of housing and of middle school and high school programming.[76] In addition, as illustrated by the examples above, not every role is resource intensive. For example, changing procurement can create cost savings over time, and multiple anchor institutions in a community can partner around an initiative.

As anchors of all sizes consider how to contribute more to their surrounding communities, organizations are increasingly working to help them better understand the costs and benefits of a given strategy, as well as its potential effectiveness. Detailed in the next section are two major efforts aimed at helping anchor institutions evaluate the net benefit of engaging more proactively in local economic development and poverty-reduction efforts.

Measuring anchor impact

Increasingly, anchor institutions are looking at how they can help their surrounding communities through their economic and intellectual resources. However, few tools exist to broadly assess the long-term impact of these activities.

The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland, which focuses on promoting new strategies and innovations in community development, created a set of indicators to begin to fill this gap. Developed through extensive research and in-depth interviews conducted with more than 75 leaders of anchor institutions, national nonprofit organizations, federal agencies, and community organizations, the report—"The Anchor Dashboard"—provides a baseline to assess conditions in the community and evaluate institutional effort in areas such as economic development; community building; education; and health, safety, and the environment.[77] (see Table 1) The indicators focus on whether the institution is having an impact on the community and capture the institutional effort to improve those community indicators.

TABLE 1
Anchor dashboard: Economic development indicators

	Outcome	Indicator	Data source
Economic development	Equitable local and minority hiring	• Percent of local and minority hires in staff positions • Percent employed at living wage or above	Institutional data
	Equitable local and minority business procurement	• Percent of procurement dollars dedicated to local-, minority-, and women-owned businesses	Institutional data
	Affordable housing	• Dollars invested in creating affordable housing • Dollars invested in community land trusts • Percent of households below 200 percent of the federal poverty line that spend less than 30 percent of income on housing	Institutional data, Census records
	Thriving business incubation	• Jobs and businesses created and retained over time (one year, five years, etc.) • Percent of incubated businesses serving low-income and minority populations • Dollars directed toward seed funding for community-owned business	Institutional data
	Thriving arts and cultural development	• Dollars spent on arts- and culture-based economic development; number of arts and cultural jobs and businesses created and retained	Institutional data
	Sound community investment	• Percent of endowment and operating dollars directed toward community impact investments, including support of community development financial institutions	Institutional data

Source: The Democracy Collaborative, "The Anchor Dashboard: Aligning Institutional Practice to Meet Low-Income Community Needs" (2013), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/AnchorDashboardCompositeFinal.pdf.

The Initiative for a Competitive Inner City is in the process of developing a set of metrics that are complementary to The Democracy Collaborative's work but are more focused on the return on investment, or ROI, for anchors rather than the benefit to the community. According to ICIC, "measuring ROI matters because it establishes a business case for community investment."[78]

For example, in measuring employee attraction and retention related to workforce-development strategies, anchors could look at employee turnover rates, productivity, the percentage of positions filled with qualified candidates, and the percentage of employees that qualify for career promotions, among other metrics. Such metrics can show the value of these investments and allow for the expansion of anchor commitments by encouraging universities and hospitals to institutionalize successful strategies in ongoing operations.[79]

As the Obama administration continues to promote evidence-based strategies to help revitalize low-income communities, it is critical for organizations and anchors to continue to make the case for how colleges, universities, and hospitals are important partners in place-based efforts.

Recommendations for fostering anchor partnerships

Anchor-institution leadership is not a silver bullet for the problems plaguing communities across the country—nor is any single organization or government agency. However, as the federal government continues to promote cross-sector work, it is critical for all the institutions in a community that control important resources to be at the table. The following recommendations are ways in which the federal government can better spur these partnerships in its ongoing work.

Giving greater weight to place-based grant applicants that have strong partnerships with anchors

As discussed earlier, many federal place-based initiatives call on anchor institutions to participate in community revitalization efforts. While there are great examples of these partnerships at work, the involvement of anchors across grants varies. For instance, some current Promise Zone designees have little to no anchors participating in their work—and if they do, they limit their focus to workforce development. However, one of the central partners in the Philadelphia-based Promise Zone is Drexel University, which plans on using its resources to head up the educational effort in the zone. Specifically, Drexel, along with the William Penn Foundation, will work to increase data-driven instruction that informs teacher professional development, develop school cultures that are conducive to teaching and learning, mentor middle school and high school youth with a focus on college access and readiness, and increase parent engagement.[80]

Given the fact that anchor institutions are important economic engines in communities, federal leaders should ensure that initiatives better outline the possible roles anchors can take and better assess the strength of these partnerships in order to spur more meaningful discussions within communities about the roles of colleges and hospitals. While is it important that a given anchor's leaders reimagine their institution's role in a community, previous place-based efforts have revealed that the rigor required from these applications often spurs new partnerships and ways

of working even if the partnership is not ultimately awarded the grant. As a result, greater weight should be given to applications that demonstrate a strong commitment from their anchors, and the extent of anchor commitments should be assessed against the possible roles that anchors can take, as outlined above; specific goals and outcomes the anchor wishes to achieve; steps they have taken toward achieving those goals; and initial metrics the institution has for measuring its success.

Rebuilding the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of University Partnerships

In 1994, HUD established OUP in an effort to encourage and expand the growing number of partnerships between colleges and universities and their communities. OUP has worked to support such efforts through grants, interactive conferences, and housing and urban development-related research.[81]

However, many of the grant programs have been unfunded for years. OUP has limited capacity and has had little presence in initiatives that call for anchor-institution participation, such as Choice Neighborhoods and Promise Zones. OUP has continued to hold conferences and publishes papers on anchor research and has the potential to better assist anchors located in communities that have been awarded federal grants for place-based work on issues such as evaluation and monitoring or providing technical assistance around some of the key roles the anchor has identified for itself.

Given the major investments that the federal government has made in higher education and hospitals, federal leaders should also examine what the reasonable expectations are for how anchor institutions can contribute to their communities. At the start of the Obama administration, anchor leaders recommended organizing a White House Summit on Eds and Meds and Civic Responsibility.[82] HUD could take the lead in forging a multiagency federal commission to advance the civic responsibility of anchor institutions and could produce recommendations to advance a national conversation on the role of anchors in communities, as well as action at all governmental levels.

Ensuring HUD helps develop tools to measure anchor performance

As the federal government continues to promote transparency and evidence-based strategies in place-based work, it is necessary to help communities develop a way of measuring anchor impact as part of these efforts. A more robust OUP could work to improve anchor performance by encouraging the creation of dashboard indicators that demonstrate community impact and can be reported to Congress and other stakeholders, such as the previously mentioned work that The Democracy Collaborative is doing. Such indicators would help provide a baseline to assess conditions in the community and evaluate institutional effort for improving issues ranging from economic development to safety and the environment.[83]

Encouraging HUD to work with anchors to promote affordable housing development

Many anchor institutions offer a range of housing services to assist low- and moderate-income employees, from offering financing through rebates or loans to providing counseling on purchasing or even building homes. Some anchor institutions have supported permanent housing affordability by helping finance community land trusts—where a nonprofit corporation owns the land and individuals own the homes on it—making homes substantially less expensive due to the removed land costs. For instance, the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, provided seed funding for a community land trust and helped finance 875 affordable homes to alleviate a severe housing shortage for working families.[84] OUP can develop a program to help provide resources and technical assistance for anchors to contribute to some of HUD's housing development goals.[85]

One of the leading assets of anchor institutions is their ownership of land and real estate. OUP can launch a program to provide a pool of match funding for non-profit anchor institutions that offer employer-assisted housing benefits for their employees or make a land donation to a community land trust. Universities are also important partners in AmeriCorps programs, ushering students into community service. Volunteers in these programs work with community-based organizations around the country for modest compensation. HUD can provide matching funds to colleges and universities that provide subsidized housing for volunteers who work in their communities.[86]

Encouraging colleges to better utilize the Federal Work-Study program for service learning

The FWS program provides funding for part-time employment to help students in need of financial aid cover the costs of postsecondary education. FWS can support students as they work for the college itself; for a federal, state, or local public agency; for a private nonprofit organization; or for a private for-profit organization. In exchange for this financial aid, the federal government requires that institutions use at least 7 percent of FWS funds to support students working in community service jobs, such as tutoring elementary school children.[87]

Some institutions find meeting this 7 percent requirement challenging, despite the fact that college students tend to have high levels of community service relative to the general population. Some speculate that it puts a heavy burden on low-income students. Other colleges have found that students who qualify for work-study funds often work campus jobs for their federal money and perform community service on their own time.[88] According to Robert Davidson at the Corporation for National and Community Service:

> At its best, the Federal Work-Study (FWS) program is much more than a form of financial aid; it's a powerful educational, career-preparation, and community service internship program. For many colleges and universities, however, the FWS program remains an unrecognized and virtually untapped resource for support of the institution's academic and civic engagement goals.[89]

In recent years, enforcement of the community service requirement has increased after some institutions saw their funding revoked.[90] However, there has been little guidance on how to better structure the FWS program. As part of its enforcement efforts, the Department of Education should outline ways in which colleges and universities can better align the community service requirement with its overall mission. For instance, schools such as Arizona State University have service-learning programs that could be adapted to allow students to earn school credit easily and be paid through FWS, thus addressing any concerns that work might have on academic performance.[91]

In addition, FWS programs can be integrated into other parts of campus life, such as student organizations. For example, the Phillips Brooks House Association, or PBHA, is a student-run, community-based, nonprofit public service organization at Harvard University. PBHA is the umbrella organization for 86 student-directed programs supported by full-time staff members. Together, these programs strive

for change on multiple levels in the Boston and Cambridge communities. PBHA's dual-focused mission is to provide vital resources to local communities and grow public service leaders.[92] Scholars engage in year-round community service starting in the summer each year and experience shared learning guided by program staff and community members. In addition, scholars receive financial support and one-on-one mentorship. Currently, thanks to PBHA, there are 1,400 volunteers participating in more than 85 programs serving 10,000 low-income people throughout greater Boston.[93]

Ensuring a greater impact from the community benefit requirement under the Affordable Care Act

Nonprofit hospitals are required to provide benefits to the communities they serve to keep a tax-exempt status. Nationwide, about 2,900 hospitals, or 60 percent, are nonprofit. The financial benefit of being tax exempt is estimated to be $12.6 billion annually.[94] Historically, many of hospitals' community benefit activities have been charity care. The new requirements in the ACA go beyond improving health to include greater accountability for hospitals, more effective use of resources, and building community capacity and engagement in addressing health issues.[95]

However, to sidestep these responsibilities, some hospitals may decide to define their communities to avoid geographic areas beyond their traditional service area in order to steer clear of underserved or low-income populations. In addition, hospitals may decide to conduct their required community health needs assessment with limited collaboration with the community.[96] Instead, hospitals should use these new requirements as an opportunity to explore the full range of social determinants of health and what their communities' needs truly are.[97] Federal leaders should direct hospitals to work with local leaders, particularly place-based grantees, to collaborate around the CHNA to define the scope of the community, identify community priorities, and determine how community benefit resources should be spent.

A successful example of such collaboration is when Stamford Hospital in Connecticut collaborated with the Stamford Health Department in 2011 to begin the process of updating its CHNA.[98] An informal advisory group comprised of other hospital and local health department officials—as well as representatives from community-based organizations throughout the region—provided additional input. The assessment and planning included an analysis of health data, as well as information gathered through 100 interviews with stakeholders, including public health officers, elected officials, and community residents. In addition, the hospital conducted a

survey of 3,400 residents. In order to reach low-income constituents, racial and ethnic minorities, and other vulnerable populations, a separate survey was administered at targeted venues, including primary-care clinics and community centers. This collaborative process resulted in four community health priority areas: health and wellness; chronic disease; mental health and substance abuse, or behavioral health; and access to services.[99] Such collaboration provides an important opportunity to identify strategies for improving health and quality of life for disadvantaged communities.[100]

Furthermore, the Internal Revenue Service, or IRS, is tasked with determining whether the community benefit is being achieved in these communities but has limited expertise in the areas of community development and public health. In the future, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should assess community benefit reports along with the IRS to ensure that a deeper understanding of the potential health effects is achieved.

Fostering small-business partnerships and mentoring

One of the best ways for a small business to grow is to land a large contract, but local businesses often lack the capacity to handle such contracts.[101] Increasingly, anchor institutions are stepping in to bridge this gap. Mentorship programs work to prepare small local businesses for contracting opportunities with larger firms. Currently, as a condition for receiving federal funding for research, universities must maintain competitive bidding-purchasing systems to drive down the cost of goods and services.[102] However, this can inhibit institutions from weighing the benefits of a community impact. The federal government should encourage institutions that receive funding for research to implement programs that mentor local disadvantaged businesses by providing additional grant opportunities.

For example, the University of Pennsylvania has helped prepare small companies to serve as its contractors. Telrose Corp., a local and minority-owned office-supplies company, was a three-person delivery company and subcontractor to Office Depot. The University of Pennsylvania persuaded Office Depot to help prepare Telrose to become the university's prime contractor. Over 10 years, Telrose increased its share of the contract with the university from $300,000 to $50 million.[103] The university began writing contracts requiring Tier 1 companies to support Tier 2 companies and gained broader support for this long-term vision by ensuring contracts were either cost effective or cost neutral.

Another example is a partnership between Columbia University and New York City to increase the amount of construction dollars they contract with minority-, women-, and locally owned businesses. Together, they developed a rigorous two-year mentorship program designed to help these businesses build capacity and access opportunities for designated contracts with the university.[104] The program's curriculum follows a project's full life cycle, from cost estimating to project closeouts. In the first three years of the program's launch, Columbia had already contracted more than $16 million in construction work with the mentored firms.[105]

Staff in procurement offices are often comfortable with who they already work with, and small businesses are often not vetted. Currently, the Small Business Administration supports small-business intermediaries to provide loans to local businesses.[106] The SBA should also provide grants to small-business intermediaries that are positioned to help connect small businesses with the potential to work with anchor-institution clients.

Helping align community and technical college courses with apprenticeship programs

Anchors can play an important role in workforce development, but linkages between businesses and community and technical colleges have been historically poor. Even where some of those links exist or have begun to be built, there are still barriers to ensuring that local community and technical colleges are offering the courses and programs needed by companies for their apprenticeship training or to complement classroom-based instruction with related on-the-job training. Similarly, students have had difficulty transferring credits to their bachelor's degree programs from occupational certificates and associate's degree programs earned during an apprenticeship. While articulation agreements have increasingly been put into place to help transfer such credits—and to offer credits for on-the-job training as part of registered apprenticeships—they are still relatively rare.

In a 2013 Center for American Progress report titled "Training for Success: A Policy to Expand Apprenticeships in the United States," CAP experts recommended that the Department of Education and the Department of Labor work with policymakers, accrediting bodies, and colleges and universities to greatly expand the number of effective articulation agreements in place.[107] These agreements allow apprentice-ship training to count toward degree requirements and would further embed apprenticeships in a seamless career ladder that would allow workers to continue

their formal education after completing a training program. Pioneering work in Indiana allowing individuals enrolled in a joint apprenticeship training program to obtain an associate's degree or technical certificate from Ivy Tech Community College offers a strong example of how such a system could be designed.[108]

Furthermore, in a recent CAP column, "Policies States Can Enact to Promote Apprenticeship," the authors recommend that states ensure community colleges join the Registered Apprenticeship-College Consortium, or RACC—a new effort that will allow graduates of registered apprenticeship programs to transfer college credit between RACC member colleges.[109]

Conclusion

While the relationship between communities and businesses has changed drastically over the years, colleges, universities, and hospitals continue to be economic engines anchored in the communities in which they are located. As the federal government continues to be a major investor in the work of these institutions, it is critical for federal leaders to explore strategies to harness the economic, human, and intellectual resources of anchor institutions for the benefit of low-income communities.

In addition, as federal programs continue to call on anchor participation, federal officials must provide better guidance and technical assistance around the unique roles anchors can play. These institutions are inextricably tied to their communities and have a vested interest in ensuring that they thrive. It is important for federal leaders to tap into this concern and to ensure anchor institutions work with public, private, nonprofit, and philanthropic leaders to revitalize communities.

About the author

Tracey Ross is a Senior Policy Analyst with the Poverty to Prosperity Program at the Center for American Progress. She focuses on place-based responses to fighting poverty. Prior to joining CAP, she was a program associate at Living Cities, where she worked on its signature effort, The Integration Initiative, supporting cities as they work to transform broken systems to meet the needs of low-income residents. In 2012, she was selected as a "Next American Vanguard," one of Next City Magazine's recognitions of 40 urban leaders under age 40.

Ross began her career in the office of former Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-NY), working on judiciary, women, and children's issues, and the office of former Sen. Ken Salazar (D-CO), working on energy and environment issues. She completed her master's in public affairs and a certificate in urban policy and planning at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. During her program, she spent a semester working in the office of then-Newark, New Jersey, Mayor Cory Booker (D) on housing issues and a summer working at Green For All on green jobs legislation. Ross received her bachelor's degree from the University of California, Berkeley, in 2006.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to CAP staff members Melissa Boteach, David Bergeron, Maura Calsyn, Julia Gordon, and Sarah Ayres. Special thanks to Ted Howard, Charles Rutheiser, Kim Zeuli, Dayna Cunningham, and Galen Benshoof for their guidance and input in writing this report.

Endnotes

1 Alison Gold, "Where? Who? What? 3 Questions on Transforming Systems from Living Cities' Anchor Design Lab," The Catalyst, August 1, 2012, available at http://www.livingcities.org/blog/?id=63.

2 Adie Tomer and others, "Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America" (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2011), available at http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2011/5/12%20jobs%20and%20transit/0512_jobs_transit.pdf.

3 Gold, "Where? Who? What? 3 Questions on Transforming Systems from Living Cities' Anchor Design Lab."

4 The Democracy Collaborative, "Achieving the Anchor Promise: Improving Outcomes for Low-Income Children, Families and Communities" (2013), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/Achieving%20the%20Anchor%20Promise_composite_FINAL.pdf.

5 Ibid.

6 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Anchor Institutions and Urban Economic Development: From Community Benefit to Shared Value" (2011), available at http://www.icic.org/ee_uploads/publications/ICIC_RESEARCH_anchor_institutions_r2.pdf.

7 Ibid.

8 The Democracy Collaborative, "Achieving the Anchor Promise."

9 Joan Develin Coley and others, "'Anchor' collaboration will move city forward," The Baltimore Sun, June 24, 2014, available at http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-city-collaboration-20140624,0,7596568.story.

10 Ben Olinsky and Sarah Ayres, "Training for Success: A Policy to Expand Apprenticeships in the United States" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/report/2013/12/02/79991/training-for-success-a-policy-to-expand-apprenticeships-in-the-united-states/.

11 The Democracy Collaborative, "Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development" (2007), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/report-linking.pdf.

12 Ibid.

13 U.S. Department of Education, "The Federal Role in Education," available at http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html (last accessed August 2014).

14 The Democracy Collaborative, "Linking Colleges to Communities."

15 White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, "What is an HBCU?", available at http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/ (last accessed August 2014).

16 National Center for Education Statistics, Higher Education General Information Survey (U.S. Department of Education, 2012), Table 283, available at http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_283.asp.

17 CAP analysis of data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. See National Center for Education Statistics, "IPEDS Data Center," available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter (last accessed August 2014).

18 Nina Liou, Laurel Davis, and Sheila Ards, "Historically Black Colleges & Universities: Three Case Studies of Experiences in Community Development" (Baltimore, MD: Optimal Solutions Group LLC, 2007), available at http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/hbcu_vol1.pdf.

19 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, FY 2010 Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant Award Information (2010), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=cn_grant_2010_summ.pdf.

20 Ibid.

21 The Democracy Collaborative, "Linking Colleges to Communities."

22 Ibid.

23 David Zuckerman and others, "Hospitals Build Healthier Communities" (Columbia, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, 2013), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/Zuckerman-HBHC-2013.pdf.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid.

27 U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Opens Competition for Promise Neighborhoods," Press release, April 30, 2010, available at http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/04/04302010b.html.

28 U.S. Department of Education, "Promise Neighborhoods," available at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/promiseneighborhoods/index.html (last accessed August 2014).

29 Leslie Cranford, "Texas Tech, Community Partners Celebrate $24.5M Grant," Texas Tech Today, February 13, 2013, available at http://today.ttu.edu/2013/02/texas-tech-lisd-community-partners-celebrate-24-5m-grant/.

30 Ibid.

31 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Choice Neighborhoods," available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/cn (last accessed August 2014).

32 Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Authority, "Choice Neighborhoods Initiative: Anchor Institutions" (2012), available at http://www.shra.org/Portals/0/pdf/public_housing/CNI%20TW/People%20Education%20TF%20Handouts%20pt1%205.14.13.pdf; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, FY2013 Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grants NOFA Questions and Answers (2013), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=ImplementationNOFAQandA.pdf.

33 Seattle Housing Authority, "Yesler Neighborhood: Choice Neighborhoods," available at http://www.seattlehousing.org/redevelopment/yesler-terrace/ChoiceNeighborhoods/ (last accessed August 2014).

34 Seattle University, "Choice Neighborhoods Grant," available at http://www.seattleu.edu/suyi/action/neighborhood/grant/ (last accessed August 2014); Seattle Housing Authority, "$19.73 million HUD grant awarded to Seattle Housing for Yesler Terrace redevelopment," Press release, December 13, 2012, available at http://www.seattlehousing.org/news/releases/2012/choice-neighborhoods-grant/.

35 Mary Cunningham and Graham MacDonald, "Housing as a Platform for Improving Education Outcomes among Low-Income Children" (Washington: Urban Institute, 2012), available at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412554-Housing-as-a-Platform-for-Improving-Education-Outcomes-among-Low-Income-Children.pdf.

36 Strive Together, "Real Results for Real Communities," available at http://www.strivetogether.org/results (last accessed August 2014).

37 Tracey Ross and Erik Stegman, "A Renewed Promise" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2014), available at http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/PromiseZones-report2.pdf.

38 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and others, *2013 Urban Promise Zone Application Guide* (2013), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=pz_urban_app_guide.pdf.

39 Ibid.

40 The Kresge Foundation, "Kresge-supported project provides easily accessible information about 'community benefit' requirement for nonprofit hospitals," July 3, 2013, available at http://kresge.org/news/kresge-supported-project-provides-easily-accessible-information-about-%E2%80%98community-benefit%E2%80%99-requi.

41 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Anchor Institutions and Urban Economic Development."

42 Jake Schoby-Thal, "Town-Gown Relations 101: When the University Overtakes the Town," Next City, July 25, 2012, available at http://nextcity.org/daily/entry/town-gown-relations-101-when-the-university-over-takes-the-town.

43 Michael Kimmelman, "Reading, Writing and Renewal (the Urban Kind)," *The New York Times*, March 18, 2014, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/18/arts/design/reading-writing-and-renewal-the-urban-kind.html?_r=0.

44 Ibid.

45 Johns Hopkins School of Education, "Henderson-Hopkins Fact Sheet," available at http://hendersonhopkins.org/About/factsheet.html (last accessed August 2014).

46 Kimmelman, "Reading, Writing and Renewal (the Urban Kind)."

47 Greg Rienzi, "The changing face of East Baltimore," *The Gazette*, January 1, 2013, available at http://hub.jhu.edu/gazette/2013/january/east-baltimore-changes-development.

48 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Anchor Institutions and Urban Economic Development."

49 Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, "Leveraging Anchor Institutions for Local Job Creation and Wealth Building" (College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, 2012), available at http://community-wealth.org/_pdfs/news/recent-articles/04-12/paper-dubb-howard.pdf.

50 Partners Healthcare, "Building a Strong Health Care Workforce," available at http://www.partners.org/Community/Health-Care-Workforce/Default.aspx (last accessed August 2014).

51 *The Bay State Banner*, "Partners HealthCare Job Training and Employment Program Provides Pathways to Careers in Health Care," April 24, 2013, available at http://baystatebanner.com/news/2013/apr/24/partners-healthcare-job-training-and-employment/.

52 Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb, "The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads" (College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, 2010), available at http://community-wealth.org/_pdfs/news/recent-articles/10-10/report-axelroth-dubb.pdf.

53 *The Bay State Banner*, "Partners HealthCare Job Training and Employment Program Provides Pathways to Careers in Health Care."

54 Partners Healthcare, "Building a Strong Health Care Workforce."

55 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "How Local Purchasing Spurred Growth in West Philly," available at http://www.icic.org/connection/blog-entry/bp-how-local-purchasing-helped-revitalize-west-philly/bp (last accessed August 2014).

56 Troy Graham and Joseph N. DiStefano, "Controller: Can 'anchors' spend more in Phila.?", Philly.com, January 11, 2014, available at http://articles.philly.com/2014-01-11/news/46069597_1_butkovitz-drexel-university-temple-university.

57 *Temple Times*, "Temple feeds billions into Pa., regional economies," May 26, 2005, available at http://www.temple.edu/temple_times/5-26-05/econsult.html.

58 Graham and DiStefano, "Controller: Can 'anchors' spend more in Phila.?"

59 Brian Martucci, "Jobs, housing, transit: leveraging the power of Central Corridor's anchor institutions," MinnPost, March 7, 2014, available at http://www.minnpost.com/line/2014/03/jobs-housing-transit-leveraging-power-central-corridors-anchor-institutions.

60 Dubb and Howard, "Leveraging Anchor Institutions for Local Job Creation and Wealth Building."

61 Alison Gold, "Emerging Practices: Ideas from Cleveland & Detroit on Leveraging Anchor Institutions," The Catalyst, September 20, 2011, available at http://www.livingcities.org/blog/?id=8#sthash.R9cSgS6j.bAFmdBBu.dpuf.

62 Ibid.

63 Farzana Serang, J. Phillip Thompson, and Ted Howard, "The Anchor Mission" (College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, 2013), available at http://democracycollaborative.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/UH-composite-online.pdf.

64 Johns Hopkins University, "Baltimore Scholars Program," available at http://apply.jhu.edu/finaid/baltimorescholars/ (last accessed August 2014).

65 Living Cities, "Practice," available at http://www.livingcities.org/integration/practice/ (last accessed August 2014).

66 Living Cities, "Living Cities Integration Initiative: Detroit Profile" (2011), available at http://www.livingcities.org/assets/documents/tii/Detroit_onepager-20110706.pdf.

67 Ibid.

68 Michigan Municipal League, "Live Midtown" (2014), available at http://placemaking.mml.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/casestudy-live-midtown-web.pdf.

69 Ibid.

70 Ross and Stegman, "A Renewed Promise."

71 Aaron Foley, "Live Midtown to offer more incentives to lure workers to buy, rent in Detroit," MLive, January 24, 2012, available at http://www.mlive.com/news/detroit/index.ssf/2012/01/live_midtown_to_offer_more_inc.html.

72 Michigan Municipal League, "Live Midtown."

73 JC Reindl and John Gallagher, "Downtown Detroit apartment rents spiking higher, even pricing out middle class," Detroit Free Press, January 26, 2014, available at http://www.freep.com/article/20140126/BUSINESS04/301260081/Rents-rising-Detroit-down-town-Midtown-Corktown.

74 Ibid.

75 Henry S. Webber and Mikael Karlström, "Why Community Investment Is Good for Nonprofit Anchor Institutions: Understanding Costs, Benefits, and the Range of Strategic Options" (Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, 2009), available at http://www.chapinhall.org/sites/default/files/Anchor_Paper_04_20_09_0.pdf.

76 Webber and Karlström, "Why Community Investment Is Good for Nonprofit Anchor Institutions."

77 The Democracy Collaborative, "The Anchor Dashboard: Aligning Institutional Practice to Meet Low-Income Community Needs" (2013), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/AnchorDashboardCompositeFinal.pdf.

78 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Strategies for Measuring the Shared Value of Anchor Initiatives," available at http://www.icic.org/connection/blog-entry/blog-strategies-for-measuring-the-shared-value-of-anchor-initiatives (last accessed August 2014).

79 Ibid.

80 The White House, "Fact Sheet: President Obama's Promise Zones Initiative," Press release, January 8, 2014, available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/08/fact-sheet-president-obama-s-promise-zones-initiative.

81 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Office of University Partnerships (OUP)," available at http://www.huduser.org/portal/oup/home.html (last accessed August 2014).

82 Ira Harkavy and others, "Chapter 8: Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies." In Paul C. Brophy and Rachel D. Godsil, eds., Retooling HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan (Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, 2009), available at http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/chapter-harkavy-et-al.pdf.

83 The Democracy Collaborative, "The Anchor Dashboard."

84 First Homes, "About Us," available at www.firsthomes.org/history.html (last accessed August 2014).

85 Harkavy and others, "Chapter 8: Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies."

86 Ibid.

87 U.S. Department of Education, "Programs: Federal Work-Study (FWS) Program," available at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/fws/index.html (last accessed August 2014).

88 Doug Lederman, "Community Service Crackdown," Inside Higher Education, October 11, 2007, available at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/10/11/workstudy.

89 Campus Compact, "Earn, Learn, and Serve: Getting the Most from Community Service Federal Work-Study," available at http://www.compact.org/initiatives/federal-work-study/ (last accessed August 2014).

90 Lederman, "Community Service Crackdown."

91 Arizona State University, "University Service-Learning," available at https://communityengagement.education.asu.edu/students/university-service-learning (last accessed August 2014).

92 Phillips Brooks House Association, "About: The Phillips Brooks House Association (PBHA)," available at http://pbha.org/about/ (last accessed August 2014).

93 Ibid.

94 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, "What's new with community benefit?" (2012), available at http://www.rwjf.org/content/dam/farm/reports/issue_briefs/2012/rwjf402124.

95 Dayna Cunningham, phone interview with author, May 2, 2014; Martha H. Somerville and others, "Hospital Community Benefits after the ACA: Present Posture, Future Challenges" (Baltimore, MD: The Hilltop Institute, 2013), available at http://www.hilltopinstitute.org/publications/HospitalCommunityBenefitsAfterTheACA-HCBPIssueBrief-January2011.pdf.

96 Ibid.

97 Zuckerman and others, "Hospitals Build Healthier Communities."

98 Stamford Hospital and Stamford Department of Health and Social Services, "Community Health Needs Assessment" (2013), available at http://www.stamfordhospital.org/Documents/Stamford-Hospital-CHNA-Final-0913.aspx.

99 Ibid.

100 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, "What's new with community benefit?"

101 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Mentorships Help Local Businesses Win Procurement Contracts with Anchors," available at http://www.icic.org/connection/blog-entry/blog-mentorships-help-local-businesses-win-procurement-contracts-with-ancho (last accessed August 2014).

102 Princeton University Office of Finance and Treasury, "General Principles – Purchasing Goods & Services Policy," available at http://finance.princeton.edu/policy-library/buying-paying/purchasing-goods-services-3/ (last accessed August 2014).

103 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "How Local Purchasing Spurred Growth in West Philly," available at http://www.icic.org/connection/blog-entry/bp-how-local-purchasing-helped-revitalize-west-philly/bp (last accessed August 2014).

104 Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "Mentorships Help Local Businesses Win Procurement Contracts with Anchors."

105 Ibid.

106 Kim Zeuli, phone interview with author, June 12, 2014.

107 Olinsky and Ayres, "Training for Success."

108 Ibid.

109 Sarah Ayres, Ethan Gurwitz, and Ben Schwartz, "Policies States Can Enact to Promote Apprenticeship," Center for American Progress, June 30, 2014, available at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2014/06/30/92841/policies-states-can-enact-to-promote-apprenticeship/.

The Center for American Progress is a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to promoting a strong, just, and free America that ensures opportunity for all. We believe that Americans are bound together by a common commitment to these values and we aspire to ensure that our national policies reflect these values. We work to find progressive and pragmatic solutions to significant domestic and international problems and develop policy proposals that foster a government that is "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Center for American Progress