

2013

Anchor Institutions:

An Interpretive Review Essay

Henry Louis Taylor, Jr. and Gavin Luter
University at Buffalo

A publication supported by the Anchor Institutions Task Force
2013

Anchor Institutions Task Force



Executive Summary

“Anchor Institutions: An Interpretive Review Essay” seeks to evaluate the current state of knowledge on anchor institutions. As capital fled urban places, as the federal government devolved many of its responsibilities down to the state and local levels, and as the economy became dominated by the service and knowledge sectors, anchor institutions emerged as a new stabilizing force and change agent in U.S. society. Anchor institutions, however, have a mission greater than just participating in the stabilization and development of communities, cities, towns, villages, and rural areas. This larger purpose is to play a vital role in the building of a better, more democratic, equitable and just society. Within this context, the Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) seeks to leverage the resources of anchor institutions to address urgent social problems and to build democratic, mutually beneficial anchor institution-community partnerships. To facilitate this task, the AITF carried out this review of the literature to assess the current state of knowledge in the field.

This review of the literature provides an overview of the origins of the anchor institution concept and then explores three interactive themes. The first theme explores the challenge of developing a more precise definition of anchor institutions, while the second theme examines the role of social responsibility, democracy and social justice in the activities of anchor institutions. Here, the big question is “can anchor institutions reach their full potential without embracing a social-purpose mission and deep commitment to democracy and democratic practice?” Without such a mission and commitment, anchor institutions will not make the type of cultural and institutional changes needed for them to realize their full potential. The last theme relates to the importance of developing a research agenda to serve as scaffolding for the civic engagement and anchor institutions movement. In the concluding remarks, both the dangers and opportunities ahead are pointed out. Most important, the review closes by noting while the existing literature on anchors is solid, we should nevertheless continue to extend the frontiers of knowledge on anchor institutions.

Introduction

The Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) is a think tank devoted to making the case for the role of anchor institutions in the social and economic development of society, both in urban and rural settings and across communities, cities, towns and villages. The AITF’s work is based on the idea that communities cannot be transformed and recreated without greater alignment across institutions, civic organizations, citizens, policy, foundations and the private sector. This is where anchor institutions can play a critical role. The advent of deindustrialization, capital flight, and globalization influenced complex societal problems and declining urban centers. The interplay of these forces caused anchor institutions to evolve as critical sources of stability, growth and development. This brought to the forefront questions of how to leverage the resources of anchor institutions to address societal problems and to build an equitable society based on democracy, social justice and a commitment to place and community. At the core of the AITF mission is the leveraging of the resources of anchor institutions to address urgent societal problems and to build democratic, mutually beneficial anchor institution-community partnerships (Anchor Institutions Task Force, 2010). To realize this mission in practice, the Task Force must deepen its knowledge and understanding of anchor institutions and the forces shaping their development.

The three purposes of this literature review are to evaluate the current state of knowledge on anchor institutions; to gain insight into the role of anchors in the transformation and development of rural and urban communities, including cities, towns and villages; and to guide future research on the topic. The review is particularly concerned with developing insight into the ways that anchor institutions grapple with the issues of collaboration and partnerships, equity and social justice, democracy and democratic practice and commitment to place and community. Lastly, the review is mostly focused on the anchor institution literature

developed after 1999, and is informed by four interrelated themes: (1) definitions, (2) types of anchor institutions, (3) role of anchors in central city revitalization, and (4) the role of anchors as agents of change.

This literature review is divided into five parts. The first part explores the evolution of the anchor institution concept, while the second part grapples with the problem of defining anchor institutions. Part three examines the role of anchor institutions in the redevelopment of communities, cities, towns and villages, and part four deals with the role of social responsibility, democracy and sustainability in the development of anchor institutions. In the final part, a scaffolding to guide future research on the topic is discussed.

Part One: Origins of the Anchor Institution Concept

Today, *anchor institution* is an increasingly popular way of thinking about the role of societal institutions in the development of communities, cities, towns and villages (Task Force, 2009). This term emerged out of the landscape of change that increasingly took place in the United States from the late 1960s onward. At that moment, deindustrialization, globalization and the rise of neoliberal policies undermined the manufacturing-based economy of many U.S. cities and metropolitan regions, leaving unemployment, poor schooling, decaying neighborhoods and generational poverty in their place (Sugrue, 2005; Taylor & Hill, 2000; Wilson, 1996). A knowledge-based economy came to dominate, while a neoliberal approach to governance reduced the role of government in society, thereby, spawning both a devolution to states and localities without replacing federal resources and a withering of the welfare state (Hackworth, 2007). In this setting, new institutions stepped forward as the “anchors” of their communities, particularly institutions of higher education and academic medical centers (“eds and meds”). After 1970, as urban conditions worsened, higher education, driven by its public service mission, started to play a progressively important role in grappling with urgent central city problems (Woffard, 1970; Nash, 1973).

This public service mission of higher education has considerable historical grounding. The founding purpose of both colonial colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Universities was to educate young people for service to others. Fulfilling America’s democratic mission was the founding purpose of land-grant universities (Bonnen, 1998). A defined urban-serving mission for higher education dates from the late 19th century and the founding of Johns Hopkins University, the first modern research university, in 1876. William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago was the most eloquent and powerful proponent for the engagement of universities with their cities and communities. Rainey, acting on the premise that involvement with the city, particularly its schools, would advance faculty research and student learning, helped the University of Chicago to become a great university (Task Force, 2009).

This *social-purpose* credo of higher education, which intensified in the 1950s and 1960s, inspired both Paul Ylvisaker’s speech in 1958, which called for the development of urban experiment stations modeled after the work of agricultural land grant institutions and Robert Wood’s plans for the establishment of Urban Observatories in the 1960s (Hackney, 1986; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994). The idea that universities can and should play a central role in improving urban life also motivated Julian Levi’s work on neighborhood revitalization at the University of Chicago during this same period (Parsons, 1963). Between 1965 and 1968, John Gardner’s leadership of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Ford Foundation provided millions of dollars to universities to develop projects with their cities and communities. Unfortunately, these funds did not produce the desired result. Colleges and universities treated urban engagement as a mere add-on; consequently, they made no real effort to change their core teaching and research functions. They resisted making the internal changes needed to work effectively with government, foundations, and other organizations, and they did very little to contribute to the improvement of their local communities (Szanton, 1981; Nash, 1973; Task Force, 2009).

The crisis of the American city had not yet caught up to urban universities. However, urban conditions continued to worsen in the 1970s and 1980s, and by the 1990s, urban universities could no longer avoid the problems of their local communities, including crime, violence, and physical deterioration (Harkavy & Benson, 1994; Rodin, 2007). During this time, a compelling intellectual case for university engagement, developed by Derek Bok, Ernest Boyer, and John Gardner, started to have a powerful impact on a number of faculty members, along with some college and university presidents. Bok, Boyer and Gardner said that universities, especially urban universities, would best fulfill their core academic mission by focusing on the improvement of conditions in their host communities. When Secretary of HUD Henry Cisneros created the Office of University Partnerships in 1994, he explicitly stated that universities were a crucial resource for improving America's cities and that university would significantly benefit from serious engagement with the problems of their host communities (Cisneros, 1995).

The university's¹ prime motivation for addressing urban problems stemmed from its *spatial immobility*. Higher education was rooted in place, and given the magnitude of its investments, the university could not just leave. Because it was a fixed asset, the growing problems of the city affected its operations, including the ability to recruit faculty and students. So, it was in its "enlightened" self-interest to work with government and neighborhood residents to help find solutions to urban problems originally through urban renewal projects (Ashworth, 1964; Bender, 1988; Hackney, 1986; Nash, 1973; Parsons, 1963).

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, as deindustrialization, globalization, and neoliberalism deepened, institutions other than eds and meds were increasingly sought out as partners in the quest to solve urgent societal problems. In this epoch of fiscal scarcity and growing societal problems, the term "anchor institutions" emerged as a new way of thinking about the role that institutions could play in developing the communities, cities, towns and villages in which they were located. This approach grew out of the engaged university movement and represented an emergent belief that institutions, other than higher education, could play a role in the social and economic development of communities, cities, towns and villages. Initially, when the engaged university paradigm took shape in the 1970s and 1980s, higher education made no effort to partner with other place-based institutions. By the mid-1990s, this changed. As problems worsened and resources became increasingly scarce, higher education realized that it needed partners to grapple successfully with the complex socioeconomic challenges that were manifesting themselves in local communities.

During the 2000s, the idea that communities, cities, towns and villages had "fixed assets," other than higher education and academic medical centers, gained momentum. As problems confronting central cities and metropolitan regions intensified, higher education sought out new partners to help them meet the new challenges of urban development. In these difficult times, Wiewel and Broski (1997) said that higher education started to view itself as just one member of a much larger community. So, institutions of higher education sought out other institutions to work with them on solving the urgent problems facing society (Wiewel and Broski, 1997). This quest led to the question, "What institutions are most likely to partner with higher education on solving societal problems?" Ira Harkavy and Harmon Zuckerman (1999) said the city had "fixed assets" which that could help them revitalize the core. Harkavy and Zuckerman defined these "fixed assets" as large, spatially immobile institutions that were tied to the city and community. Then, in 2001, the Aspen Institution Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives defined these "fixed assets" as anchor institutions, marking the first time that the concept had been formally articulated.² In this study, Fulbright-Anderson, Auspos and Anderson said "anchor institutions" are central city institutions "that have a significant infrastructure investment in a specific community and are therefore unlikely to move." (Fulbright-Anderson, Auspos & Anderson, 2001, p. 1). During the 2000s, the concept anchor institution

¹ The "university" in this sense is used to include all institutions of higher education.

² Various people in the engagement university movement were aware of fixed assets in the city, but the concept "anchor institution" did not appear in print until the Aspen Institution study.

emerged as a new paradigm for understanding the role that place-based institutions could play in building successful communities and local economies.

Part Two: Definitions Matter: What is an Anchor Institution?

The concept “anchor institution” emerged during the 2000s as a new way of thinking about the role that place-based institutions can play in addressing societal problems and in building a more democratic, just and equitable society. However, despite the growing popularity of this concept, “anchor institution” is still an imprecise concept that needs a more precise definition. For example, currently, there are about forty-one definitions of the concept found in the literature. While similarities exist among the definitions, there are still important differences among them. To develop a more precise definition of “anchor institutions,” we will explore four aspects of the concept: *spatial immobility*, *corporate status*, *size*, and the *anchor mission: social purpose, democracy and justice* (Bates, Cross, Golin, & Redman, 2011; Birch, 2007; Burack, 2005; Camden Higher Education Task Force, 2008; Christopherson, 2004; Coalition of Urban Serving Universities 2010a, 2010b; Cooney, 2010; Fulbright-Anderson et al, 2001; Gertler & Vinodrai, 2004; Hahn, 2003; Task Force, 2009; Harkavy & Zuckerman, 1999; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; ICIC & CEOs for Cities, 2002; Ivanova, 2005; Katz, 2009; Kauper-Brown, Wesley-Freeman, & Kleb, 2006; Kordesh, 2002; Leichner, LaFlam, & Gary, 2009; Maurasse, 2005, 2007; Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008; Perry, Wiewel, & Menendez, 2009; Webber & Karlstrom, 2009; Wright, 2011).

Spatial Immobility

Spatial immobility is an important feature of an anchor institution. Webber and Karlstrom (2007) say that anchor institutions are tied to certain locations “by reason of mission, invested capital, or relationship to customers or employees” (p. 4). Hodges and Dubb (2012) and The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland (Community-Wealth.org, Overview: Anchors, Online, 2010) also emphasize spatial immobility as the defining characteristic of anchor institutions. Harkavy and Zuckerman (1999) say this immobility gives anchors a strong economic stake in the health of their surrounding community. There is a consensus in the literature that an institution must meet this threshold of spatial immobility before being considered an anchor institution. Here, it should be stressed these spatially immobile institutions can be found in urban and rural settings, as well as in central cities and small towns and villages.

This poses the question, what social and economic forces “root” institutions in specific communities? Webber and Karlstrom (2009) say that anchor institutions are geographically tied to a specific location by a combination of *invested capital*, *mission*, or *relationships to customers or employees*. It is easy to see how these variables interact to root higher education and academic medical centers in a particular place. However, the case of museums, libraries and other cultural institutions is more confounding. These institutions rarely have large capital investments in specific localities, their employment base is often small, their customers are scattered across the urban metropolis, and their missions are rarely expressed in geographic terms. Yet, in most cities, the idea of museums, the central library and other big cultural institutions leaving the city is unthinkable.

David Maurasse (2007) suggests that social and cultural institutions are so embedded in the life and culture of a city that their relocation is unimaginable. Birch (2007) says that sports facilities, public utilities, some large churches, performing arts and other cultural facilities differ in their reasons for being in a city. A performing arts center, which draws on a regional audience, might view the city as a crucial part of its *identity*,

while other anchors might remain in the core for historical reasons, or maybe because of subsidies or locational advantages. Kordesh (2002), Ross et al (2008), and LoCurto (2007) say that urban identity and pride may be the prime factors rooting an anchor in its urban setting. The insights derived from the literature suggest that factors other than deep financial investments can root an institution in a community. The bottom line is that variables, such as capital investment, mission, locational advantage, customer base, or tradition, can operate alone or in concert with other issues to connect an institution to a specific place, thereby rendering them spatially immobile.

The Corporate Status Question

Another challenge in defining anchor institutions is the corporate status question. Can a large privately owned corporation be an anchor institution, or are anchors always non-profit organizations? Given the critical importance of spatial immobility in determining anchor institution status, it seems reasonable to assume that only non-profit organizations would qualify. However, it is not quite that simple.

Those institutions identified as anchor institutions are usually non-profit organizations. The Democracy Collaborative (Community-Wealth.org, Overview: Anchors, Online, 2010) says that “Anchor institutions are *nonprofit institutions* (emphasis added) that once established tend not to move locations.” Webber and Karlstrom (2009) say that universities and medical centers, *unlike many private businesses* (emphasis added), are not likely to leave the central city. Michael Porter (2010) says that anchor institutions like the Cleveland Clinic are large organizations, typically educational, medical or cultural, that are deeply rooted in their communities and that play an integral role in the local economy. These institutions draw billions in funding from non-local sources, spend sizeable amounts on the procurement of local goods and services, act as major employers that train the local workforce and utilize their vast resources to the benefit of their local communities. Porter’s big interest is how to leverage these vast resources to grow inner-city businesses. Most observers, when listing anchor institutions, include only non-profit organizations such as universities, colleges, academic medical centers, libraries, municipal enterprises, performing arts centers and faith-based establishments (Bates, Cross, Golin, & Redman, 2011; Burack, 2005; Camden Higher Education Task Force, 2008; Christopherson, 2004; Coalition of Urban Serving Universities 2010a, 2010b; Cooney, 2010; Fulbright-Anderson et al, 2001; Gertler & Vinodrai, 2004; Hahn, 2003; Harkavy & Zuckerman, 1999; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; ICIC & CEOs for Cities, 2002; Ivanova, 2005; Katz, 2009; Kauper-Brown, Wesley- Freeman, & Kleb, 2006; Leichner, LaFlam, & Gary, 2009; Maurrasse, 2005, 2007; Perry, Wiewel, & Menendez, 2009; Task Force, 2009; Webber & Karlstrom, 2009; Wright, 2011). The implication is that private businesses are “footloose” enterprises that cannot be trusted to remain in a community; therefore, they should not be considered anchor institutions.

Not everyone agrees with this viewpoint. Birch (2007), the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (2010) and others suggest some corporations can be considered anchor institutions, including banks, sports stadiums and privately-owned utility companies (Miller, 2005; Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008; Rosentraub, 2010). Although the work of Kevin Cox and Andrew Mair (1988) is not concerned with anchor institutions, their findings on place-based businesses are nonetheless instructive. They argue that some “locally dependent” businesses are place-based corporations that are not likely to move. They identified two types of businesses that fell into this category. The first group of businesses is rooted in cities because of their fiscal investment in real estate or infrastructure. Privately-owned utilities and finance institutions are prime examples of these enterprises.

Localized exchange linkages that require buying and selling relationships based on predictability, trust, brand loyalties and unique local knowledge suggest immobility. These variables are considered “non-substitutable” because they depend on stable relations with particular customers and suppliers in particular places. The local newspaper, which is dependent on the brand loyalty of readers and advertisers and operating in a set territory, is an example of this type of spatially dependent business. Radio and television

stations may also fall into this category (Cox and Mair 1988). These types of private enterprises are geographically tied to a community, and are not likely to move, Cox and Mair say.

Then there are also examples of “footloose” private corporations that behave like anchor institutions. M&T Bank in Buffalo, New York, invested millions in the development of Westminster School in the North East Side neighborhood over an 18 year period. In 2012, the bank partnered with the school to win a U.S. Department of Education Promise Neighborhood implementation grant, which leveraged an additional \$14 million for investment in the community.³ South Shore Bank in Chicago, a community development bank, founded and headquartered in Chicago represents another example.⁴ The bank had branches in Chicago’s South and West sides, as well as in Cleveland and Detroit until the time of its dissolution in 2010. Both of these privately held banking institutions pursued urban development strategies informed by a social purpose. Does acting like an anchor institution make banks, such as M&T and South Shore anchor institutions? David Perry, of the University of Illinois at Chicago, says no.⁵ He argues that businesses operate within a creed informed by profits and markets. So, regardless of their philanthropic endeavors, if the profit margin falls below a certain threshold, they will either leave or close. For this reason, private enterprises are not likely to forge long-term sustainable partnerships with communities. The fate of South Shore Bank appears to support Perry’s thesis. In 2009, the bank sustained significant losses, although it was not involved in subprime lending. Nonetheless, it was declared insolvent in 2010, closed by regulators and most of its assets were acquired by Urban Partnership Bank.

In a somewhat different scenario, David Imbroscio (2010) maintains that locally owned businesses ought to be the foundation of urban community economic development policy. Operating within this framework, a growing number of communities in North Carolina have launched place-based economic development strategies. These efforts assist in the start-up and development of companies that

- are rooted in a community’s interest in the “triple bottom line” of economic, social, and environmental returns on investment,
- are focused on unique features of a particular landscape or culture,
- are locally driven and capitalizing on existing local assets,
- provide a balanced long-term approach to sustainability of resources, and
- are dependent on creative entrepreneurship and long-range vision.

Neither Imbroscio nor North Carolina economic developers suggest that these locally-owned businesses might be considered anchor institutions, but they suggest that some businesses are place-based establishments whose fates are tied to the development of the local community. These issues notwithstanding, the literature suggests that anchor institutions are non-profit organizations, but that certain types private corporation have the potential to “function like” anchor institutions.

A Question of Scale

A third critical feature of anchor institutions is size. This poses the question, “Is there a size threshold that an institution must reach before being considered an anchor?” McCuan (2007) says that scale matters. New York-Presbyterian Hospital, with its 15,078 employees and \$2.6 billion in revenues, she says, is clearly a New York City anchor institution. Birch (2007) says that anchors are frequently the leading employers in their cities. Maurrasse (2007) states that anchor institutions are important to the remaking of the city and its future, suggesting they are either large institutions or very influential ones. The Camden Higher Education Task

³ Buffalo Promise Neighborhood (2011). Project Narrative for Buffalo Promise Neighborhood. Buffalo, NY: Author. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/promiseneighborhoods/2011/u215n110046narrative.pdf>

⁴ Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Failed Bank Information (Online). <http://www.fdic.gov/bank/individual/failed/shorebank.html>

⁵ Personal Conversation with David Perry, 2012

Force (2008) say that anchors have high levels of employment and significant purchasing power. The 2012 NOFA for the Department of Housing and Urban Development Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant defines anchor institutions as place-based entities that have regional significance and are permanently rooted, economic drivers in specific locales—generating jobs, creating local business opportunities, and contributing in significant ways to the development of human, social and cultural capital (Choice Neighborhoods Grant Program, 2012, p. 10).

Most studies state that anchors are important components of the central city economy and play a significant role in urban life and culture (Leichner, LaFlam, & Gary, 2009; Maurrasse, 2007; Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008). Although there is no size test that an institution must pass before being declared an anchor, most studies suggest that anchors are “influential” institutions whose land holdings, purchasing power, employment and cultural influences impact the local economy. Anchors, then, in one way or another, are large, influential institutions that contribute to the growth and development of their community.

Even so, identifying an institution that meets this “influential” and “size” threshold can be complicated. To provide assistance in this complicated task, the University of Pennsylvania’s Netter Center for Community Partnerships (2008) developed a useful set of guidelines, called the *Anchor Institutions Tool Kit*. The tool kit uses nine questions to assist in the identification of anchor institutions.

- Does it have a large stake and an important presence in your city and community?
- Is it a center for culture, learning and innovation with enormous human resources?
- Is it one of the largest employers, providing multilevel employment possibilities?
- Is it among the largest purchasers of goods and services in your region?
- Is it a job generator?
- Does it have economic impacts on employment, revenue gathering and spending patterns?
- Does it consume sizeable amounts of land?
- Does it have crucial relatively fixed assets and is not likely to relocate?
- Does it attract businesses and highly skilled individuals?

The tool kit does not say how many of the variables must be present for an institution to be considered an anchor, but it is helpful in making determinations about the levels of “influence” and “impact” that an institution has in the city and region. Given the importance of “size” and city and/or regional influence, a small community based organizations or church might be “anchors” in their neighborhood, but still may not be “large” or “influential” enough within the larger urban context to be considered an anchor institution.

The Anchor Mission: Social Justice, Equity and Democracy

The AITF stresses anchor institutions’ *potential* to play a leading role in creating a more democratic, just and equitable society. Therefore, to be considered an *authentic* anchor, an institution must be more than a large, place-based organization with influence in the region. It should also have a social-purpose mission. The core values embedded in that social-purpose mission (democracy, equity, social and racial justice, place and community) will enable an anchor to build democratic, mutually beneficial and sustainable relationships with its host community, thereby enabling it to become a *change agent* and engine of socioeconomic development. David Maurrasse (2001) provided the first book of case studies that illustrated that higher educational institutions can and should have a democratic community partnership agenda built into its academic and institutional core. Over a decade later, Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb (2012) built on Maurrasse’s argument in their book of institutional case studies, arguing that democratic partnerships required transformative changes in a higher educational institution’s culture, values, operations and procurement activities. This type of action requires

consciousness and intentionality.

This raises a critical question, “is social responsibility a desirable trait for anchor institutions, or is it a necessary requirement for obtaining anchor institution status?” The literature does not provide an exact answer to this question. Of course, social responsibility is hugely important and only those institutions imbued with it will answer Ernest Boyer’s call “to serve a larger purpose” (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).⁶ Important and significant, the literature nevertheless suggests that while a desirable trait, social responsibility is not a requirement for an institution qualifying as an anchor. Here, we think the *potential* for acquiring a social-purpose mission is the operative word. Unlike spatial immobility, there is no social responsibility litmus test for anchor institutions. At the same time, the literature suggests that a fundamental goal of the civic engagement and anchor institution movement is for the activities of anchor institutions to be informed by an ethos of social responsibility (Alperovitz, 2003; Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007; Dubb, 2007; Harkavy, 2006; Kauper-Brown & Siefer, 2006; Leichner et al, 2009; Porter & Kramer, 2011; Weber & Karlstrom, 2009). Without achieving this goal, anchor institutions will not make the changes needed to imbue their institutions with the spirit of democracy and a commitment to building a better, more just and equitable society.

The question, then, is what actions can be taken to move anchor institutions in this direction (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2010, p. 3). Benson, Harkavy and Puckett (2007) said “For universities and colleges to fulfill their great potential and really contribute to a democratic ...revolution, they will have to do things very differently than they do now.... To become part of the solution, higher eds must give full-minded devotion to the painfully difficult task of transforming themselves into socially responsible civic universities and colleges. To do so, they will have to radically change their institutional cultures and structures, democratically realign and integrate themselves, and develop a comprehensive, realistic strategy” (p. 84). This perspective is true for all anchor institutions. Thus, while social responsibility is important and significant, it is not a litmus test for anchor institution status. However, the literature suggests that an anchor institution should minimally have the *potential* to acquire a social-purpose mission.

Recapitulation

The literature on anchor institutions makes it possible to craft an insightful definition of the term. There is general agreement that anchors are large, spatially immobile, mostly non-profit organizations that play an integral role in the local economy. These three characteristics are interrelated, although spatial immobility is the defining feature of an anchor institution. Immobility is critical because it ties the institution to its host community, thereby cementing the relationship between the two. So, it is this *spatial immobility* which makes the anchor a prime candidate for using its resources to address community needs. This rootedness is typically based on capital investments, but mission, tradition, locational advantage and customer base can also exert powerful gravitational pulls on anchor institutions. Indeed, most often, it is a combination of factors that roots an anchor to its host community.

The issue of social responsibility is a more complex question. The literature suggests that social responsibility is a desirable, but not a required trait for anchor institutions. At the same time, the general view is that an anchor institution must have the “potential” to acquire a social responsibility framework. Without this moral imperative, an institution is not likely to answer Boyer’s call to serve “a larger purpose,” and it will not realize its great potential to contribute to the building of a better, more just and democratic society. So, then, while social responsibility might not be a requirement for an institution to be considered an anchor, it must have the *potential* to acquire a social-purpose mission. This brings us to another critical question about anchor institutions. Can a private corporation, such as a bank, radio station or newspaper, be an anchor institution? If

⁶ Boyer’s call was actually to higher education and by “larger purpose,” he was referring to the democratic purpose of higher education or what he called its “civic mandate” (Boyer 1990, p. 16).

spatial mobility and potential for adopting a social-purpose mission are used as guidelines, business corporations probably will not qualify as anchor institutions. However, there may be instances when a corporation “acts” like an anchor institution, but even in these cases, profits and markets may still keep them from being considered anchor institutions (CEOs for Cities, 2010).

There is one final point. Anchors are typically defined as “organizations,” but McCuan (2007), says that outstanding civic leaders should also be considered anchor institutions. She argues that these individuals and their network of associates are also critical to the redevelopment of their communities. Collectively, they are anchor institutions. This perspective addresses the relationship between the individual and institutions. James Coleman (1990) says that institutions are a form of social relations that have been fused together in a legal framework, which make them sustainable over time. The power and influence of individuals are typically related to the institutions to which they belong. Civic leaders do not function in isolation, and neither do their network of associates. They are members of institutions, and it is their relationship to these institutions from which they derive their power and influence.

From this vantage point, the McCuan thesis is another way of addressing the importance of institutional leadership and indirectly speaks to the challenge of getting institutions to adopt and institutionalize social responsibility. Thus, individuals play an important role in the development of anchor institutions, but the individuals themselves are not “anchors.” Finally, taken as a whole, the existing literature offers an insightful definition of anchor institutions, but the concept is nevertheless still an evolving one.

Part Three: The Role of Anchor Institutions in Addressing Societal Needs and Challenges

The Anchor Institutions Task Force believes that anchor institutions are important partners in the building of successful communities and local economies. As major job-producing industries left numerous communities and a new knowledge economy emerged, vibrant anchor institutions led by eds and meds remained behind, but the abundant resources of these institutions have yet to be fully tapped by local communities. A goal of the AITF is to facilitate this process by assisting in the development of a framework that will leverage the resources of anchor institutions to address the problem in their local communities.

The purpose of Part Three is to gain insight into the role played by anchor institutions in grappling with the challenges faced by their local communities. Much of this literature focuses on the role of eds and meds in the development of their local economies (Hahn, Coonerty, & Peaslee, 2003; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; ICIC & CEOs for Cities, 2002; Maurrasse, 2001; Baznik, 2003; Bender, 1988; Clark, 2011; Perry & Wievel, 2005; Perry et al, 2008; Rodin, 2007; UC Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005; Webber & Karlstrom, 2009; Kromer & Kerman, 2005; Kumar, 2006; Murphy, 2011; Perry & Wievel, 2005; Wiewel, Gaffikan & Morrissey, 2000). Eds and meds, in particular, have the potential to play a vital role in the building of successful communities and local economies. Hodges and Dubb (2012) say their sheer size causes them to impact the local economy in multiple ways, including through procurement, investment, real estate development, business incubation, and through the purchases made by their students, faculty and staff (Harkavy and Zuckerman 1999; Bartik & Erickcek, 2008; Green & Venkatachalam, 2005; Lester & Sotarauta, 2007).

Most critically, when higher education plays the role of good neighbor, it catalyzes a dialect between economic and neighborhood development, especially within its host community. Studies show that university employee assisted housing programs and affordable housing projects have improved inner city neighborhood conditions and strengthened local housing markets (Calder & Greenstein, 2001; Hoerth, Packnett, & Perry, 2007; Duenes et al, 2001, Kumar, 2006; Perry & Wievel, 2005; Baznik, 2003; Bostic, Lewis, & Sloane, 2006;

Kauper-Brown & Siefer, 2006). These inner-city neighborhood development activities, in turn, provide jobs and opportunities for residents, along with goods and services for the students, faculty, staff and neighborhood residents (Kromer & Kerman, 2005; Perry & Wiewel, 2005; Perry, Leviatan, Bertrand, Patton, Packnett, & Kelley, 2008; Rodin, 2007; Baznik, 2003; Kromer & Kerman, 2005). In these communities, to create greater access to jobs and opportunities, eds and meds have also created workforce development and training programs (Bartik & Erickcek, 2008; Blair, Bransberger, & Conway, 2007; Doekson & Johnson, 1997, Nelson & Wolf-Powers, 2010).

Michael Porter and the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC) provide additional insight of the potential impact that eds and meds can have on inner city community economic development. The ICIC say that anchor institutions offer an enormous market opportunity for inner city businesses (2010). These institutions draw billions in funding often from non-local sources, spend sizable amounts on the procurement of local goods and services, and act as major employers that train the local workforce. About one quarter of all spending done by educational and medical institutions, says ICIC, is made by anchor institutions located in inner cities. ICIC argues that business owners situated in these inner city communities can leverage the resources of anchor institutions by (1) becoming a supplier of goods and services to the anchor institutions in their community (2) using the anchors to assist them in identifying and training employees and (3) securing “world class” advisory and consulting services from the anchors (ICIC, 2010).

If inner city business owners “capture” a significant portion of the resources of these anchor institutions, they will be able to improve their community through the stabilization of their own businesses and through the creation of additional jobs and opportunities for the residents. Gar Alperovitz and the Democracy Collaborative (Community-Wealth.org, Overview: Anchors, Online, 2010) offer yet another complementary example of how higher education can assist in the building of successful communities and local economies. Specifically, they are engaged in research and practice to build democratic approaches to business and community economic development, including the formation of employee-owned enterprises, community development corporations, and non-profit and municipal businesses (Alperovitz, 2003; Alperovitz, Dubb, & Howard, 2007, 2008; Adams, 2003; Lamore, Link, & Blackmond, 2010). The work of Alperovitz and David Imbroscio (2010) at the University of Louisville demonstrate the role that higher education can play in the design and development of sustainable democratic approaches to business and economic development.

Perhaps, the most fundamental contribution that higher education can make to community and economic development is through improvements in public education. Substantial anchor institution literature exists on the topic. This literature has been discussed in numerous works, so it will not be reviewed here in detail. Nonetheless, the work of Ira Harkavy and the University of Pennsylvania’s Netter Center for Community Partnerships deserve special mention. The single most important dimension of Harkavy’s work lies in the placement of university-assisted community schools at the core of the neighborhood transformation process (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett, 2007; Benson & Harkavy, 1991; Taylor, 1992). The central idea behind the university-assisted community school movement is to transform public schools into full service centers, which are “hubs” of community life. Most critically, Harkavy and his colleagues view the neighborhood school as the core neighborhood institution, which not only provides comprehensive services for students and their parents, but that also catalyzes and pulls together other community institutions and groups to help solve the wicked problems facing their community (Benson, Harkavy & Puckett, 2007).

Henry Louis Taylor, Jr. (2005) added to this literature by indicating that neighborhood development and school reform are conjoined. This viewpoint posits that you cannot reform schools without simultaneously transforming the neighborhoods of which they are apart (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett 2007; Benson & Harkavy, 1991, 2000; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; Harkavy, 1998). Other studies show how anchor institutions can also positively impact neighborhood development by bolstering quality public education through tutoring, service-learning and other school reform activities (Black, 1999; Chung, 2002; Fenwick, 2006; Reigg, & Staiger, 2006; Shirley, 1997).

Taken as a whole, the social and economic activities of eds and meds might constitute a new economic paradigm. This is the argument made by David F. Shaffer and David J. Wright (2010) in their assessment of the SUNY system in New York. The activities of SUNY, they posited, represented a new economic development paradigm which is based on four interrelated factors.

1. Putting their research power to work by developing new ideas that will strengthen the country's competitive edge in the new economy;
2. Providing a wide range of knowledge-focused services to businesses and other employers;
3. Embracing a role in the cultural, social, and educational revitalization of their home communities, and most importantly,
4. Educating people to succeed in the innovative age. (p. 1)

Shaffer and Wright say these four factors are connected to four broad areas of endeavor. The first endeavor concerns innovation and involves the university thinking creatively about leveraging its strengths in knowledge production to generate economic benefits. The second endeavor focuses on the pursuit of strategies to help employers prosper and grow by developing worker training programs and management counseling, along with setting up entrepreneurial training programs and assisting in the development of start-ups. The third endeavor deals with assisting in the revitalization of inner city neighborhoods, downtowns and other pockets of distress throughout the state. School reform is a particularly important facet of this work on regenerating communities. Lastly, Shaffer and Wright say that higher education's most fundamental contribution to community and economic development lies in the creation of an educated populace. This idea relates to a host of lifelong learning programs and a commitment to increase the educational attainment of New Yorkers.

Recapitulation

Since 2000, the anchor institution literature has been dominated by studies focusing on economic development, especially studies on eds and meds as agents of urban development. Prior to 2000, the literature was concerned mostly with social issues and the so-called urban crisis. Although the emphasis has shifted to economic development, the anchor institution literature on social development, especially public education, is still very strong. Overall, then, the anchor institution literature is becoming a more balanced one, with greater emphasis being placed on studies that illustrate the role that anchors can play in the socioeconomic development of communities, cities, towns and villages. The prevailing theme of this literature is that eds and meds have supplemented manufacturing firms as new sources of stability, job growth and economic vitality in most urban centers and some rural communities as well. Carolyn Adams (2003) says that eds and meds have become centerpieces of urban economies by employing large numbers of workers, purchasing goods and services, and anchoring neighborhoods through land investments, thereby helping cities become more competitive in the global urban rivalry (p.571). At the same time, she says that policymakers do not provide eds and meds with the levels of support they need to quicken their growth and development.

While most economic and urban development studies deal with the role of higher education in the new economy, there are also studies that examine sports facilities, faith-based institutions, hospitals, libraries and cultural institutions as critical components of the local economy. Lastly, although the literature on the role of anchor institutions in building successful communities and local economies is more balanced, insightful and growing, it nonetheless has critical lacuna. Outside of eds and meds, we know very little about the role that anchor institutions play in solving societal problems and revitalizing communities, cities, towns

and villages. There is a need to gain more insight into the multiple ways that all anchors can contribute to the building of successful communities and local economies.

Part Four: Social Responsibility, Democracy, Sustainability and Anchor Institutions

The AITF believes that using the resources of anchor institutions to address the most pressing civic, social and economic problems facing communities, cities, towns and villages is vital to building a more democratic, equitable and just society. However, for anchors to realize their great *potential* as agents of change and leaders of a democratic devolution revolution, they must be prepared “to serve a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation’s life” (Boyer, 1995). By this we mean that anchors must have the potential to acquire an anchor institution mission to guide their activities. Such a mission would place social responsibility and the fight to build a better, more just and equitable society at the center of the institution’s culture and operation (Boyer 1994; Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett 2007; Saltmarsh & Hartley 2011). Hodges and Dubb (2012) define the anchor institution mission, particularly for urban universities, as “the conscious and strategic application of the long-term, place-based economic power of the institution, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the community in which it resides.” Thus, an institution can only realize its full potential if it adopts an anchor institution mission. This brings us to the question of the role played by social responsibility in the activities of anchor institutions and in their transformation into democratic civic institutions, positioned to play a leading role in the civic engagement movement and in the democratic devolution revolution.⁷ A theme in the anchor institution literature is that to sustain the progressive actions of anchors, their activities must be conscious and intentional. The reason is that without making internal changes in their institution’s culture, priorities, operations, and procurement policies, anchors cannot use fully their resources to spearhead these activities (Task Force, 2009; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Benson, Harkavy & Puckett, 2007). In this context, Porter (2010) says that for colleges and universities to become engines of economic development and community revitalization they must formulate a strategic framework based on an *explicit* strategy to develop their surrounding community.

The big question is how do you get anchor institutions to sustain their involvement in neighborhood revitalization and economic development activities, and then move on “to serve a larger purpose” (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011)? Within the broader anchor institution movement there is some tension over the issue of the sustained involvement of anchor institutions in community development activities. Michael Porter and Mark Kramer (2011) say if anchor institutions are to sustain their involvement in the inner city, their thinking must *morph* from notions of “social responsibility” to notions of “shared value.” Porter and Kramer (2011) view these as two concepts as being very different. “Social responsibility,” they say, refers to a belief that institutions have a duty and responsibility to engage in actions which are beneficial to society (Porter & Kramer, 2011). “Shared value,” on the other hand, refers to an institution pursuing its own interests in a way that also creates value for the surrounding neighborhood. Through a process of pursuing its own self-interest while simultaneously meeting the needs of the local community, Porter says that a “shared value” is created between the anchor institution and its host community. In this scenario, an economic principle is applied to the community development activities of an anchor institution. Porter and Kramer say explicitly that “shared value” is a socially beneficial way to maximize profits.⁸ It is not “...social responsibility, philanthropy, or even

⁷ The democratic devolution revolutions refers to placing partnerships, especially among higher education, community based organizations, unions, churches and other organizations and associations at the forefront of delivering services and programs to improve neighborhoods and assist individuals, children and families (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012).

⁸ Porter’s goal is to reinvent capitalism by creating a more socially beneficial approach to economic development (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

sustainability, but a new way to achieve economic success (p. 64). It is not on the margin of what companies do but “at the center” they say.

The end game in the “shared value” approach is to optimize the interests of anchor institutions by improving conditions in their host community. For Porter and Kramer, the bottom line is that social responsibility, alone, will not sustain the neighborhood revitalization and economic development activities of anchor institutions. Institutions will sustain involvement in a community only if they get a *tangible* return on their investment. This is where “shared value” becomes important. Unless anchors get a solid and concrete return on their investment, their efforts to regenerate their host communities will wane. In their approach to solving this *sustainability* issue, Porter and Kramer counterpoise “social responsibility” to “shared value,” and then place the “shared value” framework on a higher plane than “social responsibility.”

Ira Harkavy, John Puckett, Lee Benson, Barry Checkoway and others have a different viewpoint. In their outlook, social responsibility is not a stage through which anchor institution must pass en route to a higher level. Instead, social responsibility is the destination. The quest to improve conditions in the anchor’s host community is the beginning of a journey to fulfill a larger purpose to build a better, more democratic, equitable and just society. Sheldon Hackney, former president of the University of Pennsylvania, said higher education has an *obligation* to be a good citizen, and its pedagogic duty is to provide models of responsible citizenship for its students (Harkavy & Puckett 1994). Universities and colleges, then, along with schools and religious institutions, have a special responsibility to be moral institutions, exemplifying the highest civic and character-building values of society. This concept of “neighborliness” lies at their heart of the notion of civic responsibility and engagement. It is connected to a moral imperative that expresses the need for the higher education to be concerned about the plight of those residents living within its shadows. Consequently, it is both necessary and mutually beneficial for urban universities to work to revitalize their local communities (Harkavy & Puckett 1994). This view of social responsibility is found throughout the literature on anchor institutions (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981; Bok, 1990). Barry Checkoway (1991, 1997, 2001) in a series of essays argues that public service assumes that the public research university is a public institution with public responsibility and that knowledge is a resource for the public good.⁹ These comments, while focused on higher education, also hold true for all anchor institutions.

This brings us back to the question of how to sustain the involvement of anchor institutions in neighborhood revitalization and economic development. Most studies indicate that anchor institutions must get a return on their investment in order to sustain involvement in their host neighborhoods (e.g. Bates et al, 2011; Daniel & Schons, 2010; Leichner et al, 2009). There is a broad consensus that social responsibility, alone, is not sufficient to achieve this goal. Therefore, anchor institutions are encouraged to pursue their enlightened self-interest in a democratic, mutually beneficial way with their host community. Unlike shared interests, the pursuit of enlightened self-interest does not call for a decoupling of social responsibility from self-interests. Rather, the view is that two should be conjoined and treated as a dialectic. Social responsibility, Ira Harkavy emphatically says, is embedded in the very notion of “enlightened self-interest.”¹⁰ Most critically, if social responsibility is decoupled from self-interest, there is a danger that civic engagement will degenerate into narrow economism (Gasper, 2005). Thus, outside of Porter and his cohorts, other scholars view social responsibility as a key ingredient of the civic engagement and anchor institution movement.

This raises the question of how to identify those institutions most likely to integrate social responsibility into their mission. While the anchor institution literature does not address the issue directly, it nonetheless

⁹ The work of Barry Checkoway is important because it introduces the civic engagement movement to the urban planning community and precipitated much discussion over the topic among urban planners.

¹⁰ Personal conversation with Henry Louis Taylor, Jr.

suggests that eds and meds are the most likely to make social responsibility an integral part of their mission (Benson, Harkavy & Puckett, 2007, p. 83-84). The reason is that public service is already part of the culture of higher education. Of course, most colleges and universities have not made the cultural and institutional changes necessary to realize their great potential as partners in the building of a more democratic, equitable and just society (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett 2007; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). Even so, eds and meds are still the anchors most likely to adopt a social purpose mission and to make the institutional changes needed to play a lead in building pathways to a better world (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007).

Within this framework, those eds and meds located in distressed inner-city communities are the ones most likely to adopt an anchor institution mission. In these troubled environments, the enlightened self-interest of anchors is most directly tied to the revitalization their host community. This assessment of eds and meds suggest that *location* is an important indicator of those anchors most likely to adopt a social purpose mission (Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Fulbright-Anderson et al, 2001; Urban Strategies Council, 2010; Baznik, 2003; Coalition for Urban Serving Universities, 2010a, 2010b; Cromwell, Giloth, & Schachtel, 2005; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; ICIC & CEOs for Cities, 2002; Johns Hopkins University, 2010; Kordesh, 2002; Lamore, Link, & Blackmond, 2005; Taylor, 1992; Yates, 2009).

This section has dealt mostly with the experience of eds and meds, because there is very little information about other anchor institutions in the literature. Studies are starting to emerge on sports facilities (Chapin, 2002; Rosentraub, 2010), hospitals (Bartik & Erickcek, 2008; Bostic et al, 2006; Kauper-Brown et al, 2005; Kauper-Brown & Seifer, 2006; McGee, 2010; Ross et al, 2008), cultural institutions (Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium; 2006; Kiddler, 2010; Kwatinetz, 2011; Yates, 2009), charitable organizations (Ditkoff & Colby, 2009; Sojourner, Brown, Chaskin, Hamilton, Fiester, & Richman, 2004; Vargas, 2011) and faith-based institutions (Anglin, 2004; Bucuvalas, 2003; Reece & Clamp, 2002; Vidal, 2001). The problem is these studies have not used an anchor institutions interpretive framework, so our understanding of how they operate and function within this paradigm is limited. Nonetheless, we can assume that anchor institutions located in distressed inner-city communities will be the most likely to adopt an anchor institution mission.

Part Five: The Research Agenda

Overall, a solid foundation of knowledge has been established on anchor institutions, but additional research is required to increase understanding of this concept. This section is divided into five categories: the role of anchor institutions in urban and rural development, public policy, school reform and neighborhood development, data management and evaluation, and theoretical and conceptual issues.

The Role of Anchor Institutions in Urban and Rural Development

Substantial research on non-higher education anchor institutions is necessary. In particular, the field can benefit from greater knowledge about the activities of libraries, museums, faith-based institutions, community-based organizations, community foundations, municipal entities, public housing authorities, and big non-profits such as United Ways and Catholic Charities. These studies could provide insight into both their economic impact on local economies and their role in addressing urgent socioeconomic problems. It would be helpful to learn how these institutions address equity, social justice, race, poverty, and building partnerships. It is also important to demonstrate these institutions' economic impact through their purchases, employment, cultural activities and overall operations, including capital investments and land holdings. Academic medical centers and public hospitals are included on this list. While we know a great deal about the economic impact of these

institutions on local communities, we know much less about the role they play in addressing urgent social problems.¹¹

Additional research on the role of anchor institutions in rural and semi-rural areas would significantly improve understanding of anchor institutions. The AITF is deeply concerned about distressed places within and across regions. In this sense, anchors can be situated anywhere in geographic space, including small towns and villages. Studies of anchor institutions have tended to focus on urban settings. Consequently, little has been written about the role played by anchor institutions in the development of rural and semi-rural localities.

It is also important to further investigate spatially immobile or locally dependent businesses. These types of enterprises include privately-owned utilities, sports complexes, newspapers, and radio and television stations, and other businesses that are rooted in the community, and therefore, not likely to move. The question of whether private businesses can be anchor institutions has not been resolved. The work of Kevin Cox and Andrew Mair is a starting point, but it is important to study these businesses within an anchor institution framework. Finally, it is important to investigate and analyze how all of these types of anchor institutions can become socially responsible and address critical social issues democratically, collaborating with community residents and institutions as well as with each other.

Public Policy

Policy studies can add value to this body of literature as well. These studies could explore the kinds of federal, state and local policies that can, (1) incentivize the role of anchor institutions as catalysts and facilitators in building partnerships to address social and economic development problems in communities, cities, towns and villages, (2) stimulate interagency cooperation across the federal government and link interagency cooperation to funding streams connected to local social and economic development initiatives, and (3) enable government to assume fiscal responsibility for providing stable and adequate funding for programs and activities designed to transform distressed neighborhoods into successful communities and stronger local economies. This work would not only investigate specific types of policies; it would deepen understanding of resistance to those policies and ways to overcome them.

School Reform and Neighborhood Development

The goal of transforming the public school system is perhaps the most critical task in building a democratic society anchored by equity and socioeconomic justice. In this sense, because neighborhoods are contributing factors to inner city distress and inadequate public schools, it is important to situate the school reform movement within the context of neighborhood redevelopment. Within this framework, it is crucial to gain deeper understanding of the challenge of interweaving school reform and neighborhood development in an urban setting dominated by school choice. In particular, it would be useful to understand how the school choice movement is impacting the community school movement, especially the effort to build schools that are focal points for galvanizing citizens and organizations to help solve community problems. Additional research also could explore district-wide reform movements, such as Say Yes to Education and STRIVE. Both of these movements owe much of their progress to their connection to higher education. Yet, it is not clear how these reform efforts relate to *university-assisted* community schools, which treat neighborhood schools as core neighborhood institutions that will play a critical role in building democratic, just and equitable communities.

¹¹ While this literature review was being finalized, The Democracy Collaborative released a new report (March 2013) by David Zuckerman, with contributions by Holly Jo Sparks, Steve Dubb, and Ted Howard on *Hospitals Building Healthier Communities*, which provides an in-depth look at six hospitals in five cities that are rethinking their economic and community engagement strategies.

High stakes testing and school reform are other important considerations in the role of anchor institutions in education. Testing is especially controversial. Many teachers and principals, along with a number of activist parent organizations oppose high stakes testing and call for a more reasonable way to evaluate students, teachers and schools and a more equitable way to make teachers and schools accountable. Studies could explore this issue from an anchor institution perspective, addressing the connection between place and education (e.g. Greenwald, 2007). It is also important to assess and evaluate the growing influence of private organizations and market principals on public schooling such as education management organizations (e.g. Miron, 2007). The university-assisted community school movement is operating in an environment much more complex today than it was ten years ago. Another important topic to explore is how to transform urban education leadership bodies into socially responsible entities that can guide the school reform movement (Shipps, 2008).

Finally, the literature could benefit from further investigation of the role of anchor institutions in the redevelopment of distressed neighborhoods. This includes exploring their role in catalyzing and facilitating the development of partnerships that address urgent social problems. In this regard, it is important to understand the extent to which the democratic devolution revolution proposed by Benson, Harkavy and Puckett (2007) has already emerged and what can be done to stimulate its continued growth and development. Studies should combine case studies of anchor-based neighborhood planning and development, and explore the emergent “models” of neighborhood development. How to develop these communities without displacing the existing, low-income population is another crucial area for further study (Hodges & Dubb, 2012).

Data Management and Evaluation

Reason and scientific thinking underscore every aspect of life. Evidence-based approaches that employ performance indicators and metrics in solving social problems have become prevalent. In a November 2012 HUD conference for Choice Neighborhood grantees, Secretary of HUD Shaun Donovan placed this “rational approach” to solving socioeconomic problems in its political context. He said that we were in a war against conservative forces that seek to eliminate funding for programs that address urgent social problems. Donovan said the only effective way to counter this argument is with data which illustrate effectiveness. While this approach is valuable, data management and evaluation are more than just proving that programs work. Evaluation should be a tool to build and develop programs and to identify the most important and promising initiatives being launched.

It is important to complete the difficult task of developing a common set of performance indicators and metrics that are used by those in the civic engagement and anchor institutions movements. Without such performance indicators and metrics, it would be difficult to compare experiences in different locations and places. And while institutions and localities can develop additional indicators and metrics, a common set of indicators and metrics can evaluate experiences across space, while simultaneously giving each locality the right to develop their own indicators and metrics.

Theoretical and Conceptual Issues

More comprehensive theoretical and conceptual frameworks can guide the research and practical work of anchor institutions. Anchor institutions are social institutions that function as mediating forces at the intersection of people and localities. Anchor institutions, in their role as urban and rural change agents, are also the architects of contemporary geographical settings, and as such, they should operate with greater levels of consciousness and intentionality.

It is particularly important to more deeply understand how the work of anchors is being influenced by the changing landscape of race and class and the emergence of color-blind forms of racism. Harkavy and the Penn Group¹² have long argued that we are attempting to build a society based on participatory democracy, cosmopolitanism, and racial and socioeconomic justice. These ideas should be placed in conceptual frameworks that demonstrate how they can be integrated into projects and programs that shape the urban metropolis. In this regard, the field could benefit from more studies of the interplay between race and place and gain greater insight into ways in which the new racism is operating and how it continues to place blacks, Latinos and other people of color in a non-competitive and disadvantaged position. Seemingly benign public policies and institutional structures, especially those of anchor institutions, influence the life chances of people of color.

Conclusion

The state of knowledge on anchor institutions is growing rapidly. Yet, at the same time, this knowledge base contains many gaps. Anchor institutions have great *potential* to play a leading role in the building of democratic and successful communities and local economies. Yet, we have a long way to go before this potential is realized. This review of the literature is designed to provide a foundation upon which to build the knowledge base required to guide our practice. The role of anchor institutions as anchors of stability and change in the urban metropolis will increase as the nation's economy continues to shift. The problems of racism, poverty, unemployment, bad housing, poor schooling and inequality will persist and the U.S. economy will continue to stagnate. To meet the challenges ahead, anchor institutions must morph into socially responsible civic institutions that are driven by a moral imperative. For this to happen, anchors must transform their cultures and make institutional changes that reflect social responsibility and a willingness to serve a larger purpose.

To realize this in practice, it will be necessary to continue building and developing the literature on anchor institutions. Within this framework, higher education should play a leading role in catalyzing and facilitating the partnerships and collaborations needed to address societal problems and build a better society. In *Dewey's Dream* (2007) and most recently in "Democratic Devolution: How America's Colleges and Universities Can Strengthen Their Communities" (2012), Harkavy and others make a convincing case for why higher education should drive this process. However, there are real dangers that could compromise higher education's potential role in building the "good society."

The most imminent one is the rise of *academic capitalism* and the *entrepreneurial university* ideal (Anderson, 2001; Clark, 1998; Deem, 2001; Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt, & Terra, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). This approach is attributed to Burton R. Clark, a distinguished UCLA professor of Higher Education, whose 1998 book, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, became the manifesto for supporters of this trend. This model calls for the adoption of an economic development strategy based on making the business creed an integral part of university life and culture. In the entrepreneurial university, schools, departments and centers are encouraged to adopt a market approach to all their activities, including teaching, research and service.

In the foreseeable future, community colleges, colleges and universities will have to operate with less support from government. This means that increasingly schools, departments and centers must make income generation a top priority. In this setting, the temptation to set aside social responsibility will be very great. The possibility of universities *substituting* a "shared value" framework for a social responsibility framework is a real possibility. To counter this, anchor institutions will need to marry social

¹² By Penn Group, we are referring to that cluster of scholars that work closely with Ira Harkavy and the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania.

responsibility and income generation. In this emerging setting, it will be increasingly important for anchor institutions to devise income generating strategies that are consistent with their social responsibility creed. Given that the future of anchor institutions is interdependent with the conditions of their surroundings, there is reason to believe the need for income and the strengthening of local communities can converge.

In some ways, declining economic conditions can in fact accelerate the democratic devolution movement. The, often discrete, efforts of many institutions, non-profits and community-based organizations will be increasingly strained by economic realities. It will be increasingly necessary for organizations and institutions to rethink how they work and how best to generate the funds needed to run their operations. This context can catalyze greater efforts to build partnerships and collaborations to address social problems, rebuild communities, and strengthen local economies. And anchor institutions are critical to the potential success of these collaborative possibilities.

Bibliography

- Adams, C. (2003). The meds and eds in urban economic development. *Journal of urban affairs*, 25(5), 571-588.
- Alemanne, N. D., Mandel, L. H., & McClure, C. R. (2011). Chapter 3: The rural public library as leader in community broadband services. *Library Technology Reports*, 47(6), 19-28.
- Alperovitz, G. (2003). An asset based community development paradigm for the twenty-first century. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Alperovitz, G., Dubb, S., & Howard, T. (2007, November 15). New approaches are needed to curb poverty, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved from <http://philanthropy.com/premium/articles/v20/i03/03004101.htm>
- Alperovitz, G., & Howard, T. (2005). The next wave: Building a university civic engagement service for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(2), 141.
- Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(3), 241-281.
- Amirkhanian, A. (2003). "This works: Encouraging economic growth." *The Manhattan Institute Civic Bulletin*, 33.
- Anchor Institutions Task Force (2010). *Anchor Institutions Task Force Statement*. New York, NY: Marga, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.margainc.com/files_images/general/anchor_task_force_statement.pdf
- Anderson, M. S. (2001). The complex relations between the academy and industry: Views from the literature. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 226-246.
- Andrews, T. (2008). Colleges as community-based organizations. *Community & Banking*, 3, 6-8.
- Anglin, R. V. (Ed.) (2004). *Building the organizations that build communities: Strengthening the capacity of faith- and community-based development organizations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Annette, A. (2009, December 4). Faith groups, churches play important, continuing role in Hamilton, *The Hamilton Spectator*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=Q4K200953309309&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Ashworth, K. H. (1964). Urban renewal and the university: A tool for campus expansion and neighborhood improvement. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 35(9), 493-496.
- Aspen Publishers, Inc. (2009). House Dems urge BTOP to be friendlier to 'anchor institutions'.

- Telecommunications Reports*, 75(19), 46.
- Bartik, T., & Erickcek, G. (2008). *The local economic impact of "eds & meds": How policies to expand universities and hospitals affect metropolitan economies*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Bates, M. A., Cross, J., Golin, I., & Redman, E. (2011). *Giving back and getting back: An analysis of the return on community investments by public universities*. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Battelle Memorial Institute (2004). *Targeting growth opportunities around Baltimore's bioscience research Anchors: An assessment for approaching the development of the East Baltimore life sciences and technology park and addressing broader regional biosciences development*. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Baznik, R. E. (ed.) (2003). *Great universities and their cities: A colloquium at Case Western Reserve University on the occasion of the inauguration of Edward M. Hundert, M.D., as President of the university*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western University. Retrieved from <http://www.community-wealth.org/pdfs/articles-publications/anchors/report-baznik.pdf>
- Bender, T. (1991). *The university and the city: from medieval origins to the present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1991). Progressing beyond the welfare state. *Universities and Community Schools*, 2(1/2), 1-25.
- Benson, L. & Harkavy, I. (2000). Higher education's third revolution: The emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1), 47-57.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (1992). Higher education, regional collaboration, and inner city revitalization: Western New York and Buffalo's East Side as a pioneer project. *Universities and Community Schools*, 3(1-2), 4-7.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., and Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Berger, A. N., & DeYoung, R. (2001). The effects of geographic expansion on bank efficiency. *Journal of Financial Services Research*, 19(2), 163-184.
- Berger, G., & Duguet, P. (1982). *The university and the community: The problems of changing relationships*. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Birch, E. L. (2009). Downtown in the "new American city". *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 626(1), 134.
- Birch, E. L. (2007). The draw. *Next American City*, 15, 28-28.

- Black, C. (2008, March 10). Hospitals go greener to improve bottom line, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattlepi.com/local/article/Hospitals-go-greener-to-improve-bottom-line-1266826.php>
- Blaik, O. (2008, February 23). Campuses in cities: Places between engagement and retreat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.community-wealth.org/pdfs/articles-publications/anchors/article-blaik.pdf>
- Blair, A., Bransberger, P., & Conway, M. (2007). Sector initiatives and community colleges: Working together to provide education for low-wage working adults. *Workforce Strategies Initiative at the Aspen Institute, 4*. Retrieved from <http://www.aspenwsi.org/publications/07-009.pdf>
- Bonnen, J. T. (1998). The land grant idea and the evolving outreach university. In R. M. Lerner and L. K. Simon (Eds.) *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century: Outreach and scholarship for youth and families* (pp. 25 – 70). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Bok, D. C. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bok, D. C. (1990). *Universities and the future of America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
- Bostic, R. W., Lewis, L. V. B., & Sloane, D. C. (2006). *The neighborhood dynamics of hospitals as large land owners*. Paper presented at the Lincoln Institute for Land Policy Conference on Large Landowners and Their Impact on Land Values, Cambridge, MA.
- Bowen, H. R. (1982). *The state of the nation and the agenda for higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Princeton, NJ.
- Boyer, E. L., & Hechinger, F. M. (1981). *Higher learning in the nation's service*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyte, H. C., & Hollander, E. L. (1999, June). *Wingspread declaration on renewing the civic mission of the American research university*. Paper presented at the Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.
- Brilliant, E. & Young, D. R. (2004). The changing identity of federated community service organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 28*(3-4), 23-46.
- Brown, J., & Geoghegan, J. (2007). *Bringing the Campus to the Community: An Examination of the Clark University Partnership after Ten Years*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Land Institute of Land Policy.
- Brookings Institution, (2008). *Blueprint for American prosperity: Unleashing the potential of a metropolitan nation*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute.

- Bucuvalas, A. (2003, April). The Potential of Faith-Based Community Organizations. *Harvard Graduate School of Education News*. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/features/warren04012003.html>
- Business at the speed of light [Editorial]. (2011, June 20). *The Fredrick News Post*, Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W62425573187&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Calder, A., & Greenstein, R. (2001, July). Universities as developers. *Land Lines*, 1-4. Retrieved from https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/230_LLI0107.pdf
- Camden Higher Education and Health Care Task Force (2008). *A 5 year winning investment: Camden's anchor institutions provide jobs, services, and a bright future*. Camden, NJ: Author.
- Carman, J. G. (2001). Community foundations: A growing resource for community development. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12(1), 7-24.
- Casper-Futterman, E. (2011). *Back to basics: Worker cooperatives as economic development*. Paper presented at the American Planning Association, Boston, MA.
- CEOs for Cities (2010). *How to behave like an anchor institution: A white paper by CEOs for Cities with Living Cities*. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chapin, T. (2002). *Identifying the real costs and benefits of sports facilities*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land and Policy.
- Checkoway, B. (1991). Unanswered questions about public service in the public research university. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 5(3), 219-225.
- Checkoway, B. (1997). Reinventing the research university for public service. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 307.
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 125-147.
- “Chicago hospital to anchor development project” (2011, March). *Health Facilities Management Magazine*, 24(3), 8. Retrieved from http://www.hhnmag.com/hhnmag_app/jsp/articledisplay.jsp?dcrpath=HFMMAGAZINE/Article/data/03MAR2011/0311HFM_Upfront_Development&domain=HFMMAGAZINE
- Chmura, T. (1986). *The higher education-economic development connection: Emerging roles for colleges and universities in a changing economy*. Washington, DC: Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- “Choice Neighborhoods Grant Program” (2012). *77 Federal Register* (10 May 2012). Online. Available <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-05-10/pdf/2012-11305.pdf>

- Christopherson, S. (2004, April). *Creative economy strategies for small and medium size cities: options for New York State*. Paper presented at the Quality Communities Marketing and Economics Workshop, Albany, NY.
- Chung, C. (2002). *Using public schools as community-development tools: Strategies for community-based developers*. Cambridge, MA: Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University.
- Cisneros, H. (1995). *The university and the urban challenge*: Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Clark B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Clark, J. (2011). *Approaches to the cooperative revitalization of Auburn Avenue*. Atlanta, GA: School of City and Regional Planning, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Clopton, A. W., & Finch, B. L. (2011). Re-conceptualizing social anchors in community development: utilizing social anchor theory to create social capital's third dimension. *Community Development*, 42(1), 70-83.
- Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium (2006). *Arts and culture in Columbus: Creating competitive advantage and community benefit, A community discussion paper*. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (2010a). *Urban universities as anchor institutions: A report of national data and survey findings*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (2010b). *Urban Universities: Anchors Generating Prosperity for America's Cities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cooney, S. (2010, April 30). *Using anchor institutions to create sustainable communities—The Cleveland experience*. Retrieved from <http://www.triplepundit.com/2010/04/using-anchor-institutions-to-create-sustainable-communities-the-Cleveland-experience/>
- Cortese, A. D. (2003). The critical role of higher education in creating a sustainable future. *Planning for Higher Education*, 31(3), 15-22.
- Cox, K. & Mair, A. (1988). Locality and community in the politics of local economic development. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 78(2), 307-325.
- Creighton, S., Sweeney, R. J., & Cauley, K. (2011). Consortium, university, and program impact on regional economy and community. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 1(2), 1-11.

- Cromwell, P. M., Giloth, R. P., & Schachtel, M. R. B. (2005). East Baltimore revitalization project: Opportunities and challenges in transforming an urban neighborhood. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(2), 113-137.
- Daniel, M., & Schons, S. (2010). *Measuring, attributing, and quantifying the return to anchor institutions making responsible community investments: Yale University and New Haven, CT*. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Management, Yale University.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20.
- The Democracy Collaborative. (Online). University of Maryland. Retrieved from <http://democracycollaborative.org/>
- Ditkoff, S. W., & Colby, S. J. (2009). Galvanizing philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(11), 108-115.
- Doussard, R. (2008). Portland State University gets a new president who's an expert in urban development, right as its community is making big plans. *Oregon Business Magazine*, 31(11), 28-30.
- Dubb, S., & Howard, T. (2007). *Linking colleges to communities: Engaging the university for community development*. College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative.
- Duenes, L., Ciurea, M., Edelsberg, E., & Parkes, R. (2001). *Building partnerships for neighborhood change: Promising practices of the university-community partnership initiative*. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Foundation.
- Eisen, V. (2004). *Building better communities: A getting started resource guide for community foundations*. Coral Gables, FL: Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities.
- Elfenbein, J. I. (2009). Bringing to life Baltimore '68: Riots and rebirth--A how-to guide. *Public Historian*, 31(4), 13-27.
- Elliott, D. S., Levin, S. L., & Meisel, J. B. (1988). Measuring the economic impact of institutions of higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 28(1), 17-33.
- Etienne, H. F. (2012). *Pushing back the gates: Neighborhood perspectives on university-driven revitalization in West Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C., & Terra, B. R. C. (2000). The future of the university and the university of the future: Evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research policy*, 29(2), 313-330.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fanton, J. (2006, June). *The importance of institutions*. Remarks at Chicago Donor's Forum Luncheon, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from

<http://www.macfound.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=1kLXJ8MQKrH&b=4294207&ct=2676781>

- Feld, M. M. (1986). *The university and the city: Partners in social change*. Providence, RI: University of Rhode Island Urban Field Center.
- Fenwick, L. (2006). *Putting school and community on the map*. Atlanta, GA: Enterprise Atlanta.
- Fischer, K. (2006, July 14). The university as economic savior, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A18. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-University-As-Economic/7492>
- Fishleder, L., Hewitt, W., & Vogel, L. (2011). *Capitol broadcasting company and the American tobacco district*: Duke University Florida School of Business.
- Florida, R., Gates, G., Knudsen, B., & Stolarick, K. (2006). *The university and the creative economy*. Pittsburgh, PA: The Heinz Endowments.
- Farrant, R., & Silka, L. (2006). *Inside and out: universities and education for sustainable development*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Company.
- Fox, Kenneth. 1985. *Metropolitan America: Urban Life and Urban Policy in the United States, 1940-1980*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Franklin, R. M. (2005, February). *Cosby's call and our response: What the church and community should do*. Remarks given at Emory University, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from http://cslr.law.emory.edu/fileadmin/media/PDFs/Lectures/Franklin_Cosby_Lecture.pdf
- Fullbright-Anderson, K., Auspos, P., & Anderson, A. (2001). *Community involvement in partnerships with educational institutions, medical centers, and utility companies*. Aspen, CO: Annie E. Casey Foundation, Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives.
- Gale, Dennis E. (1996). *Understanding urban unrest: From Reverend King to Rodney King*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gasper, D. (2005). *The ethics of development: From economism to human development*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gertler, M. S., & Vinodrai, T. (2005). Anchors of creativity: how do public universities create competitive and cohesive communities? In F. Iacobucci & C. Tuohy (Eds.), *Taking public universities seriously*, 293–315. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Geruson, R. (1994). Higher education and medical complexes: The key to revitalizing West Philadelphia. *Universities and Community Schools*, 4(1-2), 70-12.
- Green, R. D., & Venkatachalam, P. (2005). Institutions of Higher Education as Engines of Small Business Development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(2), 49-69.
- Gruenewald, D. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 619-654

- Grogan, P. S. (2009). Anchor institutions in a shifting economy. *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(1), 11-17.
- Gurwitt, R. (2008, May 1). Eds, Meds, and Urban Revival. *Governing*. Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/article/eds-meds-and-urban-revival>
- Hackney, S. (1986). The university and its community: Past and present. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 488, 135-147.
- Hackworth, J. R. (2007). *The neoliberal city: Governance ideology, and development in American urbanism*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hahn, A., Coonerty, C., & Peaslee, L. (2003). *Colleges and universities as economic anchors: Profile of promising practices*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Halal, W. E. (1996). *The new management: Democracy and enterprise Are transforming organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Harkavy, I. (1998, January). *School-community-university partnerships: Effectively integrating community building and education reform*. Paper presented at the Connecting Community Building and Education Reform: Effective School, Community, University Partnerships, Washington, DC.
- Harkavy, I. (2000, Summer). Historical evolution of university-community partnerships. *Community News, Michigan State University Center for Urban Affairs*, 12(2).
- Harkavy, I., & Hodges R. A. (2012). Democratic devolution: How America's colleges and universities can strengthen their communities. Progressive Policy Institute. Retrieved from: <http://www.progressivepolicy.org/2012/10/democratic-devolution-how-americas-colleges-and-universities-can-strengthen-their-communities/>
- Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. L. (1994). Lessons from Hull House for the contemporary urban university. *The Social Service Review*, 68(3), 299-321.
- Harkavy, I., & Zuckerman, H. (1999). *Eds and meds: Cities' hidden assets*. *The Brookings Institution Survey Series*, 22. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy.
- Harris, S. E. (1960). *Higher education in the United States: the economic problems*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, S. E. (1964). The economics of American medicine. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 40(12), 917.
- Hartley, M., Winter, A., Nunery Ii, L. D., Muirhead, B., & Harkavy, I. (2005). Factors influencing civic engagement at Australian and U.S. research universities: Two illustrative examples. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement*, 10(2), 25-47.
- Haya El, N. (2011, April 1). Young and educated show preference for urban living, *USA Today*, p. 01a.

Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=J0E027794804011&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Haya El, N., & Paul, O. (2010, June 25). College towns, capitals do OK in recession, *USA Today*.

Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=J0E042334147710&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Health Alliance (2006). *Community benefit report: A healthy community through caring for people one individual at a time*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.

Henry, A. (2011). *Did the broadband stimulus stimulate? Rural Telecom*, 30(4), 18.

Hodges, R. A., & Dubb, S. (2012). *Road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Hoereth, J., Packnett, D., & Perry, D. (2007). *University employer-assisted housing: Models of university-community partnerships*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Hopkins, E. (2010). Understanding the different types of low-income neighborhoods. *Community Investments*, 22(1), 13-18, 36.

Iarocci, M. S. (2008, March 3). The show must go on. *Fairfield County Business Journal*, p. 12.

Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=31217067&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Imbroscio, David L. (2010). *Urban America reconsidered: Alternatives for governance and policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Institute for Competitive Inner Cities & CEOs for Cities (2002). *Leveraging colleges and universities for urban economic revitalization: An action agenda*. Boston, MA: Institute for Competitive Inner Cities.

International Finance Corporation (2010). *Strategic community investments: A good practice handbook for companies doing business in emerging markets*. Washington, DC: Author.

Institute for Competitive Inner Cities (2011). Anchor Institutions and Urban Economic Development: From Community Benefit to Shared Value. *Inner City Insights*, 2.

Ivanova, M. (2005). Assessing UNEP as anchor institution for the global environment: Lessons for the UNEO debate. *Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy Working Paper Series*, 5(01).

Ivanova, M. (2006). *Understanding UNEP: Myths and realities in global environmental governance*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New Haven, CT: Yale University. Retrieved from ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Database. (UMI No. 1317319481).

- Ivanova, M. (2006, March). *Global environmental governance: A North-South compromise or Confrontation?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA.
- Ivanova, M., & Daniel, C. E. (2008). Reclaiming U.S. leadership in global environmental governance. *SAIS Review*, 28(2), 57-75.
- Johns Hopkins University (2010). At home in the city: Forging a new partnership with Baltimore. Retrieved from <http://web.jhu.edu/administration/provost/speeches%20and%20writings/101022%20Vol%20Sum%20mit/At%20Home%20in%20the%20City.pdf>
- Johnson, A. (2011). *Developing urban arts districts: An analysis of mobilization in Dallas, Denver, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Seattle*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Database. (UMI No. 2405122721).
- Katz, M. (2009, November 9). Camden's waterfront - and its woes. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W61298181806&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Katz, M. B. (2011). *Why don't American cities burn?* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kaupers-Brown, J., & Seifer, S. (2006). *Health institutions as anchors in communities: Profiles of engaged institutions*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Kaupers-Brown, J., Wesley-Freeman, D., & Kleb, G. (2005, March 5). *Health institutions as economic and community anchors: Case studies and practical strategies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Seattle, WA.
- Kromer, J., & Kerman, L. (2005). *West Philadelphia initiatives: A case study in urban revitalization*. University of Pennsylvania: Fels Institute of Government.
- Kellogg Commission (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
- Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1982). "The Uses of the University" Two Decades Later. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 14(7), 23-31.
- Khadduri, J., Schwartz, H., & Turnham, J. (2008). *Policy roadmap for expanding school-centered community revitalization*: Columbia, MD: Enterprise Community Partners.

- Khadduri, J., Schwartz, H., & Turnham, J. (2007). *Reconnecting schools and neighborhoods: An introduction to school-centered community revitalization*. Columbia, MD: Enterprise Community Partners.
- Kiddler, S. (2010). *PILOT task force report*. Boston, MA: PILOT Task Force, City of Boston.
- Kordesh, R. (2002). *Illinois workforce advantage: State of Illinois place-based community development initiative*. Retrieved from <http://www.community-wealth.org/pdfs/articles-publications/anchors/paper-kordesh.pdf>
- Kumar, M. (2006). *Geographical scope of university expansion and its impact on land and housing markets – A method and its demonstration with a case study of an urban university: Working Paper*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Kwatinetz, M. (2011). *The bull & the ballot box: Art museum economic strategies*. Paper presented at Penn Roundtable on Anchor Institutions, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/PennUrbanResearch/the-bull-the-ballot-box-art-museum-economic-strategies>
- Lamore, R. L., Link, T., & Blackmond, T. (2006). Renewing people and places: Institutional investment policies that enhance social capital and improve the built Environment of distressed communities. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(5), 429-442.
- Langseth, M. N., & McVeety, C. S. (2007). Engagement as a core university Position and advancement strategy: Perspectives from an engaged institution. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(2), 117-130.
- Leichner, K., LaFlam, K., & Garry, S. (2009). *Columbia University and the business case for responsible redevelopment*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Lester, P. (2010). *The role of colleges and universities in pace-based initiatives*. Washington, DC: United Neighborhood Centers of America.
- Lester, R. K., & Sotarauta, M. (2007). Universities, innovation, and the competitiveness of local economies: An overview. In R. Lester & M. Sotarauta (Eds.), *Innovation, Universities, and the Competitiveness of Regions. Technology Review*, 214, 9-30. Helsinki: Tekes.
- Lester, R. (2006). "Universities, innovation, and the competitiveness of local economies." MIT Industrial Performance Center Working Paper 05-010.
- Liou, N., Davis, L., & Ards, S. (2007). *Historically back colleges and universities: Three case studies in community development*. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- LoCurto, M. J. (2007, July 21). Planning, dialogue can help ease a difficult task, *The Buffalo News*, p. A6.

Retrieved from

<http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8422&sr=lni%284P7T-KNM0-TWDJ-03WR%29>

- Lowe, J. S. (2008). A participatory planning approach to enhancing a Historically Black University–community partnership: The case of the e-City initiative. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 23(4), 549-558.
- Manjarrez, C. A. (2007). *Making cities stronger: Public library contributions to local economic development*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Mansfield, L. A. (2003). Dreaming big dreams: the University of Alabama at Birmingham School of Medicine. *Southern Medical Journal*, 96(8), 764-766.
- Markusen, A. (2006). Urban development and the politics of a creative class: evidence from a study of artists. *Environment and Planning*, 38(10), 1921-1940.
- Markusen, A. (2007). A consumption base theory of development: An application to the rural cultural economy. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 36(1), 9-23.
- Martin, A. (2002, September 29). In the Region/New Jersey; Restoring neighborhoods by renovating eyesores, *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8422&sr=lni%2846W5-S0V0-01CN-H15F%29>
- Mattoon, R. (2008, October). Do colleges and universities have a role in local and regional economic development? *Profitwise News and Views*, 4. Retrieved from <http://www.community-wealth.org/pdfs/news/recent-articles/01-08/article-mattoon.pdf>
- Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*: New York: Routledge.
- Maurrasse, D. (2005). *Engaging resources in higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Maurrasse, D. (2007). *Leveraging anchor institutions for urban success*. Chicago, IL: CEOs for Cities.
- McCuan, J. (2007). Anchors: Not always institutions. *Next American City*, 15, 6.
- McKee, G. A. (2010). *Health-care policy as urban policy: Hospitals and community development in the postindustrial city*, *Community Development Investment Center Working Paper*. San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- Miller, R. (2005, April 25). Bank gives \$1 million to school, *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8422&sr=lni%284G1G-YXG0-TWCR-5284%29>

- Miller, R. (2005, April 25). The Dallas Morning News Robert Miller column. *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W62728538557&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Miron, G. (2007). Education management organizations. In H. F. Ladd and E. B. Fiske (eds.), *Handbook of Research in Education Finance and Policy* (p. 477-496). New York: Routledge.
- Morrison, D. S. (2008). Latinos will drive the next housing boom. *Taunton's Fine Homebuilding*, 193, 26.
- Muller, R. W. (2001). What matters: making the case for public support of teaching hospitals and medical schools. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 76(2), 201-207.
- Murphy, T. P. (1975). *Universities in the urban crisis*: New York: Dunellen Pub. Co., distributed by Kennikat Press.
- Murphy, T. (2011). *Building on innovation: The significance of anchor institutions in a new era of city building*. Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute.
- Myers, J. (2010, 8/19/2010). Oklahoma due federal funds to expand broadband, *Tulsa World*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W63389143071&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Nash, G. (1973). *The university and the city: Eight cases of involvement*. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Netter Center for Community Partnerships (2008). *Anchor institutions toolkit*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from <http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/anchortoolkit/>
- O'Cleireacain, C., & Rivlin, A. M. (2001, 7/1/01). Families vs. singles, cost vs. benefits, *The Washington Post*, p. B03. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopic/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8422&sr=lni%2843D5-VR50-010F-92SY%29>
- Parry, M. (2010). Government asks colleges to enhance the nation's internet capacity. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56(28), A14. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Government-Asks-Colleges-to/64708/>
- Parsons, K. C. (1963). Universities and cities: The terms of truce between them. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 34(4), 205-216.
- Perry, D. C., & Wiewel, W. (2005). *The university as urban developer: Case studies and analysis*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe Inc.

- Perry, D. C., Wiewel, W., & Menendez, C. (2009). The university's role in urban development: From enclave to anchor institution. *Land Lines*, 2-7. Retrieved from https://www.lincolnst.edu/pubs/dl/1647_862_Article%201.pdf
- Perry, D., Levitan, S., Bertrand, A., Patton, C., Packnett, D., & Kelley, L. (2008). *360 degrees of development: Universities as real estate developers in Atlanta*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Porter, M. (2010). *Anchor institutions and urban economic development: From community benefit to shared value*. Presentation from Inner City Economic Forum Summit 2010, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.icic.org/ee_uploads/publications/Anchor-Institutions.PDF
- Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77.
- Proenza, L. (2007, October). *University innovation: How urban universities create a competitive advantage*. Remarks given at Florida International University Convocation, Miami, FL. Retrieved from http://www.community-wealth.org/_pdfs/articles-publications/anchors/article-proenza.pdf
- Reese, T. D., & Clamp, C. (2002). *Faith-based community economic development*. Boston, MA: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.
- Robert, J. C., & Harold, A. R. (1992). Concerns about school-linked services: Institution-based versus community-based models. *The Future of Children*, 2(1), 107-117.
- Rodin, J. (2007). *University and urban revival*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rodriguez, H., & Houston, D. (2007). *Procurement matters: The economic impact of local suppliers*. Austin, TX and Chicago, IL: Civic Economics.
- Romanos, M. C., Edelman, D. J., & Arefi, M. (2006). *UC/community interactions and collaborations: A study of peer institutions: Main report*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati School of Planning.
- The Roper Group & A. Ilan Consulting (2004). *Camden City higher education and healthcare institutions: Economic impact report 2003 for Camden Higher Education and Healthcare Task Force*. Newark, NJ: Author Retrieved from <http://www.umdj.edu/comreweb/pdf/CamdenEIReport.PDF>
- Ross, C. L., Barringer, J., Danner, A., Woo, M., Doyle, J., Allen, M., Marcus, M. (2008). *Hospitals and community health HIA: A study of localized health impacts of hospitals*. Atlanta, GA: Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Russ, V. (2009, September 8). North to the future, *The Philadelphia Daily News*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W6717746955&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M. (Eds.) (2010). *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education..* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Shaffer, D. F., & Wright, D. J. (2010). *A new paradigm for economic development: How higher education institutions are working to revitalize the regional and state economies.* Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, The University at Albany.
- Shipp, D. (2008). Urban regime theory and the reform of public schools: Governance, power, and leadership. In B. S. Cooper, J. K. Ciubulka & L. D. Fusarelli (eds.), *Handbook of Education Politics and Policy* (p. 89-108). New York: Routledge.
- Shirley, D. (1997). *Community organizing for urban school reform.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Singer, D. (2011, July 18). Phila. invests \$735k to help residents buy homes. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W62483970585&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Singer, D. (2011, July 19). Philadelphia revives program to help employers encourage homeownership. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W61054858925&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university:* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking special justice.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sojourner, A., Brown, P., Chaskin, R., Hamilton, R., Fiester, L., & Richman, H. (2004). *Moving forward while staying in place: Embedded funders and community change.* Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children.
- Souccar, M. K. (2005, December 19). Companies show art appreciation; Big businesses entering New York market build brands by sponsoring cultural events. *Crain's New York Business*. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8406&sr=lni%284HXG-T9M0-TWSV-K2W1%29>
- Spade, J. S. (2005). The hospital emergency department: an anchor for the community's healthcare safety net. *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 66(2), 134-138.
- Spatz, D. (2010, April 29). What Berks has that employers want: Consultant tells Chamber of Commerce that county's selling points have changed. *Reading Eagle (PA)*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W6692292591&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- Steven, B. S. (1993). USC and the rebuilding of Los Angeles. *Change*, 25, 48-55.
- Sugrue, T. J. (1996). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in postwar Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sungu-Eryilmaz, Y. (2009). Town-gown collaboration in land use and development *Policy Focus Report Series*. Chicago, IL: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- The Surdna Foundation (2011). *Unlocking the power of anchor institutions*. Retrieved from http://www.surdna.org/component/content/article/3-whats-new/363-unlocking-the-economic-power-of-anchor-institutions-.html#_ftn1
- Szanton, P. L. (1981). *Not well advised*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Ford Foundation.
- Milwaukee Talkie (2011, May 13). Anchor institutions may be called on to do more. Retrieved from <http://milwaukeeetalkie.blogspot.com/2011/05/anchor-institutions-may-be-called-on-to.html>
- Task Force on Anchor Institutions (2009). Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies. In P. C. Brophy & R. D. Godsil (Eds.), *Retooling HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan* (pp. 147-169). Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research.
- Taylor, H. L. (1992). Redefining the relationship: The urban university and the city in the 21st century. *Universities and Community Schools*, 3(1-2), 17-22.
- Taylor, H. L. (1997). No more ivory towers: Connecting the research university to the community. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 327-332.
- Taylor, H. L. (2010, 12/13/10). Collaborative efforts are the East Side's only hope, *The Buffalo News*, p. A10. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8422&sr=lni%2851PF-JVY1-DY37-D39R%29>
- Taylor, H. L. & Hill, W. (Eds.) (2000). *Historical roots of the urban crisis: African Americans in the industrial city, 1900-1950*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Taylor, H. L. & McGlynn, L. (2009). The connection: Schooling, youth development, and community building—The Futures Academy case. In Harkavy, I. & Hartley, M. (eds.) (2009). *Universities in Partnership with Schools: Strategies for Youth Development and Community Renewal. New Directions for Youth Development*, 122, 19-40.
- Tierney, W. G., & Jun, A. (2001). A university helps prepare low income youths for college: Tracking school success. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 205-225.
- Tully, M. (2010, September 21). Federal grant will boost broadband in Frederick County. *The Frederick News-Post* (MD). Retrieved from http://www.fredericknewspost.com/sections/archives/display_detail.htm?StoryID=116096

- Twombly, E. C., Auer, J. C., & Bond, K. (2006). *Community anchors east of the river: An analysis of the charitable infrastructure in wards 7 and 8 in Washington, D.C.* Washington, DC: Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy, The Urban Institute.
- US Census Bureau (2005) Historical Census Statistics by Race, 1790-1900, for Large Cities. U.S. Census Bureau.
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (2005). *The power of partnerships: Celebrating 10 years (1994-2004), Community Outreach Partnership Centers.* Washington, DC: Office of University Partnerships.
- US Unified Community Anchor Network (2011). *Final report of the U.S. UCAN task force on community anchor network economic models.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.usucan.org/docs/UCAN%20TF%20final%20report.pdf>
- United Nations (1999). *Community involvement in crime prevention: Background paper for the workshop on community involvement in crime prevention.* Vienna: Austria. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=snh&AN=SM184808&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- van der Wusten, H. E. (1988). *The urban university and its identity: Roots, locations, and roles.* Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Vargas, C. (2011, April 11). Philanthropy officials will tour Camden for ideas. *The Philadelphia Inquirer.* Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=2W62326347861&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Vey, J. (2005). *Higher education in Pennsylvania: a competitive asset for communities, Metropolitan Policy Program: Survey Series.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Vidal, A. (2001). *Faith-based organizations in community development.* Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Community Development.
- Vilsack, T. (2010). USDA broadband report highlights role of the Recovery Act in bringing connectivity to rural America. Washington, DC: The White House. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mth&AN=32W3194063380&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Votruba, J. C., & Zimpher, N. L. (2009). The metropolitan university of the 21st century: Building bridges to regional stewardship. *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(1), 5-10.
- Wachter, Susan and Zeuli, K., eds (2013) *Revitalizing America's Cities*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Webber, H. S., & Karlstrom, M. (2009). *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.
- Wedham, E. (2003). The 'religious district' of elite congregations: Reproducing spatial centrality and redefining mission. *Sociology of Religion*, 64(1), 47-64.
- Welch, D. J. (2011). *Broadband spending*. Washington, DC: House Committee on Energy and Commerce. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mth&AN=32Y1478311319&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Welch, S. B. (2009). Safety first. *Crain's Detroit Business*, 25(34), 4.
- Whyte, M. (2010, August 21). What's wrong with this picture? *Toronto Star*, p. E6. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=6FP0727925915&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Wiewel, W., & Broski, D. C. (1997). *University involvement in the community: developing a partnership model*. Chicago, IL: Great Cities Institute, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Wiewel, W., Gaffikin, F., & Morrissey, M. (2000). Community-university partnerships for affordable housing. *Cityscape: Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1), 27-46.
- Wiewel, W., & Knaap, G. (Eds.). (2005). *Partnerships for smart growth: university-community collaboration for better public places*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Wiewel, W., & Perry, D. C. (2008). *Global universities and urban development: Case studies and analysis*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe Inc.
- Williams, J., King, S., & Vance, L. (2010). *Guidance on criteria for anchor institutions & definitions of place-based & school-Based Initiatives*. Oakland, CA: Urban Strategies Council. Retrieved from <http://www.urbanstrategies.org/programs/schools/documents/MemoCriteriaforAnchorInstitutionsFINAL3.26.10.pdf>
- Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Woffard, J. W. (1970). *Urban Universities: Rhetoric, Reality, and Conflict*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education & Welfare.
- The Work Foundation (2010). *Anchoring Growth: The role of 'Anchor Institutions' in the regeneration of UK cities*. London, UK: Author.
- Wright, J. (2011, February 17). Britain needs talentopolis. *Times Higher Education*, 28-28. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=d3c5ac85-53d1-4381-ab2a->

0a300fd0407d%40sessionmgr112&vid=1&hid=107&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbG12ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#db=a9h&AN=59370021

Yale University Office of the Secretary (1993). *Economic impact: Yale & New Haven*. New Haven, CT: Author.

Yates, J. (2009, Summer 2009). Can "Anchor Institutions" Help Revitalize Declining Neighborhoods by Buying from Local Cooperatives? *Owners at Work*, 21. Retrieved from <http://www.geo.coop/node/402>