The Road Half Traveled

University Engagement at a Crossroads

Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb

Anchor Institution
Mission ↗

About the Authors

Rita Axelroth is a consultant in the fields of education policy, university engagement, and community development. She formerly served as the Research Coordinator for the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. Axelroth is the lead writer of the Netter Center's Annual Reports (2007–08 and 2008–09) and author of *The Community Schools Approach: Raising Graduation and College Going Rates — Community High School Case Studies,* a publication of the Coalition for Community Schools (2009).

Steve Dubb is the Research Director of The Democracy Collaborative. Dubb is the principal author of *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development* (2007) and *Building Wealth: The New Asset-Based Approach to Solving Social and Economic Problems* (2005). Dubb is also a co-author (with Deborah B. Warren) of *Growing a Green Economy for All: From Green Jobs to Green Ownership* (2010).

The Road Half Traveled

University Engagement at a Crossroads

Rita Axelroth and Steve Dubb

Contents

List of Figures

Section Four: Envisioning the Road *To Be* Taken — Realizing the Anchor Institution Mission

Acknowledgements

Preface

By Ted Howard and Gar Alperovitz

Over the past ten years a great deal of momentum has begun to build as anchor institutions — particularly, universities — have become increasingly engaged in local community and economic development. It is now widely recognized that place-based (and largely public or non-profit) anchors are important economic engines in many cities and regions, both through their role as significant employers but also, increasingly, through a broad range of related institutional economic activities.

Increasingly, university presidents, administrators, faculty, and students alike have come to understand that by using its economic as well as its intellectual influence, higher education can form effective local partnerships to improve the social and economic conditions of the metropolitan areas in which they are located.

This idea of the university being engaged in enhancing both the social and economic welfare of the community is not new. Indeed, the U.S. tradition of the land-grant college, dating back to 1862, was predicated on a similar commitment. But it was the image of the isolated "ivory tower" that often defined universities for much of the post-World War II period. Although the process is still only partial and backsliding cannot be discounted as a possibility, that norm is now breaking down.

While still a minority within higher education, a growing number of universities have actively and increasingly effectively embraced their role as local economic anchors. Their efforts have involved very substantial investments — sometimes in the hundreds of millions of dollars, as well as the dedication of countless hours of faculty, staff, and student time — to help improve low-income and disinvested neighborhoods in their regions.

In some cases, urban crime helped spur these initiatives. But there have also been many other factors behind the shift: an intellectual movement that identifies "engaged scholarship" as essential to the university's educational and research missions; increasing pressure to fill social service and infrastructure gaps that stem in part from the declining revenue base of state and local governments; and a growing realization among many university officials that the health and viability of their institutions is inextricably bound up with the stability of the neighborhoods adjacent to their campuses.

A central objective of this report on ten leading university efforts is to assess the growing anchor institution movement and analyze some of the implications of various emerging directions. While there have been many reports and stories on universities and anchor institutions, we have aimed to move beyond promotion, public relations, and anecdotes to ask how these initiatives affect (positively and negatively) low-income communities and residents locked in generational poverty, and how such strategies can be more sharply focused for greatest impact. Through a cross-section of ten urban universities and colleges that have been leaders in one respect or another within the

general movement, the report aims to describe what it means (and what it can mean) for a university to consciously embrace an anchor institution mission.

There is no question that over the past 10 to 15 years, there have been a number of important advances in university-community engagement. Notwithstanding this progress, a central question remains: will anchor institution strategies, as presently constituted, make a substantial difference toward the economic well-being of low-income families and to the stabilization and revitalization of the neighborhoods in which they live?

By and large, even the best of the current anchor strategies do not specifically target and measure the impact of their economic and community development activities on low-income neighborhoods. In many cases, the reason for this failure is obvious: anchors making these investments are motivated by goals such as improving public safety and transportation in the surrounding area, or creating a more student-friendly retail environment next to campus. Benefiting low-income residents, particularly economically, often is at best a secondary motive.

Often useful efforts may produce quite worthwhile general benefits to the community-at-large — and certainly contribute to the improvement of the built environment surrounding campuses — but the *direct* impact on low-income children and families is often less dramatic than some boosters suggest. Indeed, in some cases, such as when families are compelled to move due to increased rents or property tax assessments resulting from certain types of university-fueled economic development, the impact on low-income residents can be highly detrimental.

What is ultimately required, we believe, is a much deeper level of institutional engagement than is common in many efforts if there is to be significant change. This requires that anchors commit themselves to consciously and strategically applying their place-based economic power, in combination with their human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the places in which they reside in general, and the welfare of low-income residents in particular.

For such strategies to be successful, they must be rooted in a comprehensive vision of community building. In the case of many low-income, disadvantaged neighborhoods, this will require concentrated investments on the part of local universities that are aimed quite specifically and strategically at stabilizing and subsequently revitalizing the community and its economy.

As the ten institutions profiled in this report demonstrate, a great deal has been learned and accomplished in recent years, and, building on this, a new opportunity now exists for urban universities to fully achieve a powerful new fulfillment of their anchor institution role. It is our hope that "The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads" will serve as an important road map for institutions that seek to advance their work to a new level of critical impact.

Executive Summary

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

Ira Harkavy et al., Anchor Institutions Task Force, *Retooling HUD*, 2009.[1]

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

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

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

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

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

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

in developing their strategies to improve the conditions in distressed communities, must recognize that they are often in the position of "swimming upstream."[6]

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

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

The ten institutions profiled here — and many others across the country — have demonstrated a variety of innovative ways universities can partner with their local communities, organizations and government to *begin* to address problems of poverty, unemployment, inadequate schooling, affordable housing, crime, and other social issues. Taken together, we believe we are on the verge of an important new vision of what might be possible if urban universities seek to **fully achieve their anchor institution mission** — that is, to *consciously apply their long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with their human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the communities in which they reside.*

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

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

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

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

The 10 colleges and universities selected for this study are:

Emory University: private research university in Atlanta, GA

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

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

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

Portland State University: public comprehensive university in Portland, OR

Syracuse University: private research university in Syracuse, NY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⋮

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

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

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

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

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

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

University as Facilitator

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

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis

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

Miami Dade College

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

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

Key Issues	University as Facilitator	University as Leader	University as Convener
The Engaged Community	• Dispersed partnerships rather than geographic focus	• Focus on adjacent neighborhood • Revitalization often initiated in response to crisis or threatening conditions	• Targeted efforts often focus on non-adjacent neighborhood • Strategic choice to engage (not required by history or immediate threat)
Partnership Programs and Goals	• Focus on scholarly engagement, education and health partnerships, and in-kind resources to build local capacity	• Focus on comprehensive neighborhood revitalization—especially education, health, and community development—through academic and non-academic resources	• Focus on capacity building, as part of neighborhood revitalization • Education and health partnerships often part of broader agenda
Institutional Support and Leadership	• Strong administrative support for broad civic engagement mission • Designated community partnership center with focus often on scholarly engagement	• Strong administrative support often directly overseeing revitalization efforts • Additional partnership centers promote university-wide engagement	• Moderate-to-high administrative support often with designated, high-powered staff to oversee revitalization efforts • Additional partnership centers promote university-wide engagement
Funding and Resources	• Low endowment • Limited budget • Limited corporate investments • Moderate leveraging of external resources	• Moderate-to-high endowment • High budget • Significant corporate investments • Internal investment leverages considerable external resources	• Moderate-to-high endowment • Moderate budget • Moderate corporate investments • Significant leveraging of external resources
Principles of Economic Inclusion	• Emphasize access to education • Limited but focused efforts towards support of small and local business owners	• Emphasize innovative corporate practices for community economic development (e.g., local purchasing, real estate development)	• Emphasize capacity building • Developing targeted corporate practices that support diversity, with increasing focus on local community
Nature of Community Relationships	• Good neighbor: responsive to community's or city's agenda • Typically reactive (partnership "taker," not "maker")	• University agenda setting • Strong community dialogue, but plans often presented "to them" rather than developed "with them" • Hire from within rather than from community • Create stand-alone organizations to pursue agenda; heavily brand efforts	• Co-agenda setting among university and community partners • Hire community people to work in partnership centers—translator function • Partner with new or existing community organizations with shared leadership; low-key branding
Impacts on Community	• Large-number of nonprofits benefit from partnerships • Neighborhood-wide impacts difficult to measure due to extensive geography of effort	• Significant university interventions in community development, public health and K-12 schooling show promising indicators • Major improvements in public safety • Often result in higher real estate values in target areas	• Substantial increase in nonprofit and community capacity • Efforts centered on target neighborhood(s) relatively new, making long-term impact difficult to assess

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

Portland State University

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

University as Leader

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

University of Cincinnati

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

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

University of Pennsylvania

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

Yale University

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

University as Convener

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

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

Emory University

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

Lemoyne-Owen College

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

Syracuse University

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

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

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

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

⋮

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

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

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

Figure 2: Best Practices among Anchor Strategies — Select Features

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

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

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

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

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

⋮

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

Figure 3: Recommendations for Realizing the Anchor Institution Mission

University	- Institute high-level administrative commitment. - Employ the university's resources fully—human, academic, cultural, and economic. - Link university hiring, real estate, purchasing, and investment strategies to community partnership goals. - Promote scholarship of engagement. - Engage community residents and groups in mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships. - Learn from "best practices," from each other. - Adopt a strategic, place-based approach to capitalize on existing resources. - Leverage university economic power to support jobs for community members at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale. - Ensure Carnegie "engagement" classification takes into account community-supportive practices in the corporate areas of purchasing, hiring, investment, and real estate.
Philanthropy	- Support information sharing and networks that promote the work (e.g., Coalition of Urban Serving Universities). - Create incentives to encourage structural changes, including policy amendments and internal collaboration that support an anchor institution mission. - Provide pre-development and capital support for community job creation strategies linked to anchor institutions (e.g., The Cleveland Foundation's Evergreen Initiative). - Develop a funders' group that can support long-term, comprehensive, multi-modal initiatives at leading campuses.
Policy	- Support comprehensive programs through collaboration with new government policy initiatives (e.g. Promise Neighborhoods), expansion of current Office of University Partnership programs and creation of an "Urban Grant" program. - Fund specialized programs that match anchor resources to critical public objectives in specific areas (e.g., affordable housing, business development, K-12 education, etc.). - Create anchor-based community development programs that leverage universities' economic power (e.g., purchasing, investment, hiring, etc.) for community benefit. - Convene a multi-stakeholder group that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts through a competitive grant program. - Utilize local government to incentivize universities to invest in comprehensive community development efforts, as well as provide matching grants. - Award prizes like NSF does to provide recognition for exemplary university efforts and help legitimize the work. - Develop a national consultation team of faculty and staff from institutions that have been successful in their work with the community to aid in training and technical assistance.

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

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

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

Section One:
The Past and Present of University Engagement

This nation faces significant societal challenges, and higher education must play a role in responding to them. . . [There is] widespread agreement that colleges and universities have civic and public purposes, including the preparation of an enlightened and productive citizenry and engaging in scholarship that both addresses pressing problems and holds a mirror to society to allow for self-reflection and self-correction. The question is how to achieve these aims.

John Saltmarsh et al., *Democratic Engagement White Paper*, 2009.[9]

Brief History of Universities, Community Partnerships and Economic Development

Universities, in addition to their central role in education, play a critical economic development role. Nowhere has the connection between higher education and economic development been more clearly drawn than in the United States. This link was made explicit in 1862 when Congress passed the Morrill Act, establishing a system of land-grant colleges by allocating federal land to the states to support the establishment of public universities in each state. As James Collier of Virginia Tech notes, while the Morrill Act certainly served to expand access to university education, its "primary goal was to solidify the American economic infrastructure in anticipation of the Civil War's outcome." Senator Justin Smith Morrill (R-VT) himself, in calling upon Congress to pass the Land-Grant Act, argued that land-grant colleges not only would provide education for the "sons of toil," but would speed growth in agriculture, "the foundation of all present and future prosperity."[10]

Historically, community partnership work has not been as visible in U.S. higher education as economic development, but it too has deep historical roots.[11] One early example was the settlement house movement of the late 19th and early 20th century. In its most frequent form, a settlement house was a building in a poor community that was used as a community center. Settlement houses taught literacy and urban survival skills to immigrants and rural migrants and helped organize tenants to secure better housing. University students often lived in the facilities and provided much of the settlement houses' staffing. Hull House, organized by Jane Addams in partnership with the University of Chicago, is one of the best known of these efforts. This work was given prominent support both among the university administration and faculty. University of Chicago's first president William Rainey Harper declared that the university should be the "Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer." And of course it was as a faculty member at the University of Chicago where the philosopher John Dewey first developed his theories of "learning by doing" and experiential education.[12]

For a variety of reasons, the prominence of university-community partnerships and university economic development activity declined in the first half of the 20th century. The reasons are not hard to discern: agriculture, once the foundation of "all" prosperity (in Morrill's words) became less significant as the United States became a primarily urban and metropolitan country and land-grant colleges largely failed to shift the focus of their cooperative extension work to reflect the changing economy. Also, the issues of rural-urban migration and immigration from abroad that had led to the settlement house movement in the first place subsided, as immigration laws restricted entry to the United States. Moreover, universities became increasingly linked to the federal government, especially through military research contracts, which made local community economic development activity relatively less important to universities.

But then circumstances changed again. The roots of today's generation of community-university partnerships can be traced to the late 1960s, when activist academics began to insert community work into university curricula. Robert Sigmon and William Ramsey of the Southern Regional Education Board coined the term "service-learning" in 1967 to describe the work of university students and faculty on a Tennessee Valley Authority-project in East Tennessee conducted by Oak Ridge Associated Universities in partnership with tributary area organizations."[13]

As service-learning grew, it developed a strong anti-poverty cast. Michael Lounsbury of Cornell University and Seth Pollack, Director of the Service Learning Institute at California State University-Monterey Bay, write that, "While the practitioners had different origins, they were united in the belief that students could be productive foot soldiers in the war on poverty." Federal funds helped promote this work through the National Student Volunteer Program (established in 1969 by President Richard Nixon and renamed the National Center for Service-Learning in 1979) and the federal volunteer office, ACTION.[14] The election of Ronald Reagan as President in 1980 soon led to the end of federal support for these programs. Nonetheless, after this initial setback, service-learning in the 1980s rebounded, as advocates placed new emphasis on the academic benefits for college students, while deemphasizing activism. This shift was critical in gaining the bipartisan support that led President George H.W. Bush to sign a bill restoring federal funding to service-learning in 1990, legislation that was expanded when President Bill Clinton came to office in 1993. A decade later, service-learning had become ubiquitous, with the advocacy group Campus Compact estimating in 2004 that 98 percent of its 1,000-plus member campuses offered service-learning courses.[15]

Meanwhile, the federal government also played a key role in encouraging the reconnection of universities to local economic growth. Specifically, in 1980, Congress passed the Bayh-Dole Act, which helped bring about a large expansion of university local economic development activity by enabling universities to profit from their professors' discoveries. From 1980 to 2000, the number of patents issued to universities increased from an average of 250 a year to 3,000 a year. Many have criticized Bayh-Dole for commercializing the university, but there is no doubt about its extraordinary economic impact. A 1999 study of the Association of University Technology Managers found that university technology-transfer activities contributed $40 billion to the U.S. economy and helped support 270,000 jobs nationwide.[16]

In the 1990s, community partnership activity received a considerable boost, as a combination of factors led a number of universities to begin to develop more broad-based strategies. One of these factors was the end of the Cold War, which brought with it at least the prospect of declining military contracts. In this environment, faculty members who could add value to the university in a different way gained more clout. More broadly, the end of the Cold War promised, at least for a time, the possibility that the university would become less focused on federal research attuned to national goals and more focused on local research attuned to meeting statewide or community goals. Modest federal support also helped spur university engagement initiatives, such as establishment of the Office of University Partnerships (OUP) at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1994. OUP grew to have an annual budget that peaked at slightly over $33 million. Additionally, roughly one quarter of the Learn and Serve America

program's budget (or about $10 million a year) supports university service-learning programs. The Department of Commerce also has a small University Centers program in the Economic Development Administration: average funding in the 2000s was about $6.5 million a year.[17]

More urgency, too, was given to the potential benefits of community partnerships when a national wave of urban crime, spurred in large measure by the spread of crack cocaine in the late 1980s, hit major U.S. cities. Meanwhile, federal funding for social service programs had been severely cut during the Reagan administration. Conditions in America's urban core grew more desperate. One indicator is the murder rate. For example, in New Haven, homicides nearly tripled, rising from twelve in 1985 to thirty-four in 1991. In Philadelphia, homicides also climbed rapidly: growing from 273 in 1985 to a peak of 503 in 1990. Nationally, the urban concentration of violent crime reached record levels: in 1991, the seven most populous cities in the United States alone accounted for more than one fourth of all homicides nationwide.[18]

In response, a growing number of universities decided that they literally could not afford to ignore the deteriorating conditions surrounding their campuses without risking driving away the students and faculty on whom their stature ultimately depended. Two of the universities profiled here, Penn and Yale, are very explicit in acknowledging the critical role public safety issues (including specific instances of murder) played in how they developed their initiatives. In other cases, such as Cincinnati, general neighborhood deterioration and perception of crime spurred a similar university response.

Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett of the University of Pennsylvania highlight (albeit more diplomatically) the importance of these factors: "In the aftermath of the cold war, accelerating external and internal pressures forced research universities to recognize (very reluctantly) that they must—and could—function as moral/intellectual institutions simultaneously engaged in advancing universal knowledge, learning *and* improving the well-being of their local geographic communities (i.e. the local ecological systems that powerfully affect their own health and functioning)."[19] Although Benson and his colleagues refer specifically to research universities, this movement has taken hold in higher education institutions of all sizes and sorts. As a result, in the mid-1990s, community partnership centers began blossoming on a number of campuses across the country—centralized units that could galvanize and manage vast resources and programs being directed to the community. Partnership centers helped coordinate otherwise disparate community efforts, occasionally leading to comprehensive university engagement strategies. As noted above, many of these strategies developed at urban campuses as they reacted to crisis in surrounding blighted neighborhoods.

Heading into the 2000s, a new and deeper understanding of the importance of the role of universities in community economic development began to emerge, leading many universities to greatly expand their community partnership efforts—this time, less out of a sense of crisis than out of an appreciation of the opportunity an anchor institution strategy provides. Many of the institutions profiled here, including Emory, Syracuse, Portland State, IUPUI, and Minnesota were *not* faced with an immediate crisis, but chose to act anyway. As noted later in the report, such efforts typically do not involve the same level of resources as those of university "crisis response" strategies, but often, likely due in part to the *lack* of an immediate crisis, these

partnerships often do a better job of taking into account community concerns in the framing and agenda-setting of their initiatives.

As has been true since the Morrill Act, economic and educational motives remain intertwined. In terms of economics, while hardly true of all U.S. cities, a number of American cities began to rebound after decades of decline. Indeed, efforts such as Yale's in New Haven and Penn's in West Philadelphia are part of a broader trend of urban revival. (For example, the nation's capital, Washington, D.C., after decades of population decline, saw its population rise by over 34,000 to nearly 600,000 from 1998 to 2008.)[20] The fact that urban problems began to seem not quite as "intractable" was buttressed by the increasing realization — borne out both by practical examples such as the early efforts at Penn and Yale, as well as by academic research — that universities, acting in their economic capacity as anchor institutions, could make a powerful positive contribution to social and economic outcomes.

A number of studies have highlighted this critical university role. In 2002, the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and CEOs for Cities discussed this untapped potential: "Despite their considerable size, colleges and universities are often an overlooked component of urban economies. Their impact on these economies can be enormous. More than half of all colleges and universities in the nation are located in the urban core: central cities and their immediate surroundings. They have significant purchasing power, attract substantial revenues for their surrounding economies, invest heavily in local real estate and infrastructure, are major employers, and help to train the workforce and nurture new businesses." Nationwide, America's 4,000 colleges and universities spend more than $400 billion annually, own more than $300 billion in endowment investments, and employ roughly three million faculty and staff. As David Perry of the University of Illinois at Chicago and David Cox of the University of Memphis write, "Urban universities are spending up to a quarter of a trillion on salaries, goods and services, which is more than 20 times what the federal government spends in cities on jobs and economic development." David Maurrasse, in a 2007 report for CEOs for Cities, argued that anchor institutions such as universities have "special importance to the re-making of a city and its future." [21]

The term "anchor institution" itself, which once would have surely received blank stares from university leaders, now is regularly a part of university president discourse. In 2007 and 2008, more than three-dozen university presidents came together to form the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, which seeks to promote university engagement in K-12 public schools, community health outreach, and community economic development. In 2009, a number of university presidents — namely, Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University, Gerard Clancy of the University of Oklahoma-Tulsa, Eduardo Padrón of Miami Dade College, Beverly Tatum of Spelman College, and Wim Wiewel of Portland State University — joined with more than a dozen community partnership leaders and researchers to submit a report to HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan that called on the federal government to help forge a "new compact between government, anchor institutions and their communities" to leverage university resources to meet the needs of urban communities. This group, dubbed the Anchor Institutions Task Force, decided in 2010 to formalize its status as a separate entity of practitioners and leading experts in university-community partnerships.[22]

University trade associations have also taken note of these developments. For example, in April 2009, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) named Muriel Howard as its President. Howard, who hails from the urban campus of Buffalo State College, where she was President from 1996 to 2009, quickly moved to re-establish the group's urban steering committee. The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) has created a new Office on Urban Initiatives and, in June 2010, appointed its first Vice President of Urban Affairs to direct the new Office.[23]

The growth of this anchor institution movement has also gained a great deal of academic support. Leading scholars of the 1990s (including Derek Bok, Ernest Boyer, and John W. Gardner) helped to build the argument that by strategically focusing their many resources—from academic programs and research to business practices—on locally identified problems, universities can improve their core intellectual and academic work—in part by giving students and faculty real-world experience which can inform both research and teaching. Boyer, for instance, offered a new definition of scholarship. His "scholarship of engagement" has four functions: discovery, integration of knowledge, teaching, and application. Boyer's definition has been widely adopted—meaning that many community partnerships (a form of application) are now part of the definition of the university's central educational mission.[24] Gardner, who served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Lyndon Johnson and as President of the Carnegie Corporation, called for government to facilitate new forms of interaction between all sectors of society (public, private and nonprofit), including higher education institutions, to strengthen families and communities. Putting these ideas together, Bok, who served as Harvard's president from 1971–1991, sharply criticized universities for not doing enough to help solve America's most urgent social problems. He urged academic leaders, foundations, and government to work together to encourage universities "to respond effectively to the full agenda of national needs."[25]

Today, this growing understanding of enhancing teaching, research, and learning through community engagement—and, further, the related understanding that the campus, as an anchored part of a broader community, cannot thrive if surrounded by a sea of poverty, disinvestment, dilapidated housing, and other signs of a failing social structure—has become an increasingly important element in reducing internal academic resistance to community engagement strategies. Indeed, to some extent, the extension of those strategies has become seen as central to achievement of the university's mission.

But while community engagement has gained prominence at many higher education institutions, the rhetoric far surpasses the number of tangible, mutually beneficial initiatives. John Saltmarsh and his colleagues in a 2009 white paper on democratic engagement further caution that, "Engagement defined by activities connected to places outside the campus does not focus attention on the processes involved in the activity—how it is done—or the purpose of connecting with places outside the campus—why it is done."[26] In other words, even when engagement initiatives are carried out, are these efforts fundamentally changing the culture of higher education in a way that will lead them to invest in the long-term economic development and improved quality of life of their local communities?

As we head into the second decade of the 21st century, the field is asking itself some critical questions about institutionalization, accountability and the true impacts on those most in need.

David Cox, Executive Assistant to the President at the University of Memphis and former director of the Office of University Partnerships for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (1998–99), discusses one of the field's central concerns: "We need agreed upon metrics and accountability. People write up what they are doing and get great PR [public relations] coverage. But you have to read it with a grain of salt. We need to get beyond that. Right now, when you ask universities, 'Do you really do what you claim you're doing?'—The answer is usually 'Trust me.' We're moving on ideology, and we have to move beyond that to take this work to the next level."[27]

Henry Taylor, Professor at SUNY-Buffalo, speaks from experience about the challenges of effecting real change: "The majority of outreach programs operate under the framework of what I call 'liberal do-goodism.' [The University is] more comfortable with the sound of rhetoric without concrete action—there's a lot more PR than substance. The university wants to 'appear' involved, and it is, but it's not strategically focused. And, as long as it's not strategically focused, then it's not about bringing real change."[28]

Elizabeth Hollander, Senior Fellow at Tufts University and former Executive Director of Campus Compact, emphasizes the particular challenge of community wealth development: "In thinking about the university role in improving a community without gentrifying it, it's hard to do, no matter who you are. When university and city government are equally committed, then chances are improved. Most of where this work is right now, is people being proud of doing anything at all—we too easily slide over true wealth development and the true impact on residents."[29]

To begin to answer some of these questions, in this study we examine in depth the community development initiatives at ten universities to see *how* they are partnering with their communities, *why* they have chosen to act in these ways, and *what* are their intended—and realized—impacts. After visiting these ten institutions, we chose to analyze six major anchor strategies being implemented by urban colleges and universities: 1) comprehensive neighborhood revitalization; 2) community economic development through corporate investment; 3) local capacity building; 4) education and health partnerships; 5) scholarly engagement; and 6) multi-anchor, city and regional partnerships. These strategies are not mutually exclusive; rather, many universities have come to develop multi-faceted approaches to anchor-based community development.

The higher education institutions chosen for this study demonstrate some of the most innovative and effective approaches to leveraging their resources as anchor institutions. In part, their success is due to the understanding of these approaches as a powerful pedagogical strategy. In other words, by actively engaging in community work, universities can make new contributions to learning, teaching and research. Demonstrating the patterns among our three clusters of institutions (facilitator, leader, and convener), Figure 4 presents the strategies and tools typically implemented by each set of schools—in other words, how these universities generally express their role as anchor institutions. In particular, the facilitative model places special

Figure 4: Expressions of the Anchor Institution Role

Strategies	University as Facilitator	University as Leader	University as Convener
Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization	• Not very common in this model, unless approached as partner for community-led revitalization effort	• Very descriptive of this model; usually university-led	• Typically part of this model; joint university-community planning
Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment	• Not very developed within this model	• Leading examples of business practices such as local purchasing and endowment investment	• New and/or evolving practices that support local investment
Local Capacity Building	• Individuals, local businesses and organizations supported through educational programs, incubator space, and in-kind resources	• Included among goals, but not always carried out in practice (university maintains heavy influence)	• Key focus, seen through practices such as resident engagement, trainings, and participatory leadership
Education and Health Partnerships	• Often led by individual faculty or interdisciplinary teams • Typically emphasized over community development	• Large institutional initiatives often support focused community revitalization agenda • Faculty and students also engage on project-by-project basis	• Institutional initiatives often support broad community engagement agenda • Faculty and students also engage on project-by-project basis
Scholarly Engagement	• Strong programs in service-learning, capstones, and community-based research; primary focus on student experience	• Strong programs in service-learning and community-based research; may or may not be connected to community development efforts	• Strong programs in service-learning and community-based research; may or may not be connected to community development efforts
Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships	• Some collaboration with city and regional partners • Fewer partnerships with other anchors	• Lead collaboration with other anchor institutions, city partners, and/or regional consortia	• Some collaboration with other anchors and/or city partners • Occasionally part of regional consortia

emphasis on scholarly engagement, as well as in-kind resources for local capacity building and education and health partnerships. The leadership model also emphasizes education and health partnerships but places an equally strong focus on comprehensive community revitalization, using their business practices for community economic development and collaborating with other anchors or city partners to increase overall impact. Finally, the convening model focuses on local capacity building *as part of* comprehensive community revitalization, as well as engages in broader education and health initiatives and in multi-anchor, city, and regional partnerships. In the following sections we will further discuss how—and why—the institutions profiled in this report have emphasized certain anchor strategies over others.

An Overview of Key Anchor Institution Strategies Today

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization

A number of universities, including several of those featured in this report, have engaged in comprehensive neighborhood revitalization strategies. Such strategies require galvanizing and organizing internal and external resources to carry out a development plan. In this manner, these universities attempt to effect broad, systemic change in multiple areas such as safety, housing, economic development, education and health. Such a multi-pronged approach almost always requires collaboration with other partners, including other anchor institutions, so that resources can be leveraged collectively.[30] This strategy tends to be a particular focus among universities who have emphasized leadership roles — Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati. Long-term neighborhood revitalization efforts seek to include community residents and other local stakeholders as partners throughout the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases. Collectively identified goals guide the work and provide meaningful measures of impact. Universities that have assumed the role of conveners — LeMoyne-Owen, Minnesota, Syracuse, and Emory — tend to give particular focus to this collaborative process when engaged in comprehensive neighborhood revitalization.

This pattern largely reflects the location of the institutions and whether they choose to adopt a place-based strategy. For instance, universities that employ a leadership strategy tend to focus intensely on their immediate, challenged neighborhood with a significant investment of resources, while universities serving as conveners often choose to concentrate some level of resources in a poor neighborhood that is slightly removed from campus. Universities as facilitators, on the other hand, often do not adopt a place-based strategy, instead dispersing programs and resources throughout the broader community. Occasionally these schools may focus some resources to a specific neighborhood, particularly when approached to serve as a partner in a community-led revitalization effort. This is the case, for example, with IUPUI's dedication of resources to the Near Westside as a partner in the community's quality of life plan.

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment

The mere size of universities means their business and financial practices impact local economic development, whether positively or negatively, intentionally or unintentionally. A growing number of universities have come to embrace their role as purchaser, investor, workforce developer, incubator and real estate developer. Whether they choose to direct their economic power towards community development is a key question of this report. By strategically leveraging

their assets and business practices towards community economic development, universities can play a critical role in community revitalization. They can also attract significant outside investments and stimulate key public-private partnerships. These practices are particularly true of the universities we have identified as using a leadership model—i.e., Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale. These sites have demonstrated that more quantifiable impacts result when universities establish specific goals and targets for their financial practices to influence surrounding neighborhoods.

One economic practice that some universities have adopted is redirecting their purchasing dollars to support their local community. This often requires internal changes to the institution's procurement policies, whether that means providing unique opportunities for local, minority and women vendors to do business with the university (like Syracuse) or providing incentives for purchasing officers to engage in such strategies (like Penn). Additional resources or staffing may also be needed to build up local vendor capacity in order to deal with the university. By investing dollars that they would already be spending on goods and services into their local community, however, higher education institutions can help create healthy, stable, and viable communities. As Henry Webber of Washington University in St. Louis notes, "All anchors will do some local purchasing, but building or improving a local business community often requires active outreach to local vendors and intensive efforts to improve the capacity of these vendors."[31] A larger number of universities have given special effort to hire local contractors and/or mandate minority and local hires among their general contractors. (Of course, minority contracting is often required of public universities, but exceeding these expectations and focusing on local hires is certainly less common.) This may be linked to an apprenticeship program that enables residents to develop specialized skills on the jobs. Minnesota provides a leading example of this approach.

Another business practice geared towards community economic development is local workforce development and hiring. Some universities have targeted recruitment and training programs that prioritize hiring local residents. Through such programs, core skill set training linked with mentorship and real job opportunities can lead to significant economic opportunities for individuals while fulfilling specific workforce needs at the institution. Moreover, when universities expand their employment base from within their local neighborhood(s), it also promotes positive environmental practices by cutting down on commuting. The University of Southern California (USC), for example, has adopted a goal to increase employment from the areas immediately surrounding its campus. This goal has largely been realized through local recruitment and channeling applicants to various job opportunities, resulting in one out of seven applicants from the seven surrounding zip codes being hired at USC (a total of 170 hires out of approximately 1,200 positions, as of 2002).[32] Combining these workforce practices with the local purchasing practices described above, one innovative approach is to match university procurement with new community-based businesses that fulfill the needs of the university while creating opportunities for employment and asset building for local residents. Cleveland's Greater University Circle is leading the way in such an approach and will be discussed in the concluding section.[33]

Universities also can help shape real estate development for community benefit. Simply where institutions choose to erect new buildings has the potential for economic revitalization. Most higher education institutions have acted alone in their real estate activities, or, minimally, have maintained the lead role.[34] However, in order to circumvent some necessary political and financial risks that come with real estate development — as well as address broader community development goals — some universities have chosen to work with local partners, such as local community development corporations (CDCs), in whom the community may have greater trust. Other anchor institutions have partnered with private developers who can attract funding for low-income housing.[35] These options often mean ceding some degree of control of the development process. As Ziona Austrian and Jill Norton of Cleveland State University put it, "The direction that a university takes with respect to real estate acquisition and development ultimately depends on its leadership. The university president and top-level administrators set the agenda for physical development. Their vision for the future of the university and their perception of the role of the university as a civic partner determine what they do and how they do it." The authors claim that anchor institution real estate development can most effectively reach mutually beneficial goals when university leaders choose to 1) align their plans with broader community goals; 2) partner with residents, city officials, and other stakeholders; and 3) ensure opportunities for community participation in the planning and decision-making process.[36] Leadership also influences how development agendas are financed. Some institutions have invested major dollars into real estate development in their surrounding community, such as Cincinnati's dedication of $150 million in endowment funds for redevelopment in Uptown. These dollars can leverage significant private investment.

University activity can also stimulate local commercial investment and the local housing market. For example, attracting and building new businesses in the area can provide jobs for residents in addition to bringing services to students, faculty, staff, and the broader community. Employer-assisted housing programs can also help revitalize the neighborhoods surrounding universities by creating more mixed-income areas. It should be noted that these practices may intentionally or unintentionally displace existing small businesses or property owners. One principle to address such issues, according to the *Anchor Institutions Toolkit* developed at Penn, is to "create retail development in context of the surrounding neighborhood — complementing existing mix versus displacing."[37] In addition, universities may choose — or be required based on their funding source — to include affordable rental and low-income housing options for residents as part of their development, such as Portland State's agreement with the Portland Development Commission. Although rare in example, universities may also support community land trusts, nonprofit agencies that use nonprofit land ownership to maintain permanently affordable housing even in a "gentrifying" area, as Duke University has done through its support of the Durham Community Land Trust.[38]

Local Capacity Building

Some universities have sought to address community housing, business and economic development challenges by building resident and neighborhood capacity. Specifically, a number of universities have worked in partnership with existing, or formed new, local community development corporations that draw upon existing community strengths. This approach is particularly common among universities identified as conveners—Emory, Syracuse, Minnesota and LeMoyne-Owen—who also emphasize resident engagement, trainings, and joint leadership in these efforts. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), in particular, have been engaged in building and supporting community development corporations, an effort that grew largely from HUD dollars distributed to minority serving institutions in the 1990s (funding that continues to this day), as well as grant programs active during the late 1990s and early 2000s supported by Seedco and the Fannie Mae Foundation.[39]

Many universities have supported building local business capacity as part of a broader community development vision. A select number of institutions have helped establish revolving loan funds to support local entrepreneurs, such as the founding purpose of the LeMoyne-Owen College CDC. Another strategy is depositing university money in community development financial institutions and local minority-owned banks, thereby provided a larger pool of funds to lend to area businesses, as both Yale and Duke have done. Some universities operate business incubator facilities, providing a nurturing environment for emerging small businesses to develop and flourish. Other institutions provide workshops and technical assistance for local entrepreneurs. This focus on building local capacity through in-kind resources and educational programs is emphasized by universities serving as facilitators—IUPUI, Portland State, and Miami Dade College. In supporting local business development, Henry Taylor emphasizes, "The level of training should focus not only on providing market access to goods and services for the university, but actually developing groups of business owners that can go back into their community and help it grow."[40]

Some university-community partnerships aim to strengthen existing community institutions. Many of the higher education institutions in this study, for example, have increased the capacity of local nonprofits through the placement of student interns and volunteers, as well as through faculty research. Many of these universities also provide trainings for local nonprofits and small businesses, led by professionals from throughout the institution and the broader community. In some cases, it is necessary for the university to commit to building local capacity in order to have a strong, on-the-ground partner organization for its community development agenda. Some universities have engaged other partners—often community foundations or well-established CDCs—to take on a more focused community capacity building role. As David Maurrasse discusses in *Beyond the Campus*, community-based organizations and residents need a "certain level of technical capacity and political savvy" to benefit most from their partnerships with higher education institutions.[41]

Education and Health Partnerships

In recent years, the importance of community health and public education in urban revitalization has received mounting national recognition. Urban colleges and universities, in particular, have demonstrated growing interest in developing research and project-based partnerships in these areas. Indeed, education and health partnerships are a common element among all of the institutions profiled in this report.

As the 2009 HUD Anchor Institutions Task Force emphasized, "Successful community development and successful schooling are interconnected and interdependent." Moreover, successful public schools are intrinsically linked to the success of higher education institutions. This is not only because public schools prepare the next generation of college students and universities train the next generation of K-12 teachers and principals, but also because universities need strong neighborhoods to succeed, and strong neighborhoods rely on strong public school systems. Furthermore, public schools have a direct economic impact, as completing high school is one of the most important predictors of a young person's lifetime earning potential. According to a 2009 study by the Alliance for Excellent Education, if the number of high school dropouts in the nation's 50 largest cities and their surrounding areas were reduced by half, these 300,000 new graduates would collectively earn over $4.1 billion in additional wages in an average year compared to their expected earnings without a diploma. As a result of higher incomes and increased spending, these graduates would also increase local tax revenue by nearly $536 million during the average year.[42]

Community schools are one promising model of university engagement in public education, which implements a school-centered community development approach. A community school serves as the hub of its neighborhood, drawing in partners and community resources to improve student learning, strengthen families, and promote healthier communities. A growing body of research shows that community schools have a significant impact on increasing attendance, reducing the dropout rate, improving student academic performance and behavior, as well as increasing parent involvement and adult education. Moreover, more efficient use of school buildings, increased security, and better rapport between students and residents contribute to more stable neighborhoods.[43] Two of the universities featured in this study—Penn and IUPUI—have served as anchors in community school partnerships in their local neighborhoods. Through this university-assisted community school approach, and others, universities can provide a wealth of resources to local school partners, including the use of undergraduates in tutoring, mentoring, and staffing after-school programs. Professors and graduate students can also help develop curriculum and provide assistance with professional development for K-12 teachers.

A number of universities have taken a different direction in educational partnerships by adopting local schools or opening new schools (often charters) designed for low-income students. These approaches typically involve significant financial investment and intensive professional development, such as the University of Pennsylvania's support of the Penn Alexander School in West Philadelphia.

Improving community health is not only an intrinsic element of the university-assisted community school approach, but is also an increasing focus of health professional schools.[44] IUPUI, with the nation's largest nursing school (in terms of degrees offered) and one of the largest medical schools, exemplifies the mutually beneficial potential of neighborhood clinical outreach as a means of educating health professionals. Public health programs are also growing at universities across the country, with or without academic medical centers, through which faculty and students are engaged in community-based participatory research, health education and outreach. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is a growing network of over 1,800 communities and higher educational institutions across North America that demonstrates this trend.[45] Community health partnerships need not have an economic focus in order to have an economic benefit — scientific studies have proven that healthier individuals have the capacity to learn better, work harder, and have greater productivity. Going one step further, Victor Rubin of PolicyLink claims, "Health is such a large industry. If a university puts a new [health] clinic in a low-income neighborhood, it can have its own economic impact by creating jobs and real estate. It becomes sort of a mini-anchor."[46] Miami Dade College's Medical Center Campus and Penn's Netter Center have both helped to open community health centers in their local neighborhoods. These centers are providing much needed services to community residents, as well as invaluable experiences to college students in the allied health fields; they may one day enjoy the spillover economic benefits to which Rubin refers.

Scholarly Engagement

Scholarly engagement refers to the variety of ways that universities can leverage their *academic* resources to achieve community development objectives, generally carried out in ways that are mutually beneficial for the university, including enhanced learning, research and teaching. Scholarly engagement may include service-learning, semester or year-long "capstone" projects, practicums, health clinicals, internships, community problem-solving research, and more. In one form or another, scholarly engagement is a common feature among all of the institutions in this report; still, service-learning and community-based research is *most* emphasized by universities identified as facilitators, largely driven by their emphasis on student and faculty engagement while meeting partnership requests. Indeed, IUPUI, Portland State, and Miami Dade College have three of the largest service-learning programs in the nation.

Some universities, including several in this study (Syracuse, Portland State, Minnesota and IUPUI), have made revisions to their tenure and promotion guidelines to include a broader definition of scholarship. For example, in addition to IUPUI's "Public Scholar" designation for faculty hiring, and faculty awards from the Chancellor's Office, the university also encourages effective faculty engagement by providing fellowship opportunities to work in one of five targeted areas of community revitalization. Such policies and practices can encourage faculty to conduct more, and more ongoing, community-based participatory research. Other institutions have worked to imbed service-learning opportunities within their curriculum, helping to create a "culture of service" in a generation of youth. Service-learning, per se, although it is perhaps the most visible result of the growing university engagement movement, is not a major focus

of this report, in large measure because the nature of the work (the overwhelming majority of which is tied to the academic calendar of quarter-long or semester-long courses) does not easily lend itself to transformative community change.[47] Still, students in service-learning courses can provide labor for immediate nonprofit and public school needs. They can also be linked to sustained partnerships and programs, providing a consistent source of volunteers and leading to greater potential impact. Some institutions, like Portland State and Emory, provide year-long capstone courses as a means to engage students in deeper relationships with community partners, as well as connect students' experiences to a broader field of study. These capstone projects involve interdisciplinary teams of students working collaboratively with community partners to identify, and aim to solve, pressing community problems or assist community partners in pursuing important new opportunities for improving the well-being of their residents and neighborhood.

When scholarly efforts are connected to sustained partnerships, such as IUPUI's Faculty Community Fellows working in the Near Westside, Emory's year-long Community Building and Social Change Fellows program for students, and Penn's service-learning faculty and students working in community schools, the potential for community transformation is greatly enhanced.

Multi-Anchor, City and Regional Partnerships

Many colleges and universities have looked to expand and deepen their external partnerships — including with other educational institutions, medical institutions, corporations, and city and state government — in order to share resources and services invested in their local community. The common rationale is that urban revitalization efforts may have a greater chance to succeed if there are collective resources, ownership and accountability among many partners. In some cases, the university may choose to partner with local government for more strategic reasons, such as acquiring funding and land. As Perry and Wiewel observe, "Relations between universities and city governments tend to be project- or task-oriented, episodic, and subject to political and personal vagaries. Given the importance of universities to their cities and the importance of local government to university projects, it would make sense for both to engage in more systematic, continuous, and comprehensive joint planning."[48] Portland State portrays a leading example in which the university and the city have participated in joint planning that has met the needs of the university while contributing to the vitality of the neighborhoods surrounding campus.

Four of the universities in this study — Penn, Syracuse, Cincinnati and Minnesota — have formed consortiums with higher education and/or other anchor institutions in their region. In other words, multi-anchor partnerships are most common among universities emphasizing a leadership or convening role. Such collaboration provides an opportunity to share and leverage resources as well as learn from each other. Similar to coordinating activities across one campus, bringing together the strengths, assets and programs from multiple institutions has the potential to have greater collective impact on the community. Of course, these local institutions should also build on the skills of local residents and the strength of neighborhood associations to support community development that can be sustained.

Addressing the Challenges

Colleges and universities that incorporate any, or all, of the above anchor institution strategies face numerous challenges and critical decisions along the way. We briefly discuss several of these issues below: creating an engaged community; establishing partnership programs and goals; institutionalizing an anchor vision; securing funding and leveraging resources; building a culture of economic inclusion; sustaining participatory planning and robust community relationships; and, where the rubber hits the road, actually meeting at least some of the key needs of the low-income residents and neighborhoods who are partners in these efforts. These same issues will be explored further in each of the comparative segments of the next section. We have chosen not to explicitly discuss type of institution as one of these factors, although institutional size, funding, resources, demographics, and culture are just a few of the characteristics that shape the type and nature of campus-community partnerships. Many of these ideas are woven throughout the rest of the report as we discuss individual strengths and approaches among our cross section of cases.

Creating an Engaged Community

Individuals, groups, and entities across the world define community in many different ways, and higher education institutions are no exception to this rule. Some universities view their community as the scholars who work and study within the boundaries of their campus. Others see themselves *within* a broader community—for many urban institutions, a community of poverty and blight—one with which they may or may not choose to engage. A growing number of universities have begun to see themselves as *part of* their surrounding community, their futures intertwined with the success of their neighbors. As Michael Morand of Yale puts it, "The inextricable bond [of a university as a community institution] is expressed by the fact that our marvelously urbanized campus is continuously intersected by public streets and sidewalks, that the art museums are free and open to the public as are over a thousand lectures, concerts, and events each year. . .That engagement and rootedness is what fundamentally sets places like ours apart from hospitals, foundations, banks, corporations, and others that support community development."[49]

For universities that have taken the view that they are *within* and *part of* their surrounding community, definitions and tactics still vary. The historical relationship between the institution and the community plays a key role in the approach to engagement. Several universities have engaged in community development in response to crisis, such as violent crimes in the neighborhood surrounding campus. Some universities strategically focus on neighborhood-level impacts while others look to impact regional development. Some do both. Syracuse University, for example, has taken on the entire City of Syracuse as its community while still

focusing on revitalization of two local neighborhoods. Not all urban universities are immediately surrounded by poverty. In such cases, they may choose to focus their partnership efforts on relations with their immediate neighbors and/or government agencies, such as Emory's early partnership programs in the Clifton Corridor and surrounding neighborhood area. Or, they may choose to invest at least some level of focused resources in a targeted neighborhood that is not directly adjacent to campus but is most in need of the resources and relationships that a university can provide, such as the University of Minnesota's efforts in North Minneapolis or Emory's work through the Office of University Community Partnerships in low-income metro Atlanta neighborhoods.

Regardless of their definition, the universities in this study have all demonstrated meaningful impacts on their surrounding communities. We argue, however, that those who adopt a place-based strategy, focusing resources on specific geographic area(s), have greater *potential* to directly influence community economic development. This is discussed further in the concluding section.

Establishing Partnership Programs and Goals

The specific programs and activities enlisted by campus-community partners vary greatly, although they generally align with the partners' chosen methods of engagement, such as the six anchor strategies described above. They also depend upon the identified assets and needs of all local partners. A community needs assessment may be conducted to assess these prioritized areas, while asset mapping may be conducted to identify the capacities and strengths of local individuals, organizations, and institutions. The selected programs and goals will also depend upon existing relationships, financial capacity, and leadership. As Henry Webber and Penn's *Anchor Institutions Toolkit* both suggest, anchors may want to conduct a risks-and-benefits analysis when evaluating potential strategies and projects.[50] In the most collaborative approaches, community residents and other key stakeholders are involved in these assessments and at all stages of the planning process to collectively identify goals and activities that will mutually benefit both the community and the institution.

Another distinction among higher education institutions engaged in their communities is whether the university takes a reactive or proactive approach to community development. As described previously, a growing number of universities are taking a lead role in community revitalization efforts. Some universities are reacting in response to a crisis within or on the edge of campus, as mentioned above, while others take a more proactive approach to turn around a nearby blighted community. Other universities do not have the capacity to lead a community revitalization effort, but have served in a convening role, pulling resources and stakeholders together. Still other universities have served as key partners in a collaborative effort for community revitalization but have taken less of a leadership role, instead allowing community leaders, or other anchors, to guide the initiative.

Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision

As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "institutionalized practices of community engagement" among universities and colleges demonstrate "alignment among mission, culture, leadership, resources, and practices."[51] For universities and colleges implementing anchor institution strategies, there are no substitutes for high-level administrative support. University presidents and chancellors, in particular, set the institution's vision and priorities, as well as its budget. When these leaders support community engagement efforts—beyond rhetoric—partnerships work more effectively, more efficiently, and achieve greater impact. Still, sustainable community partnerships must go beyond the commitment of a few dedicated individuals or presidential leadership. Otherwise, few efforts will persist beyond a single administration. Depending on the university's anchor strategies, this may mean developing such measures as increasing the number of faculty as leaders in community-based research and curriculum or changing the culture among purchasing officers to focus on local procurement. Specifically, engaging faculty members—who do the vast majority of teaching and research at the university *and* who are often the longest standing members of the institution—certainly plays a critical role in institutionalizing an anchor vision.

Further, community development strategies have the greatest potential impact when the administrative and business sides of the university work together with the academic side.[52] As Maurrasse puts it, "The irony of partnerships of this sort is that each side of the equation must effectively prepare and collaborate *internally* in order to do so externally. . . Higher education/community partnerships historically have often been inconsistent and uncoordinated, leaving neighborhood residents wary of even the best intentioned outreach efforts."[53]

One promising approach to internal coordination and collaboration—and sustainability—is the presence of a centralized unit that promotes and manages outreach activities. Some of these units are focused almost exclusively on service-learning, while others have broader community partnership agendas. At the same time, major community development efforts led by university administration are often managed—and funded—separately from their community partnership centers. The degree to which these approaches, and their resources, are strategically aligned has much to do with the institutional leadership and the specific programs and goals being implemented, as well as largely affects how the *university* is impacted by engagement with its community.[54] At many of the universities featured in this study, for example, high-powered faculty or staff person(s) often lead a centralized partnership center whose efforts are supported by, and closely aligned with, the central administration. For instance, the University of Minnesota has a Dean of Extension and three Associate Vice Presidents in positions that are responsible for community engagement: Beverly Durgan, Andrew Furco, Geoff Maryuma and Irma McClaurin. All of these leaders report to Senior Vice President Robert Jones, whose commitment to advancing both the community engagement agenda and the urban agenda have brought together these university-wide efforts. This leadership and alignment often promotes more effective—and efficient—use of internal resources.

Securing Funding and Leveraging Resources

While federal, foundation, and donor dollars have supported many universities' engagement efforts, internal funds are essential for sustained community-campus partnerships. Endowment and operating fund allocations are two ways to leverage university assets for community development. Targeted alumni-giving campaigns have also raised dollars for partnership efforts. Although state institutions often have more restricted funding, those in this study have been able to draw from their central budget to support community partnership activities. University leaders often feel greater justification in the use of core funding and endowment dollars towards community engagement when the activities also help realize the core missions of their institution; this investment typically involves annual expenditures to campus partnership centers and programs that are also helping to advance research, teaching and learning. In several cases, it involves substantial capital expenditure.

Higher education institutions can also invest in community development in ways that require less direct expenditures—and more cultural transformation—such as through adopting economic inclusion practices in their employment, purchasing, hiring, investment, and contracting, as noted above. Efficient use of internal resources also requires the reallocation of existing funds to community partnership activities, such as faculty time, whose research and/or students are focused on community problem-solving.

Internal support must also be matched with external funding. Many of the universities in this study have been supported through federal dollars, such as Office of University Partnership (OUP) grants administered through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)—typically in the range of $400,000–$700,000 and administered over three-years. Reaching more than 300 universities in its first decade, OUP has had significant influence on the evolution of university-community partnerships, although funding for the program has always been limited.[55] The universities in this study have also received significant grants from local and national foundations. Too many campus-community partnerships, however, rely on grant funding, which are often limited in dollar amount and in time. "A discontinued program is a common reality in the academy, but a discontinued community partnership could prove disruptive or even devastating to local residents," observes Maurrasse.[56] External grants often do not allow for the necessary time to build relationships and have an inclusive planning process, which is essential for any ongoing efforts for community revitalization. Thus, the combination of internal and external resources may prove most sustainable for community partnerships.

Many universities and colleges have looked to diversify and expand their funding base for community partnership efforts. Universities focused on real estate development, in particular, have been able to leverage funding through Tax Increment Financing (TIF), New Market Tax Credits, revenue bonds, standard commercial loans and other sources. Some universities have helped form non-profit organizations that operate as independent entities but remain closely associated with the institution. This allows not only for the organization to attract funding using the university name but also to avoid bureaucratic and other restrictions on university funds. The LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation is a chief example of this

type of approach, where the university is able to participate in community development activities through association with and support of this separate entity. Urban planning and mixed-used real estate specialists David Dixon and Peter Roche's rationale of Ohio State University's decision to form a new entity ("Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment") also helps explain such an approach:

- "The revitalization should be led by an entity with a clearly defined mission and full-time staff dedicated to this task. Flexibility and effectiveness in conducting planning and real estate development activities would also be key, and the university itself could not provide that expertise.
- Clear authority for making decisions, independent of the very collegial decision-making process of the university, would be critical.
- Distance from the university structure would be important, both to shield OSU from potential controversy and to inspire community acceptance. . .
- Campus Partners would need to live up to private-sector expectations by playing the dual role of the redevelopment authority (assembling land and handling relocation, demolition, and environmental cleanup) and the source of 'patient capital' (taking early risks related to planning and market studies, land purchases, etc.)."[57]

Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion

Similar to the differing interpretations of community, universities view their role in promoting economic inclusion in various ways. For some institutions, providing access to higher education is their primary vision — and perhaps greatest potential — for providing economic opportunity. This is particularly true of universities serving as facilitators. Miami Dade College's open-door policy and Portland State's agreement with local community colleges both speak to this objective. Some institutions, community colleges in particular, also offer credit and non-credit courses at no charge to community residents.

Other higher education institutions try to impact community economic development in a more direct way. While many university-community partnerships have led to reductions in the rate of neighborhood crime, few universities have made significant impacts on poverty. Similarly, while considerable success has occurred in a number of partnership programs, these efforts have rarely been sufficient to eliminate the health disparities and educational achievement gap that poverty most often brings. As Stephen Viederman claims in an essay entitled, "Can Universities Contribute to Sustainable Development," "Most efforts at social change are, in effect, ameliorative: they seek to remedy immediate problems, but do not deal with root causes."[58] However, a range of strategies has emerged in the last 15 years to begin to directly and systemically address such issues and create greater economic opportunity for local residents. Some universities have dedicated intellectual and human resources to solving these real-world problems through service-learning, community-based participatory research, internships and fellowships. More tangible economic benefit — though more limited in example — comes through the dedication of purchasing and contracting dollars, employment practices, training and technical assistance,

investment, and real estate development towards community economic development. These innovative practices are largely being demonstrated by universities serving in leadership roles. Several other institutions in this study have been encouraged by state or city policies to offer assistance to minority and disadvantaged business owners. Many of the studied universities have also supported local entrepreneurs and small businesses through training, technical assistance, and seed funding. Universities in convening roles typically embrace this capacity-building focus as a means to economic inclusion.

The University of Pennsylvania's "West Philadelphia Initiatives" is one of the most highly recognized commitments to economic inclusion, which involved a combined effort of the business practices and academic programs described above.[59] This approach, however, can be challenging, as there is often a tension between the economic development mindset, and the partnership mindset, of a university. As Maurrasse phrases it, "As much as higher education appears to be moving toward involvement in local communities, the institutions also are becoming increasingly corporate in nature. . .The core academic mission holds one set of priorities; economic aspects of the mission drive another set of priorities. The two are intertwined but not always in sync."[60]

Sustaining Participatory Planning and Robust Community Relationships

Building relationships and trust among campus and community partners takes time. And, as Maurrasse wryly comments, "If the historical relationship has been contentious, it takes even more time."[61] Sustainable campus-community partnerships involve inclusive planning processes that allow for an inventory of strengths of the various partners involved, prioritization of the most pressing needs, and agreement upon mutually beneficial strategies. Transparency is a necessary element of trust between campus and community. As Rachel Weber, Nik Theodore, and Charles Hoch of the University of Illinois at Chicago write, "Transparency requires that informational channels allow partners to comprehend the interest, intentions, and capabilities of each partner. It does not mean that all information is disclosed indiscriminately (which, in fact, may constitute a dereliction of fiduciary duty), but rather that information be relevant, actionable, and delivered on a timely basis."[62]

Community buy-in is essential, prior to — and during — implementation. "For community buy-in, people from the university have to be seen as trustworthy, of their word, and bringing a tangible benefit for the community. One way to be trustworthy is to not be a direct representative of the institution (faculty or student groups, for example); or, be a representative of the institution and admit your past wrongdoings," says Rubin. "You need to be able to describe what it is the university wants to do, and be clear that you are willing to share the planning and decision making with community groups."[63]

Ongoing communication is also indispensable for sustained partnerships. Forums, town halls, and other gatherings can provide opportunities for community and university stakeholders to exchange ideas and discuss strategies for partnership and redevelopment. In Penn's case, monthly meetings called First Thursdays are held in a public library "to which all community

stakeholders and university administrators are invited and regularly attend to nourish the process of transparency."[64] Yale holds a similar monthly forum. Universities may also provide opportunities for residents and other stakeholders to counsel and monitor their partnerships through a community advisory board.

Power dynamics play an important role in campus-community partnerships. Austrian and Norton's analysis of university real estate development holds true for many university engagement initiatives: "The extent to which community groups can affect the development process is partly a function of their sophistication. Well-organized groups with highly skilled leaders are better able to exert pressure and more equipped to negotiate with the university."[65] Some institutions have signed community benefit agreements with their neighborhood, in order to negotiate results and expectations. "There's a principle behind this: it's not a benefit if the community doesn't want it," says Rosalind Greenstein, an urban policy analyst. "[A community benefit agreement] is the second best thing, though. The best thing is a really good community planning process."[66] This process is most successful when there is "consistent, committed leadership on both sides of the partnership — the university and the community," adds Elizabeth Hollander. She also emphasizes the need for "very skilled bridge people who know how to work between the two entities."[67]

Maurrasse goes a step further to discuss the importance of empowering the community. "It is important to ensure that knowledge is being transferred from higher education into local communities, promoting self-sufficiency rather than fostering dependency among local constituents. . .Capacity building would suggest the transference of power from one party to the other. Furthermore, when both parties are treated as if each has something to offer, the opinion of the transitional 'recipient' influences the nature of the relationship. Ultimately, the 'recipient' is more likely to buy into the partnership when engaged as a contributor through the process." Such practice reflects an asset-based community development approach.[68]

In this vein, a small but growing number of university administrators and faculty are recognizing and respecting the value of resident and community knowledge, which helps to break down some of these power structures. According to Harry Boyte, Founder and Co-Director of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship (now at Augsburg College), the "main obstacle to genuine and productive partnerships" between higher education institutions and their communities is a " 'knowledge war,' full of invisible hierarchies and exclusions" that dramatically limits their capacity to solve neighborhood (and greater societal) problems.[69]

Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Residents and Neighborhoods

For this report, we sought to move beyond public relations and anecdotes to assess the universities' overall approach to community development, how these efforts affect those most in need, and how such strategies can be focused for the greatest positive outcome. As anticipated, few universities have engaged in comprehensive, longitudinal evaluation of community outcomes (or university outcomes, for that matter). Much of the assessment to date has been measured against specific goals and targets for individual programs or initiatives. For example,

the University of Minnesota exceeded a 30-percent women- and minority-owned business target for the $2.1 million renovation of their new Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center, and Portland State's Business Outreach Program has assisted more than 400 small and emerging businesses to develop as well as create 150 new jobs in the last three years alone.

A few institutions are beginning to look at neighborhood-level impacts, including educational achievement, employment levels, and per capita income. IUPUI's partnership with George Washington Community School, for example, helped its 2009 high school graduates enjoy a 100 percent acceptance rate into college. In 2009, Miami Dade College awarded nearly 8,000 associate degrees and 200 bachelor's degrees, as well as helped 600 residents earn their GEDs. Remarkably, LeMoyne-Owen College has seen its surrounding neighborhood's per capita income increase from $8,000 to $13,500 over the last ten years, while the percentage of residents earning under $10,000 per year improved by 21 percent.

Some impacts of university engagement strategies — particularly those with large development agendas — have also been mixed. The University of Pennsylvania's creation and support of the Penn Alexander School, for example, achieved its desired result of high achievement for local students and attraction of Penn-affiliated families to live in the local community; real estate values have skyrocketed, however, which has displaced some of the families that once lived in the area. Cincinnati has also displaced residents and small business owners through its commercial and real estate development; to combat such consequences, they have helped acquire façade improvement grants for existing businesses as well as provided subsidized rental space.

Some university initiatives have more indirect community economic development benefits. Yale's homebuyer program, for example, has provided $22.5 million in subsidies to support more than 925 university-affiliated individuals or families to buy homes in New Haven. Emory's Office of University Community Partnerships has focused on building capacity among existing community development corporations.

Many of the university initiatives focused on community development are too young to see the desired results. Syracuse's Near West Side Initiative, for instance, has made great strides in its efforts to acquire and renovate land as well as rehabilitate old homes with sustainable green technology. Realization of the initiative's goal to improve the overall quality of life in the Near West Side (through such measures as increased employment and homeownership), on the other hand, can only be seen in time. It is also worth recognizing at this time the deep and terrible impact that the subprime mortgage and foreclosure crisis has had on low-income neighborhoods throughout the United States, including many of the communities that universities have been helping to develop. As Victor Rubin puts it, "I fear a lot of the gains that came about in university-related neighborhood revitalization may be swept away. . .it is certainly a very critical issue and will shape all these endeavors for years to come."[70] Promisingly, while conducting this study, we saw few signs of campuses pulling back from their community investment.

Summing Up

Universities' engagement with their local communities has a deep history. The movement has particularly evolved over the past five decades and is now entering a new era. Increasingly, urban colleges and universities are seeking to employ their capacity as anchor institutions to meet the social and economic needs of their local communities. However, universities engaged in this work face many challenges. As noted above, some of the key issues universities face when deploying anchor strategies include creating an engaged community; establishing partnership programs and goals; institutionalizing an anchor vision; securing funding and leveraging resources; building a culture of economic inclusion; sustaining inclusive planning and robust community relationships; and creating meaningful impacts on low-income residents and neighborhoods. Section Two, which details the anchor strategies at ten colleges and universities, will explore these issues further.

Section Two:

Anchor-Based Community Development—Three Roles

In this section of the report, we dive deeper into the particular anchor institution strategies of our ten profiled colleges and universities, organized into three chapters. First, we look at a group of three schools—IUPUI, Miami Dade College, and Portland State University—which have acted as *facilitators* in broad efforts for local and regional development. Next, we look at a second set of three schools—Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale—which have acted as *leaders* in community development efforts, focusing on revitalization of a particular community or neighborhood adjacent to campus. Lastly, we look at a third set of four schools—Syracuse, Minnesota, LeMoyne-Owen, and Emory—which have acted as *conveners*, working to forge coalitions with community stakeholders in a collaborative fashion. We begin each chapter by looking at the general characteristics defining each cluster of schools and then provide brief case studies on those individual institutions. Each chapter concludes with a comparative analysis that discusses some key challenges universities face in community development, providing further details on how these institutions work to navigate through such issues.

Chapter One: University as Facilitator

Community Partnerships at IUPUI, Portland State, and Miami Dade College

Introduction

The three universities reviewed in this chapter — Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Portland State University, and Miami Dade College — are all young, large, public institutions whose civic engagement missions emphasize educational opportunity. To this end, they seek to provide engaging, supportive learning environments for their students as well as the broader community. Service-learning, community-based research, and education and health partnerships involve large numbers of faculty and students at all three institutions. Where, or with whom, these university members engage is not constricted by a strategic institutional agenda. Instead, they are seen as "good neighbors," responding to a wide variety of community groups or agencies that wish to partner. Support from top administration helps leverage funding and recognition for engagement activities; however, the commitment of institution-wide resources, particularly corporate investment, towards community development remains limited.

Ziona Austrian and Jill Norton reflect on the limited funding available at many young, public institutions, particularly in regards to real estate development potential: "Portland State University, for example, has not yet been able to rely on its foundation because the university is relatively young, it does not have a large, well-established alumni base, and the foundation's assets are fairly limited."[71] Indeed, the endowments and budgets are limited at all three of these schools. In part *because* of limited funds, these universities focus on building capacity for community organizations and residents through in-kind resources. Miami Dade College, for example, houses and provides fiscal management for several programs targeted at job training and K-12 education for low-income residents. Its downtown campus also facilitates monthly forums for the underserved neighborhood of Overtown. Moreover, by partnering with city departments and established community organizations, these schools are able to facilitate broader, collaborative efforts for community development. Portland State, for instance, works with its city agencies in support of regional growth and development, with particular leadership in transit development and sustainability. At IUPUI, the university has worked in collaboration with its city on several initiatives; however, it is the strong community leadership in the Near Westside that has fostered an opportunity for the university to partner in comprehensive neighborhood

revitalization. Indeed, IUPUI's focused academic resources in the Near Westside are a notable exception to the other two schools in this cluster, which do not have a place-based strategy; however, the lack of corporate investment in this neighborhood limits the potential of anchor-supported development.

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

The Center for Service and Learning has been that bridge to pull resources out of the University, but there are no conversations at the upper level about what surrounds us and how they could have direct investment.

Richard Bray, Assistant Director of IUPUI's Office of Multicultural Outreach and former GINI Coordinator for the Near Westside[72]

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) was founded in 1969, as a partnership between Indiana and Purdue Universities, to serve as Indiana's urban research and academic health sciences campus. Civic engagement is part of the institution's founding mission and seen as a central component not only for student learning but also for impacting its local community. IUPUI has come a long way in mending relationships with the community it displaced in the 1960s for campus development, primarily through the efforts of the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships (ONP). Begun as a special project in the Chancellor's Office in 1997, ONP has found a more focused niche within the Center for Service and Learning. Although ONP's efforts are aligned with the Near Westside's collectively identified areas of need and the Center's resources (particularly faculty and students) have been strategically leveraged to work within these focus areas, the potential for increased university-wide collaboration remains great.

The Center for Service and Learning (CSL) serves as one of several centralized units on campus. According to Director Bob Bringle, the Center was built around incorporating service into the three things seen as most important to university students: courses, work experience, and volunteer opportunities. Formally established in 2001 through the merger of the Office of Service Learning, the Office of Community Service, and the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, the Center's mission focuses on engaging students, faculty, and staff in service activities that mutually benefit the university and the community. As noted above, this amalgamation of offices has led to a more intentional focus of academic and human resources to, and long-term partnerships with, the Near Westside, an area representing five neighborhoods near campus.[73]

Much of the University's efforts in the Near Westside today are directed through the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) project. GINI is a citywide collaboration for holistic neighborhood revitalization that is being implemented in six Indianapolis neighborhoods, which were competitively selected. "There are lots of resources in our community but we never

had a great vision. One of the greatest things we did with GINI is created that vision, and identified partners who could best move us forward," says Diane Arnold, Executive Director of the Hawthorne Community Center. By being a partner in the GINI project for the Near Westside, IUPUI has been able to participate in focused and strategic initiatives as identified through the community's Quality of Life Plan: housing, public safety, beautification, business and economic development, education, health, and civic engagement.[74]

The Center for Service and Learning's five Faculty Community Fellows each work in one of the focus areas of the GINI Quality of Life plan. The three-year grants for Fellows help "promote interdisciplinary collaboration and accountability for community outcomes in ways that wouldn't otherwise exist," says Darrell Nickolson. As a Faculty Fellow, Nickolson partners with the local community development corporation and other community organizations on plans to stimulate economic and business development. For example, Nickolson and his students are designing the expansion and new building for the Hawthorne Community Center, which hopes to serve as an anchor project to drive future development in this area. "This is not the first

---

Figure 5: IUPUI Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Partner in the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) for Near Westside

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Participation in Minority Vendor Fairs/ Trade Shows
- Some support to local businesses, but limited reach (6% annual spend to minority- and women-owned businesses)

Local Capacity Building
- Five Faculty Community Fellows work to build capacity with Near Westside organizations
- Solution Center's Community Venture Fund provides matching grants (average $5,000) to support student internships and short-term business assistance, as well as runs Nonprofit Solutions Initiative (over 100 participants/year)

Education and Health Partnerships
- Student service scholars, work-study students, faculty and staff participate in community school partnerships (integrated focus on academics, health and social services, and civic engagement)
- Clinical outreach provided by professional students (medicine, nursing, dentistry, allied health) and spin-off businesses from medical and nursing schools
- Community Learning Network: continuing education opportunities in local community centers

Scholarly Engagement
- 4,000 students participate in service-learning each year with 250 community organizations
- Several faculty development and grant programs support service-learning and civic engagement
- Chancellor's new RISE to the Challenge Initiative (Research, International study, Service learning, and workplace and community Experiential learning), with goal of every IUPUI undergraduate participating in at least two RISE experiences by graduation

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Leader in the Talent Alliance (regional alliance of schools, colleges and universities, and services to support young people from cradle to career)
- Leader in Central Indiana Community Schools Network

attempt to revitalize this area," comments Nickolson, "but IUPUI's involvement is an opportunity to really push this forward." Faculty Fellow Paula Differding-Burton helped brand a new identity for the Near Westside as well as for its new business association. This process helped "bring together five different neighborhoods and five neighborhood associations, which was no small feat," comments GINI Coordinator for the Near Westside, Patrice Duckett. Although there is interest in revitalizing the central business district in the Near Westside, many recognize that attracting more students and faculty to live in the area — who would patronize new businesses — is a necessary step. However, crime in the area has been a deterrent for these efforts. Some faculty note that this may be a perfect opportunity for the university administration to step forward with its corporate resources, particularly real estate development, rather than looking to campus expansion in the north.[75]

Unlike several other universities in this study (e.g., Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati), IUPUI has participated in comprehensive neighborhood revitalization without taking the driver's seat. This is made possible, in part, due to strong community leadership and the Center for Service and Learning staff's strong history of community work. Hawthorne Community Center serves as the lead partner for the GINI project in the Near Westside. Hawthorne Director Diane Arnold also serves on Indianapolis's public school board and is a prominent community leader. Other key partners include the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center, which provides neighborhood development specialists to work on capacity building, and Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) of Indianapolis. Although IUPUI has been a key player since the beginning, community-based organizations have maintained the lead role. "Near Westside's history of getting stuff done was the clincher [for them being selected as a GINI site]; this included a strong partnership with the University to get those things done. But IUPUI backed away from the actual presentation of the Quality of Life plan — they really let the community own it," comments Anne-Marie Predovich Taylor, Executive Director of the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center. Arnold expands upon the idea of IUPUI as a partner: "IUPUI really collaborates. They don't come in and say 'we're going to fix you.' Instead, they come and listen. They see what resources they have and can bring to the table. . .We know it has to be fruitful for them too."[76]

One of IUPUI's most successful areas of engagement, and their area of leadership within the GINI plan, is K-12 education. These partnerships have largely focused on supporting community schools — neighborhood schools that integrate academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and civic engagement to improve student learning and to develop stronger families and healthier communities.[77] IUPUI has provided substantial resources to meet the needs of community schools developing in the Near Westside and is also leading a regional community school effort. Notably, IUPUI proved its allegiance when it stood with community residents to have the local failing high school reopened as a community school. Since reopening in 2000, George Washington Community School has significantly raised both attendance and graduation rates: 100 percent of 2009 graduates were accepted into a postsecondary institution. Providing adult education in the Near Westside has also been a priority of the community school approach; for instance, IUPUI economics faculty have led financial literacy workshops for nearly 200 residents over the last several years. In addition, IUPUI's Community Learning

Network is strategically working with local community centers to offer continuing education through the centers' workforce development programming. Finally, IUPUI's School of Education is preparing the next generation of teachers to work in urban settings through applied research and pre-service training. The School houses several centers focused on issues such as multiculturalism and math and science education, which interact with local public schools and community groups.[78]

A second focus of engagement at IUPUI is in public health. The University boasts the second largest Medical School and largest multi-disciplinary Nursing School in the nation. Medical, nursing and dental students provide in-kind services to children and families throughout the community as part of their clinical training. IUPUI physiology students staff and manage a Fit for Life program at George Washington Community School's Fitness Center. The Medical and Life Sciences Departments, in particular, receive strong attention from the university administration, who hopes to see spin-off businesses developed here. These partnerships have taken on a more corporate approach than the community relationship building approach of the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships.

Opportunities for students to be engaged with the community are abundant. Through the Center for Service and Learning, 4,000 students participate in service-learning each year, contributing to over 250 community partner organizations. Institutional research data shows that work experience is particularly important to students at IUPUI, so the Center has built many opportunities for work-study positions and scholarships. Roughly one third of federal work-study students are community work-study, and more than $300,000 annually is directed to community service scholarships.[79] The Sam Jones Community Service Scholarship Program, for instance, provides opportunities for students with a background in service to sustain their community involvement and leadership at IUPUI. With nearly 180 scholars in 2007–08, this is one of the largest service scholars program in the country. The Fugate Scholars Program engages undergraduates with community school programs, such as implementing a college preparatory curriculum at George Washington. A select number of Sam Jones and Fugate scholars go on to serve as Community Partner Scholars, who act as campus liaisons with community-based organizations and facilitate the engagement of additional student workers and volunteers.

Despite its many activities, Bringle explains, the Center for Service and Learning represents "only a small mosaic of what IUPUI does," to embrace its civic engagement mission. The Solution Center, for example, was founded in 2004 to serve as "a front door" to facilitate interactions between the University's community of scholars and researchers, and business, government, and nonprofit organizations." The Solution Center is supported largely through the Lilly Endowment. One of the Center's key activities includes a Community Venture Fund, which matches funds from mid and small-sized businesses in order to support student internships, research projects, and short-term business assistance. (Grants are typically less than $5,000.) "Some organizations we work with have very limited resources. We try to help them assess their situation and solve their problems creatively," says Krista Hoffman-Longtin, Associate Director for Internships and Experiential Learning at the Solution Center. "For example, instead of hiring a Marketing Director on a very limited budget, we may suggest that they hire a consultant and

an intern to do the work." The Center also runs the Nonprofit Solutions Initiative, which manages a database of nonprofit consultants, as well as provides free networking and workshops for more than 100 participants each year. For example, the Center facilitates annual conferences focused on building capacity for nonprofits.[80]

Demonstrating yet another engagement arm, IUPUI's Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, conducts applied research in partnership with local and state government as well as social service agencies. For example, Professor and Policy Analyst Laura Littlepage and her students have partnered with the Coalition of Homeless Serving Agencies for the last four years. Their research has resulted in issue briefs for policy makers that focus on prevention. Littlepage has also launched a study on the impacts of students and service-learning on the nonprofits with whom they work. "We're not assuming it's all win-win," says Littlepage. This Center is largely supported through the Lilly Endowment, as well as university and grant funding.[81] In all, more than a dozen centers across campus have civic engagement as a defining quality of their work, emphasizing IUPUI's commitment to, and decentralized infrastructure for, realizing its anchor institution mission.

Portland State University

> To a certain extent, for PSU to really care about the metro area goes back to our very founding. We were founded to serve returning veterans, and the other Oregon University system members didn't want us to survive after we served the first wave of vets. The only way we survived was getting local unions and politicians to support us—so from the beginning, the University had to make clear how we were serving local business and local government. It was necessary for political survival in a state system that didn't necessarily support our existence.
>
> Wim Wiewel, President, Portland State University (2008–present)[82]

For nearly 20 years, Portland State's motto "Let Knowledge Serve the City" has symbolized the university's history of—and ongoing commitment to—engaged teaching and learning. As the only public university in its metropolitan region, Portland State leaders see a special opportunity to serve as a model of an engaged, urban research university. Institutional transformation took place in the early 1990s when President Judith Ramaley made a formal, articulated commitment to engagement that was manifested throughout the undergraduate curriculum. "This work, in large part, grew out of a focus on student learning," comments Kevin Kecskes, Associate Vice Provost for Engagement and Director of Community-University Partnerships. "It was not a direct interest in addressing issues of poverty, housing, etc."[83]

Although the University has remained committed to community engagement, its mission has shifted in recent years. Not only are faculty and administration beginning to think of Portland State as more of a research institution, but they have also expanded their definition of community. As President Wim Wiewel explains, "As we've become more of a research university, we have also included engagement of businesses and the government as a legitimate form of community engagement, not just nonprofits. . . The fact that we're the only game in town means it's easier for us to extend our partnership to all sectors of the metro area." Indeed, Portland State's new economic development strategy is about harmonizing their education and research agenda with the regional economic development clusters defined by the City.[84]

Revisions to the promotion and tenure guidelines in the 1990s also helped advance the scholarship of engagement at Portland State. However, "There were no mandates on *what* or *where* faculty needed to be partnering; rather, that scholarly expressions of their community-engaged work (either community-based learning or community-based research) could count as part of a faculty member's overall tenure review portfolio," says Kecskes. Indeed, across the campus, there is common reverberation of "grassroots" and "diffuse" partnerships that fits with

---

Figure 6: Portland Sate University Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Partnerships dispersed throughout greater community

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Support of mixed-use development (40% facilities/real estate not owned by university)
- Focus on sustainability for local supply chain
- Some outreach to emerging small businesses (extra points on evaluation)

Local Capacity Building
- Business Outreach Program has supported over 420 small businesses
- School of Social Work's Regional Research Institute for Human Services (RRI) provides leadership training and incubator space

Education and Health Partnerships
- Many individual faculty involved in community-based participatory research
- Formalized tutoring partnership with 60 Portland Public Schools

- Articulated agreement with all community colleges within 60-mile radius

Scholarly Engagement
- Revision to tenure and promotion in 1990s to advance scholarship of engagement
- 8,200 students, faculty and staff engage in community-based learning courses each year
- Senior Capstone Program involves more than 230 community-based research projects each year
- Masters of Urban and Regional Planning program and undergraduate degree in community development
- $50M program for sustainability research and teaching

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Strong collaboration with City Bureau of Planning and Portland Development Commission, focused on real estate development and supporting growth in regional economic development clusters (e.g. Portland State Business Accelerator)
- Anchor in transit use and development ($9.5M towards Streetcar)

the "ethos" of Portland. Kecskes' office, the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE), oversees one of the largest service-learning programs in the country. In 2007–08, 7,800 students were engaged in more than 400 community-based learning classes, providing more than 1.44 million hours of service. The Senior Capstone Program alone involves more than 230 courses that feature community-based research projects each year. "The capstone program directs armies of volunteers to do work all over the City. It is a great benefit to our community, and to the students," comments Lynn Knox, Program Manager for the City of Portland's Economic Opportunity Initiative. Still, "Projects are largely based on personal interests of the faculty, students, and community partners, so their placement is fairly random."[85]

Issues of poverty are addressed more directly through the work of individual faculty and students, particularly from the Schools of Social Work, Education, Community Health, Urban and Public Affairs, and Business Administration. Portland State also is one of only a few universities nationally to offer an undergraduate degree in community development.[86] Students enrolled in this program, as well as graduate students receiving their Masters of Urban and Regional Planning (MURP), often form deep relationships with community partners working on issues of community development. MURP students sign Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with their community partners and commit to 400 hours of community-based work as part of their program. Professors like Dr. Stephanie Farquhar in Community Health co-write grants with government and community partners, such as the County Health Department, to work on issues of health, environmental quality and social capital among vulnerable populations.[87] Some nonprofits have enjoyed ongoing partnerships with the University, particularly through student intern placements. Each year, for example, one or two Masters of Social Work students work with Sisters of the Road Café, a local nonprofit working to effect systemic change on issues of homelessness. Sisters of the Road's leaders are also invited to present regularly to students in the classroom, as well as inform the curriculum, on community organizing. "The experience working with PSU has been challenging in both ways. That's good for a partnership — to learn from each other and build relationships," says Co-Founder Genny Nelson.[88]

The School of Social Work's Regional Research Institute for Human Services (RRI), on the other hand, primarily provides research, data, grant writing, and evaluation support for local CDCs, service providers, and government entities. RRI also provides trainings in leadership development and strategic planning. "Within our evaluation strategies, we focus quite a bit on building community capacity around evaluation. We help them think through logic models and develop tools to measure their impact," says Director Laurie Powers. "I think of a successful project being where, when we're done, not only does the partner have some data to answer their questions around effectiveness and processes ('what's working'); but also, where we walk away with a mutual agreement that they have more capacity to do evaluation themselves in the future."

RRI has also provided incubator space for several organizations, helping them write grants, obtain 501(c)3 status, and even acting as their fiscal agent until they become more established. Indirect costs can sometimes be inhibiting: most contracts require a 26-percent overhead cut to the university. However, large federal grants, and a Dean who supports equity, can enable community groups to overcome these obstacles by offering them lower rates. "As we grow as a

research university, this will probably get harder," says Powers. "But at this point, we have a lot of support from our Dean and the Research Office."[89]

Another program focused on issues of poverty is Portland State's Business Outreach Program (BOP), which began in 1994 through a Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) grant. The purpose of the program is to provide technical assistance to low-income communities—primarily women- and minority-owned businesses within these communities—as well as provide a community-based learning opportunity for undergraduate business students. Student interns, as well as student teams working on their capstone courses in the business school, augment the program's small staff and help build long-term relationships with clients. Since 1994, BOP has supported over 420 small businesses, and in the past four years alone, 146 new jobs have been created at these firms. BOP was located in North Portland but moved back to campus a few years ago. Although less focused on a particular impoverished area, the program now receives more in-kind support. The Program recently completed a contract with TriMet, Portland's transit agency, to support small business owners who were impacted by their light rail construction. With TriMet funding, BOP provided technical assistance, as well as oversaw low-interest loans, to 33 local businesses.[90]

Sustainability is emerging as a theme of engagement across campus, and indeed across the City of Portland. However, sustainability efforts have been aimed more towards improving environmental quality than community development. "Arguments for equity are just not as successful or high-profile or championed by civic leaders," says Knox. A university food contract, for example, was put into place several years ago with specific indicators not only about using local food, but also about a certain percentage of waste that has to be recycled and composted. A Sustainability Coordinator oversees these efforts. This is partly because of Portland's reputation," comments Kecskes. "But we're also being opportunistic about it—when the normal university food contract came up for renewal, many students and faculty chose to strategically push to incorporate these changes into the next contract." Sustainability standards are built into purchasing and facilities contracts as well, with a focus on local supply chains and environmental quality. Sustainability has also become a theme for academic engagement. In 2008, Portland State was awarded a $25-million challenge grant from the Miller Foundation, to be matched by an additional $25 million from other donors, to focus on sustainability-related projects. Wiewel argues that academic sustainability efforts have broad implications: "We're very explicit about the triple bottom line, including equity and social sustainability," says President Wiewel. "A lot of projects through the Miller gift focus on issues of inclusion, educational improvement, health care, and access to food care."[91]

The University's finance and administration office has particularly robust partnerships with city departments, such as the Bureau of Planning and the Portland Development Commission. "We have a formal planning process with the City. We also see the City as a vehicle to communicate with the neighborhood," says Mark Gregory, Associate Vice President of Finance and Administration.[92] The City provides significant funding for the university's real estate projects but also enforces some regulations. For example, Portland State's plans to redevelop an old hotel into condominiums must include at least 150 units of affordable housing. More generally, the

University strongly supports mixed-use buildings and has maintained their goal of 40 percent facilities and real estate not owned by the university. This helps keep a percentage of the campus on tax rolls, as well as keep it open to the community. Portland State has also been an anchor of transit use and development, connecting itself to other institutions and to the larger community. However, community economic development is not among the administration's highest priorities. "We educate people first," says Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration. "Economic development can be a by-product of what we do, [simply] because we are a big purchaser, real estate developer, and employer."[93]

"The Portland ethic is collaboration, and Portland State is at the table every time," says Lew Bowers, Central City Division Manager for the Portland Development Commission. Nonetheless, despite acting in this role in some specific projects, Portland State, as an institution, has yet to take on a coordinated, strategic approach to community development. The leadership of President Wim Wiewel may help carry Portland State into a new era as a model engaged, urban research university. In his first year, for example, he created a Presidential taskforce partnership with Portland Public Schools. While institution-wide resources may become more thematically focused, however, they are unlikely to be concentrated in specific geographic areas. "We're trying to figure out how to identify the most important problems and how we can concentrate our resources there. . .without losing our grassroots, diffuse principles," says Provost Roy Koch.[94]

Miami Dade College

> *Miami Dade College's mission mandates our collaboration with our community. Those are my marching orders and they are closely in tune with what I believe. My central belief is that a community college, particularly one like MDC that embraces a community mission, is as important as any institution in the community.*
>
> Eduardo J. Padrón, President, Miami Dade College[95]

In 1960, Miami Dade Community College was born out of the needs of the community. It became the first public higher education option in South Florida and focused on workforce skills. In 2003, its name changed to reflect the addition of four-year degrees, but its commitment to the community has remained steadfast. Today, with an open-door policy and eight campuses that enroll approximately 84,000 credit students and 77,000 non-credit students annually, Miami Dade College awards more associate degrees than any other college in the country. Among its enrolled students, Miami Dade College serves a unique population that reflects the demographics of the county as a whole: 68 percent of students are Hispanic; 19 percent are Black Non-Hispanic; 34 percent are non-U.S. citizens; 52 percent are first-generation college students; 72 percent work while attending college; 39 percent come from families below the federal poverty level and 61 percent are low-income. "Miami Dade College has a unique

vantage point," comments Daniella Levine, Executive Director of the Human Services Coalition of Dade County. "They [provide] an opportunity pipeline."[96]

The College employs a workforce that also mirrors the community: across the eight campuses, ethnic minorities account for 74 percent of full-time employees, while 59 percent of full-time faculty are ethnic minorities and 53 percent are female. "Everyone got their start at MDC — they trust us, they respect us, and they send their kids here," says Ted Levitt, Director of Miami Dade College's Division of College Communications.

The Carrie P. Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center is among the College's most focused initiatives to effect community change and wealth building. The Meek Center opened in 1989 as college and community leaders recognized the need to expand access and opportunity to education, job training and entrepreneurial development. The Center started with a single mission: to build entrepreneurship with small, local businesses in the black business corridor of Miami.

Figure 7: Miami Dade College Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Many efforts dispersed, but several focused initiatives in Overtown, including Hospitality Institute and monthly forum
- Meek Entrepreneurial Center focused on small business development in black business corridor of Liberty City

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Inclusive hiring practices: 74% full-time staff are people of color; 59% of full-time faculty are people of color and 53% are female
- 20-27% of purchasing dollars to minority businesses (primarily Hispanic)
- New Minority and Small Business Coordinator enhancing policies and procedures for economic inclusion
- Reverse trade shows (procurement officers set up displays and targeted vendors are invited to attend)

Local Capacity Building
- Cultural and arts programming for broader community (e.g. Miami Book Fair International)
- Meek Center: entrepreneurial and educational support to micro-enterprises, nonprofits, and individuals

- In-kind resources, including housing of K-12 education and adult workforce programs

Education and Health Partnerships
- Open-door policy and student support services help provide 7,800 associate's degrees and 200 bachelor's degrees each year to 61% low-income and 87% minority students
- School of Community Education provides adult education, leading to 600 GEDs earned each year
- Creation and leader of the South Florida America Reads Coalition
- Strong tutoring partnerships with Community in Schools of Miami
- Medical Center Campus outreach and collaboration with Miami Rescue Mission Health Clinic

Scholarly Engagement
- 5,900 students in service-learning courses taught by 285 professors; spread across 220 community partner sites
- Civic engagement part of core learning theme for all students

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Partner in Miami Children's Initiative for educational pipeline in Liberty City

The Center now provides credit and non-credit courses as well as dual enrollment options for high school students, with a particular focus on entrepreneurship. For example, the Center's FastTrac New Venture and FastTrac Planning Programs, initially offered through the Kauffman Foundation, provide educational support to emerging micro-entrepreneurs. For nearly five years, through a partnership between the Meek Center and Neighbors and Neighbors Association (NANA), the City of Miami has provided micro-enterprise grants of $10–20,000 to 55 small businesses. Utilizing grant proceeds, the business owners enroll in the Center's FastTrac program to obtain up-to-date skills and information on operating their businesses more effectively and efficiently. "This program focuses on increasing the business owners' capacity in order to make them more competitive in the marketplace," says Meek Center Executive Director H. Leigh Toney. "Therefore, in our entrepreneurship courses, the emphasis is always on application and real-time strategies and tools for entrepreneurs to apply in their businesses right away. We also seek to gauge and address any fundamental educational needs that may arise by making basic literacy and remediation courses available to the students when needed." Nonprofit organizations have also sought support in helping to strengthen their services to the community and the College's credit or non-credit programs (some grant-supported), aim to help meet those needs as well.[97]

Community engagement also plays out in Miami Dade College's curriculum, with more than 5,900 service-learning students working with 220 community partners in 2008–09. "The community has become their learning environment in a real way. Entire departments have also begun to work together to develop cohesive departmental approaches to community engagement," says Padrón. All nursing and dental students, for example, are required to participate in service-learning. Service-learning courses, America Reads, and other community-campus partnerships are coordinated through the Center for Community Involvement, which has offices at all eight of the College's campuses. As Director Josh Young puts it, the Center "is the highly visible point of entry for community groups that wish to partner with the College in civic activities."[98]

Miami Dade College's School of Community Education also aims to meet the educational needs of the community not served by traditional college programs. The program is self-supported through revenue from its 2,000 courses. However, the School also receives College and federal funds to provide Adult Education and GED courses for free at six of the College's campuses; these efforts reach 10–30,000 students a year. The School strives to provide relevant and comprehensive programs that are linked to growing industries; for example, Director Geoffrey Gathercole is looking to establish a Green Technology Training Institute for entry-level "green collar" jobs.

Overtown, a community marred by high-profile riots that occurred in response to police brutality in the early 1980s,[99] has been the site of several programs, and the College's downtown campus president hosts monthly meetings for Overtown stakeholders. The Schools of Business launched the Hospitality Institute in Overtown (funded through the South Florida Workforce) to provide customer service and job-readiness training to long-time unemployed and homeless individuals who are committed to reentering the workforce. The program connects residents to

job opportunities in the local hospitality industry. In its first year, 350 individuals went through the Institute. The School of Community Education has also worked with the Collins Center for Public Policy to conduct community health worker trainings on campus for residents from Overtown. The Collins Center is working with other agencies to improve the civic infrastructure and help revitalize the Overtown neighborhood. "There are great opportunities for Miami Dade College to be an even stronger partner in the new and emerging Overtown," says Phil Bacon, Vice President for Neighborhood and Regional Initiatives at the Collins Center.[100]

The College's Medical Center Campus has a strong partnership with the Miami Rescue Mission in Overtown. For several years, volunteer nursing students and faculty have run Health and Screening Centers for the Mission's homeless clients, many of whom have enrolled and earned degrees from the College. The Miami Rescue Mission Health Clinic opened in May 2009 as part of a long-term collaborative effort with the College's School of Nursing.[101] The Medical Center Campus is providing a Medical Director for the Clinic, and all 13 disciplines on campus are involved. Much of this work started through the dedication of Nursing Professor Annette Gibson, who coordinates education and outreach service-learning programs involving nursing and health sciences students and faculty. "Professor Gibson's vision is to see this done by community colleges across the country by having them partner with non-profits and community-based organizations already working with community residents," says Marilyn Brumitt, Director of Community Development for Miami Rescue Mission.[102]

The Human Services Coalition of Dade County is another strong partner of the College, which has been addressing critical issues surrounding poverty and social capital in the area for 15 years. Service-learning and volunteer partnerships deepened this relationship over time. Challenges in funding and power structures (experienced citywide), however, have inhibited some of the partnership potential. "In 2006, there was a critical moment to establish clear, mutual expectations, but the money from outside investors wasn't there, and that put undue pressure on the College for support. We needed a broader communication strategy to engage more partners," says Levine, Executive Director of the Human Services Coalition.[103] Indeed, Miami's city and county government have not sufficiently invested in community-based organizations, which has weakened their ability to effect community economic development, attract private investment, and partner with large anchors, like Miami Dade College.

Another key element of the College's engagement efforts is providing cultural opportunities. Vivian Rodriguez reflects the common thread of success stories at Miami Dade College: the daughter of Cuban exiles and a College alumna, she now serves as Vice Provost for Cultural Affairs and Resource Development. Rodriguez's office oversees the College's arts and cultural partnerships, including the Miami Book Fair and the Miami International Film Festival, which have contributed to what administration calls a "downtown renaissance." The Film Festival, for example, brings in filmmakers from around the world to Miami, which has a positive impact on local artists, the local art scene, and the local economy. The College's Cultural Affairs Department also operates a residency program through its citywide performance series, which works to develop future artists and audiences through educational outreach and professional development opportunities to local artists. We have two distinct constituents in everything that we

do," says Rodriguez. "First, are our 170,000 students. Second is the community. We want to make a difference in every household. As Dr. Padrón says, 'We're Democracy's College,' and we have a commitment to making a difference."[104]

Although it has had a diversity policy designed to support equitable opportunities for minority- and women-owned businesses since 1994, the College appointed its first full-time coordinator in 2008 to enhance policies and procedures for economic inclusion of small and local businesses. At this time, the Minority and Small Business Enterprise (MSBE) Office relocated from the Purchasing Department and incorporated with the Human Resources Department under the direction of the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs, which has given the MSBE Office more autonomy. "We're taking a proactive approach to be visible to the community and show them that we want to use small, local, and minority businesses and vendors, but they have to come being ready, willing, and able," says Coordinator Sheldon Edwards. "It's a priority for the College—this comes from the top. They brought me in because I have over 18 years in the field." Among other things, Edwards is enhancing the College's current database to track and verify certification and expenditures to minority, local, and small vendors.[105]

As a community college, Miami Dade College provides significant in-kind resources to community organizations, including the housing of several programs. For example, Take Stock in Children, which works with first-generation students from low-income families, has had an ongoing relationship with the College and has enjoyed fiscal management by the College since 1997. The program provides a unique set of resources for at-risk middle school students, including mentors, advocacy, and guaranteed scholarships. "The College provides us not only with our office space and general office services (utilities, telephone internet) but also classrooms, College facilities and the use of College professional staff for our program delivery," says Director Alex Alvarez. "It is a 'win/win' for our organizations and the community." Of the program's graduates, 70 percent attend Miami Dade College and then transfer to a four-year college. The Miami Dade College Foundation enjoys two matching donor programs, most of which the College has allowed to be directed to Take Stock's scholarship funds.

Finally, Miami Dade College also houses a local branch of Working Solutions, a state-funded workforce program for displaced homemakers. The program provides free, specialized training (financial management, computer skills, etc.) to roughly 300 new clients each year as well as refers them to social services. Over one third of their clients have found full or part-time work. Program Manager Dr. Linda Scharf hopes to also help clients matriculate into degree programs. "We're an institution of true believers," sums up Levitt. "Our mission is to turn lives around—to shift the tenor of the community by giving chances to get a degree and a job in a competitive workforce." [106]

Looking Across the Cases

Creating an Engaged Community

Unlike most of the other universities featured in this study, these three schools have made limited investments in neighborhood-focused strategies. Although commitment of in-kind resources is significant, institutional investment in community development remains scarce for higher education institutions such as these that lack major endowments. Instead, available resources tend to be dispersed throughout an extensive geographical area.

IUPUI demonstrates one of the more neighborhood-focused efforts among this set of schools. More than 1,000 homes and hundreds of families were displaced from the historically black neighborhood that now houses IUPUI. Nearly three decades later, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships was founded to build relationships with the university's displaced neighbors now located in the Near Westside. Efforts have continued through the University's involvement in the GINI plan. "We've had limited resources lately, so the focus [remains] on the Near Westside, even though I've been asked to work in other neighborhoods," says ONP Coordinator Starla Officer. "We have thought about providing technical assistance to other local colleges who could partner with these neighborhoods."[107]

Several mixed-income neighborhoods and the downtown business district surround Portland State's campus. These areas are vibrant today, in part because of the university's development.[108] In the 1990s, Portland State worked with city and business officials to revitalize the area around the university (known as the University District). The University is now entering into a second phase of redevelopment in this area, which is to be named an Urban Renewal Area by the City. Academic partnerships, however, have been grassroots and dispersed throughout the metro region. "We debated last year whether we should focus on one neighborhood," says President Wiewel of his first year on campus. "We deliberately and consciously decided no. It would be too arbitrary."

Similar to Portland State, Miami Dade College's decision to develop a new campus downtown in 1970 helped revitalize the downtown area. Some level of resources and focus has been given to the Overtown community, which neighbors the College's downtown campus, as well as to Liberty City, the black business corridor of Miami. However, the majority of engagement initiatives are scattered throughout the larger community. Having enrolled more than 1.7 million students in a community that now registers a population of 2.4 million, and hosting events such as the Miami Book Fair International that draws more than 300,000 visitors annually, there is the sense — across campus and community — that Miami Dade College has touched nearly every household in the county.

Establishing Partnership Programs and Goals

These three universities are largely non-residential; for many of their students, the courses they take — and the scholarly experiences they have — often take on an even deeper significance. Addressing this need, and their civic missions, IUPUI, Portland State, and Miami Dade College

have all institutionalized service-learning into their curriculum. IUPUI's Center for Service and Learning strives to provide a continuum of engagement opportunities for its students and faculty that crosses the university's core mission of teaching, learning, and research. Many of these research and curricular activities have been focused towards the Near Westside. The curricular activities of Portland State and Miami Dade College, on the other hand, have not focused deliberately on neighborhood-level impacts. "It's not really about changing the community or a neighborhood overall," says Miami Dade College's Young. "It's more about what individual partner's needs are and putting that out to students and faculty and making those matches."

These three institutions are also focused on K-12 educational partnerships, in part because they enroll a large number of local students. In Indiana, IUPUI is not only leading the regional community school effort, but they are also a key player in Central Indiana's Talent Alliance, which aims to build an educational pipeline from cradle to career. Miami Dade College is also strengthening the educational pipeline for local students. The Miami Children's Initiative (formerly the Magic City Children's Zone) — modeled after the renowned Harlem Children's Zone program in New York City — was conceived at the College's Meek Center, and Director Toney formerly served as the Chairman of the Initiative's Board of Directors. The goal of the initiative is to create an integrated system of services to support positive youth development and increase high school graduation and college-going rates by strengthening the capacity of youth-serving organizations and expanding the quality and availability of out-of-school time programs for the black and Hispanic community of Liberty City in Miami. The State of Florida has allocated $3.6 million to the 10-year pilot project.

The College also has a strong partnership with Miami-Dade County Public Schools, providing professional development, student teachers, tutoring and mentoring, and scholarships to many low-income children and classrooms in the county.[109] The College created and leads the South Florida America Reads Coalition, which provides tutoring to more than 1,000 of Miami's most at-risk children annually. Similarly, Portland State's Graduate School of Education has a formalized tutoring partnership with Portland Public Schools that has benefited over 18,000 migrant and high poverty K-12 students in 60 schools.[110]

Community health partnerships also play a key role in these institutions' engagement agendas. Medical, nursing, and dental students at IUPUI all engage in outreach activities, such as screenings, physical exams, and health education. At Portland State, the School of Community Health leads community outreach and community-based research, in which faculty, staff and students all participate. Miami Dade College's Medical Center Campus provides health services to impoverished communities across South Florida; most notable is the Campus's collaboration with the Miami Rescue Mission to open and staff a community health clinic.

All three of these universities provide direct assistance to local nonprofits and entrepreneurs, through programs and centers such as the Meek Center at Miami Dade College, the Solution Center at IUPUI, and the Business Outreach Program at Portland State. Portland State also hosts the Institute for Non-Profit Management, housed in the College of Urban and Public Affairs. In addition to its teaching mission to produce well-prepared leaders for the nonprofit community, the programmatic and research functions of the Institute are focused on building

capacity in community-based organizations, locally and statewide. However, at both IUPUI and Portland State, the administration tends to focus more on technology transfer and incubation of spin-off businesses, rather than small and emerging business owners.

Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision

These three institutions have strong civic engagement missions as well as the commitment of their top administration, both in rhetoric and through selective resources. Chancellor Bantz of IUPUI and President Wiewel of Portland State both serve on the board of directors for the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, which advocates for public urban research universities to fuel the development of the nation's cities and metropolitan regions. President Padrón currently serves as the chair of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and is the chair-elect of the American Council on Education. He also sits on the board of Florida Campus Compact and was a long-serving member of Campus Compact's national board.

IUPUI's Center for Service and Learning receives $1.5 million in core funding annually from the university. Unlike many partnership centers at American universities, grants have become a smaller percentage of their pie, and full-time staff are all supported through core funds. As mentioned previously, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships began as a special project directly under the Chancellor, who was deeply interested in mending relationships with displaced neighbors. The scholarly work and leadership of William Plater, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties at IUPUI from 1987 to 2006, also significantly deepened the institutional support for service-learning and civic engagement on campus.[111] Indeed, Dean Plater personally attended many of the community meetings throughout the 1990s. Today, there is some disconnect between IUPUI's corporate goals and those of its partnership center. "For the past 10 years, Westside neighbors have wanted to see the university grow west. That's evidence of the positive relations we've built," says Bringle. Nickolson has worked with developers on potential plans of new student housing and mixed-use buildings in the Near Westside; however, the university is currently planning to expand north of campus instead of west. Indeed, the University has yet to invest capital, real estate, or commercial assets into the Near Westside, which could help stimulate development in the area.[112]

In a similar manner, the Collins Center, which is leading much of the revitalization efforts in Overtown, would like to see Miami Dade College work with a development company to build affordable student housing in this neighborhood. "Simply having a physical presence could bring a big boon to the area," says Bacon.[113] Classroom facilities have necessarily been the College's priority given its enrollment growth, but President Padrón is undoubtedly committed to a major community presence: "Engagement with the community [is] in Miami Dade College's strategic plan, and that plan is systematically addressed at all levels of the institution. We do try to make it a genuine tool in our prioritizing and decision-making. Truth be told, community engagement existed long before we had a coherent strategic plan. It's in the DNA of the institution, deeper than culture." Gathercole comments, "The best support you can have is from the top administration, and we have that. Dr. Padrón takes a leadership role in this area

and is a big proponent of [the School of] Community Education. We receive $1.5 million dollars annually in College money [to support free adult education programs], even though we're self-supporting."[114]

At Portland State, President Wiewel is creating a new Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships. "This will be a senior level person who will be focused on both research development and serve as the highest person of coordination of all [partnership] efforts, which includes a lot of grassroots, dispersed projects. Having this as one position makes it very clear that we see our engagement activities as contributing to our research mission: we will build our research university status on our engagement strategy."[115] However, faculty express some tension between the institution's commitment to community engagement, including access to education, and its desire to be a leading research university.

Securing Funding and Leveraging Resources

Decreases in state funding in both Oregon and Florida have hindered some of the engagement activities of Portland State and Miami Dade College, respectively. With a commitment to educational access, institutional funds are being reserved for financial aid and remedial education. "As President Padrón would say, 'We're beyond the point of our elasticity at this point,'" says Levitt. "Every penny has to go to the classroom. We provide a door into the economic mainstream through education. Money must be spent on student support services first." Still, the College dedicates more than $1.6 million internal dollars annually to support institutional engagement, such as the Center for Community Involvement's service-learning activities and the Miami Book Fair International. In 2007–08, these dollars leveraged nearly 10 times their value in external funding for engagement activities at the College. The Florida Department of Children and Families, for example, provides $8.6 million for the College to deliver a refugee vocational education program. In the last three years, approximately $3.7 million in scholarship funds have been raised through the annual Alumni Hall of Fame event.[116]

Portland State's development efforts are largely focused on land use, real estate, and transit. For such projects, the University receives significant funding from its city partners, including the Portland Development Commission and the Bureau of Planning. The University has also put millions of its own dollars towards transportation projects, including participating in a local improvement district that contributed $9.5 million towards the construction of the Portland Streetcar. Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) helped launch a small business incubator at Portland State in 1994, now known as the Business Outreach Program. The program has subsisted through funding from service contracts, grants, and in kind donations; the university covers another 20–25 percent of the program's budget. Since 1996, this program has received funding through the HUD-sponsored Economic Opportunity Initiative.

COPC funds in 1997 and 2003 also helped to expand IUPUI's Office of Neighborhood Partnerships. More recently, the Center for Service and Learning has directed some of its institutional dollars to the neighborhood: Faculty Community Fellowships were designed

to reallocate funding for faculty engagement to the Near Westside. The Solution Center also receives university funding as well as significant grants from the Lilly Endowment and several other foundations. Through its Community Venture Fund, the Solution Center provides matching grants to community partners that may not be able to fully support a project or internship. From 2004–2006, $1.4 million in Venture Fund grants leveraged $1.2 million in match funding from local organizations, which helped the Center secure additional grants. In the end, much of IUPUI's engagement dollars remain dispersed throughout the campus and its many schools and programs. "I haven't seen that big of an institutional commitment yet. There is 'no big check campaign' here," says Bray.[117]

Much of the funding for Near Westside revitalization goes straight to community partners, although IUPUI's partnership has certainly helped leverage grants. The GINI grants provided $2 million over three years for their demonstration projects ($1 million from the Lilly Endowment, and $1 from LISC and other small funders). Near Westside partners also secured a $1 million Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) grant to return blighted property to productive use. Going forward, LISC will continue to concentrate resources within many of the GINI neighborhoods. "A lot of funders are beginning to recognize the significance of the Quality of Life plans [for the GINI neighborhoods] and place-based funding," comments Anne-Marie Predovich Taylor, Executive Director of the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center (INRC). "Together, we're trying to work for systems change, so that institutions are working *with* neighborhoods, instead of neighborhoods reacting to the institutions' plans."[118]

Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion

When speaking of economic inclusion, all three of these universities give particular focus to educational access for underserved populations. As Ethan Seltzer, Professor and Director of Portland State's School of Urban Studies and Planning, puts it, "When you're talking about long-term prospects for wealth building, it's about access to education, access to opportunity! It's far more important for Portland State to have a seamless pathway with community colleges and reduce barriers to higher education, rather than community development strategies, which are somewhat marginal projects here." To this end, the University has a formal, articulated agreement with all the community colleges within a 60-mile radius to have their credits transfer over to a four-year program at Portland State. Seltzer goes on, "We're also discussing ways to have community development folks, from partner organizations, finish their education here."[119]

In Padrón's view, "Community colleges are often the only option for the great majority of young students and non-traditional students seeking a fresh beginning in the workforce... 80 percent of new jobs require some form of post-secondary education. Miami Dade College enrolls 61 percent of graduates of the local public school system (the fourth largest in the United States) who attend college in Florida. Seventy-five percent of these students are under-prepared for college. Miami Dade College is their only option." College access and success for low-income populations remains the core element of the College's community development agenda, notes Levitt: "Our primary focus is on the educational development of each individual, and in turn

the social and economic well-being of the community. And we believe that engagement with the challenges faced by the community is critical to student learning."[120]

The Meek Center's Institute for Youth Entrepreneurship builds on this philosophy by not only introducing local high school students to the basics of a business plan but also giving them exposure to the college environment. "It increases their self-confidence that they are college material, thereby making the transition from high school to Miami Dade College fairly seamless," says Toney. Regarding many of the adult programs the Meek Center offers, Toney adds, "Once they are enrolled, they get to take advantage of all of our free resources and programs available to Miami Dade College students, from the library and computer courtyard to free lectures and seminars, designed to support the College's learning outcomes and prepare our students for the workforce." The College also offers a special program for Cuban refugees. "We have a lot of immigrants with medical degrees who can't practice here. REVEST (a refugee vocational training program) helps them gain employment in an allied health field and work on English language skills," says Dr. Norma Goonen, former Provost for Academic and Student Affairs and current president of the College's Hialeah Campus. Overall, says Toney, "It's about meeting people where they are and giving them an opportunity to pursue higher education. The goal is for a more educated community."[121]

At IUPUI, a new Office of Multicultural Outreach reaches out to Latino and African-American students, and their families, from local neighborhoods to let them know that IUPUI is an option for them. This Office also works with the local community college in order to send students, who are not academically prepared for IUPUI, there first. "As long as the university maintains and increases its commitment, we'll see more local students coming to this institution," says Richard Bray, Assistant Director of IUPUI's Office of Multicultural Outreach.

Sheldon Edwards, Minority and Small Enterprise Coordinator at Miami Dade College, seems to speak for all three of these institutions when he says, "As far as economic inclusion, we do a great job of educating the students in our local community; on the business side, we're getting there." Several years ago, the Miami-Dade County Government Minority Business Office was sued when it tried to establish a minority program because there had been no disparity studies; afterwards, institutions in the area went to race and gender-neutral programs. "In lieu of minority participation, contractors are encouraged to use small, local businesses. The more you use local, the more points you get, and the more likely you are to get the contract," says Edwards.

Miami Dade College's charter mandates quotas for minority- and women-owned businesses, and executive leadership has committed resources towards enhancing its Minority and Small Business Enterprise program. Of the College's annual dollars spent in purchasing, says Edwards, over 20 percent goes to minority, predominantly Hispanic, businesses throughout the county. Miami Dade College also provides reverse trade shows — where suppliers and contractors have the opportunity to be attendees, networking with procurement officers and other university officials — and Edwards is looking to specifically invite minority vendors to these events. He is also developing a workshop that will provide further guidance to minority firms on how to better compete on bidding opportunities. "We're trying to change business practices and create awareness of what we're trying to get done," says Edwards. "For example, if we're bundling

contracts, I'm now looking at whether we should break them out so minority [firms] can handle it, such as lawn cutting—each campus should have their own contracts, so we can work with multiple, smaller contractors."[122]

IUPUI's Purchasing Director Rob Halter provides an analogy of getting up to bat: the more opportunities they can give to disadvantaged business owners, the more chances they have of success. For example, Halter established a relationship with a local, minority, and family-owned moving company in the early 1990s, and helped "develop them into the company our department needed them to be." Stewarts' Movers now has a $250,000 annual contract to handle all internal moves on campus, as well as contracts with many other big institutions in the city. The University has been a member of Indiana's Regional Minority Supplier Development Council since 1977, providing broad-based exposure both for the suppliers as well as university staff. Efforts have been in place since this time to increase the participation of minority, women, and disabled person owned businesses in IUPUI's vast and diverse procurement activities. The Purchasing Department also partnered with the University's School of Business to bring a local chapter of Main Street USA to campus, which provides training to small businesses and entrepreneurs; by working with the Indiana Workforce Development, they arranged to have 90 percent of course costs covered for individuals in the program. "These small business owners may not ever be able to do business with us, but we helped them start to sell to someone," says Halter. Overall, IUPUI's annual spend on women and minority business owners remains modest: two percent goes to minority-owned and roughly four percent goes to women-owned businesses.[123]

Portland State's contracting and purchasing offices have established programs to reach out to minority contractors, although there is no preference as to a specific neighborhood, and annual spending has also remained limited. "We can't identify by race or gender, but most minority vendors are small businesses, so we can target that way," says Karen Preston, Manager of Purchasing and Contract Services. If a company provides an emerging small business certification from the state of Oregon, the purchasing department will give them 10 extra points on their evaluation. However, this does not include any self-reported small business owners or local small businesses across the Washington state line. The focus again turns to sustainability: "We're really looking at supply chain and working on incorporating conditions in our contracts that address sustainability," says Preston. For example, all new buildings have to be minimum silver LEED-certified, a policy that will be mandated throughout the Oregon University System.[124]

Sustaining Participatory Planning and Robust Community Relationships

These three young, public institutions have not faced the traditional town-gown relationships seen at the other universities in this study and many campuses nationwide. Portland State and Miami Dade College, in particular, have made their borders very permeable to the community. "We were never going to be an enclosed campus. We'll always have other commercial business and private citizens in the area. We want that—it adds vim and vigor to our community," says Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration at Portland State.[125]

Community colleges have always been adept at rethinking the campus/non-campus divide. "We're a community college in the essence of the word," says Levitt of Miami Dade. "We extend beyond the four walls of the classroom — invite people in through our Community Education program and serve as a center where people can find things to improve their quality of life."[126]

When IUPUI's Office of Neighborhood Partnerships was formed, "the agenda was forged very much with the community. Education, economic development, and neighborhood capacity were clearly identified as priority areas," says Bringle. The Office received a grant from Campus Compact to host two community dialogues, an opportunity for university staff to listen to issues concerning the university's role and involvement in the Near Westside. Today's agenda for the Near Westside is shaped by the GINI Quality of Life plan. The Office already had strong relationships with community leaders, which facilitated their role in the plan. Further, Office Coordinator Starla Officer has a long history with nonprofits in the area. "IUPUI was at the table the whole time," says Arnold, speaking of the GINI process. "Basically, we have these ideas we want to work on, and then IUPUI helps us develop them and go even deeper," comments GINI Coordinator Patrice Duckett. The Center for Service and Learning also recently formed an Advisory Board with representatives from each of its main constituencies (students, faculty, alumni, and community).[127]

Kevin Kecskes, Portland State's Director of Community-University Partnerships, views community partnerships analytically in terms of three competing frames — egalitarian, hierarchical, and individualist. "It's pretty clear that, as university leaders, we use egalitarian language. The practice is mixed, but there's much more hierarchical ('we can fix you') and individualist ('we're buying up and taking over because we can') tendencies. We need to better align rhetoric with practice," says Kecskes.[128] Portland State learned some lessons, too, when the university looked at possible expansion along the waterfront in 2004. Despite pulling together a coalition of local stakeholders, communication was not filtering down to residents. The neighborhood organized against them, and the University decided to back off from their plans. One way Portland State is resolving such issues today is by aligning their economic development and master campus plans with the citywide Economic Development Plan. "The City gets to broker those deals with the neighborhoods [for the University]. It's part of a bigger conversation — we're taking a 20-year look at development," says Lisa Abuaf, Senior Project Coordinator for the Portland Development Commission.[129] Portland State is also positively compared to other institutions in the area, such as the University of Oregon, which has encroached on neighborhoods and even displaced feeding areas for the city's homeless through their development.[130] Many Portland State faculty, as well as their partners, argue that their strongest relationships are built on an individual, informal basis. Although these relationships often foster reciprocal collaboration, it has also meant that some engagement initiatives have ebbed and flowed under different leadership.[131]

At Miami Dade College, community stakeholders were deeply involved in the College's overall strategic plan. Each of the College's 12 professional schools also has a Community Advisory Board. Elizabeth Mejia, Executive Director of Communities in Schools (CIS) of Miami says of her partnership with the College: "When they say they want to work with the community,

they really mean it. They never asked us for money and never said, 'What are *we* going to get out of this?' which is the second question out of many other universities' mouths." Miami Dade College has been heavily involved in CIS's tutoring and mentoring program for low-income, at-risk students. "Miami Dade College is the place to go for our students; most go on to higher ed here. It is their beacon of hope," says Mejia.[132]

While many community partners enjoy the participation of service-learning students coordinated through Miami Dade College's Center for Community Involvement, some express that they have lacked institutional bridges from the College to explore and develop longer-term collaborations. In a similar fashion, at both IUPUI and Portland State, university and community leaders recognize the need to have a university-wide center that can serve as a portal for all community partners. The Center for Service and Learning and the Center for Academic Excellence, respectively, are focused more intently on curricular partnerships and scholarly engagement.

Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Residents and Neighborhoods

Impacts can be difficult to measure when programs and resources are dispersed across the campus and community. Still, IUPUI has taken several steps to foster community wealth building in the Near Westside: Financial Literacy Workshop Series led by Economics faculty have engaged more than 200 residents; Faculty Community Fellows helped form a new Business Association, created youth entrepreneurship programs, and are planning for redevelopment in vacant areas; and the university's partnership with George Washington Community High School has set hundreds of students on pathways to success. Still, the University could make deeper impacts on the Near Westside if it chose to strategically invest institution-wide resources (i.e., academic *and* non-academic) in this area. "We have a community that's articulated its Quality of Life plan. This is an opportunity for the [whole] University to look at it and see how they could apply problem-solving and resources to what the neighborhood is trying to do," says Aaron Laramore, Program Officer for LISC Indianapolis.[133]

Miami Dade College, on the other hand, supports several community development objectives but continues to focus primary resources on its student population. Levitt comments, "I don't know how much we can/will grow in the next few years. We want to keep our doors open, and we need enough remedial support for our students, which is expensive. We have to surround them with support. If President Obama's goal of doubling bachelor's degrees is to be achieved, community colleges will play a huge role." Indeed, with 58 percent low-income and 90 percent minority students, Miami Dade College provides a door into the economic mainstream through education for thousands of young people. Besides the 7,800 associate degrees and 200 bachelor's degrees awarded in 2009, 600 local residents earned their GED through Miami Dade College's School of Community Education. In Overtown, the College has also trained two cohorts of 40 people as community health workers and more than 600 residents have received certification from the Hospitality Institute, with a 35-percent job placement rate. The College's K-12 partnership programs are also showing promising results, such as I Have a Dream Overtown, which guarantees college scholarships for participants who stay in school,

remain drug-free and complete the program. This is a mutually beneficial outcome, since 61 percent of graduates from the local public school system who attend college in Florida choose Miami Dade. With even more concentration on impoverished communities like Overtown, the College may begin to see greater neighborhood-level impacts.[134]

At Portland State, the Business Outreach Program has produced the most tangible impacts for community development. Since its founding in 1994, the Program has assisted more than 400 small and emerging businesses. In the past three years alone, it has also created 150 new jobs in North and Northeast Portland. Like IUPUI and Miami Dade College, community engagement is also driven into Portland State's curriculum. Most notably, the Senior Capstone Program engages nearly 250 groups of students every year to work on problem solving with community organizations. Much of the engaged curricular and research projects across the campus, however, remain dispersed throughout the greater community. Greater collaboration and coordination, perhaps, could lead to more sustained impact. According to President Wiewel, the new Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships will be in a position not only to demonstrate "that we see our engagement activities as contributing to our research mission," but also, "to see *whether* we can achieve more by greater collaboration and coordination. . . At times, this may include geographic concentration. . . But I think there are strengths in addressing things in a more cross-cutting way."[135]

Chapter Two: University as Leader

Community Partnerships at Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale

Introduction

The community partnership efforts of the three universities reviewed in this chapter—the University of Pennsylvania (Penn), the University of Cincinnati, and Yale University—are marked by four key factors: 1) each has enjoyed strong institutional leadership that has made community engagement a continued top priority; 2) each of the campuses is adjacent to a low-income neighborhood with a high percentage of African-American residents; 3) each of their efforts evolved in large measure in response to threatening conditions in the areas surrounding campus—in Cincinnati, general neighborhood deterioration and crime helped move the University toward greater engagement, while at both Penn and Yale the schools' administrative-led efforts were spurred by murders of community members (a faculty member at Penn and a student at Yale); and 4) in response, each of these universities made long-term investments totaling over $100 million.

Implicit in the four factors named above is a fifth—all three schools have the scale, endowments, and hence the *capacity* to finance their initiatives. The University of Cincinnati has the smallest endowment of the three, ranking 73rd in the nation in June 2009, but with a still significant total, even post financial crash, of nearly $833 million. (It should also be noted that Cincinnati's endowment ranks 24th for public institutions.) Yale and Penn, both Ivy League colleges, not surprisingly rate much higher nationally, with Yale ranking second and Penn tenth. Yale's endowment, before the recent economic crisis, topped $22.8 billion while Penn's exceeded $6.2 billion. After the crash, as of June 2009, Yale's endowment had fallen to $16.33 billion while Penn's endowment had fallen to $5.17 billion.[136] In terms of annual budget, Penn's annual turnover is $5.67 billion (although this figure falls to roughly $2.5 billion if Penn Health System is excluded), Yale's annual turnover is $2.31 billion, and the University of Cincinnati's is $1.02 billion.[137]

Given the role crime played in spurring community work, it should be no surprise that all three schools share a focus on improving conditions in adjacent neighborhoods. They also share some other traits marked by this focus. Because at Penn and Yale, at least in the immediate crisis aftermath, community work is seen not as a "plus," but as an *imperative*, efforts have involved

major resource commitments, not only in terms of budget, but also in leadership energy and administrative support. To be sure, it is not true that the *only* reason for these two schools' community partnership work is as a response to tragedy. Nonetheless, tragedy has shaped both the size and direction of these universities' engagement efforts. In Cincinnati, deteriorating business districts and neighborhoods on the borders of campus led to similar commitments of resources and leadership. The power of these institutional initiatives should not be underestimated. At the same time, it poses a major challenge to "partnership" principles, for in these efforts, the university acts much less as a facilitator of community groups and much more in a direct leadership role. To be sure, *consultation* is important, and indeed obtaining community support is a necessary element of this approach, but there is no question of who is "first among equals." At the same time, as crisis has subsided and threatening conditions have gradually improved, more collaborative approaches are beginning to emerge at all three sites.

University of Pennsylvania

> *The parents did not want to hear us talk about what we planned to do. They wanted to see immediate results, or else they would pull their children out of Penn. And to make sure we got the point they…booed us off the stage. The time for further study was over. Penn's future was at stake. We needed to act.*

Judith Rodin, President, University of Pennsylvania (1994–2004)[138]

Penn is often viewed as the national leader of community partnership work — and not without reason. The extent of Penn's effort is unusual in both its scope and its duration, spanning several university presidencies and more than two decades. In examining Penn, therefore, some historical context is helpful. Penn's partnership efforts began *before* the crisis — spurred by the murder of a Penn faculty member in 1996, to which Rodin refers above — but pre-crisis support from the university trustees and administration was limited. As a result, the early years of Penn's partnership efforts, beginning in the mid-1980s under the leadership of President Sheldon Hackney and university professor Ira Harkavy, displayed a much more "grassroots" partnership feel.[139] During the Hackney years, Penn followed an approach that was in many aspects more akin to the education outreach focus that characterizes much of the present work of IUPUI, Miami Dade College, and Portland State. According to Tom Burns, a Philadelphia community development consultant who taught for a number of years in the late 1980s and early 1990s at Penn's Wharton Business School, the period of Hackney leadership was a "great period of opening up doors and building relationships." Among other things, this period was when Penn began its efforts to improve local public schools in West Philadelphia. Initiated by Harkavy and a few other faculty members in 1985, by 1992 the effort had grown to sufficient

scale that Penn established the Center for Community Partnerships (which would later be endowed by Barbara and Edward Netter) to institutionalize community partnership work. Penn also began its initial efforts to promote local purchasing.[140]

Rodin brought a shift to the more comprehensive effort that Penn is known for today, with greater attention placed on the use of *institutional* resources. As Burns explains, "In the Rodin administration, it was a new model. She understood rightly that it was absolutely in the university's self-interest to reshape the quality of life in the community . . . from a management point of view, it was an effective style. [But it was a] style of initiating things in a somewhat unilateral way—an 'enlightened self-interest' frame, which was very different than the impulse that

---

Figure 8: Penn Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- West Philadelphia Initiatives: public safety, housing, retail development, business development, and public school partnerships
- Netter Center coordinates academic, institutional, public and private resources with a focus on public education, urban nutrition, and community development in West Philadelphia

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Local Purchasing Program spent $94.8 million locally (13% of total) and $75.2 million from diversity owned suppliers (11% of total) in FY09; sourcing managers rewarded for economic inclusion
- 35% of all Penn construction jobs to minority and women workers, and 26% of all contracts to minority- and women-owned businesses
- Employer-assisted housing in West Philadelphia
- Health care career ladders and construction apprentice programs evolving

Local Capacity Building
- Nonprofit Institute trainings for members of local organizations
- Small Business Development Center at Wharton School of Business
- Strengthening CDC partnerships through LISC's Sustainable Communities Initiative—West Philadelphia (in development)

Education and Health Partnerships
- University-assisted community schools: local schools serve as hubs for community transformation for more than 5,000 children and youth
- Penn Alexander K-8 School: $750,000 annual subsidy
- School of Education: district contracts to manage two public schools
- Public health focus with school partnerships and through Schools of Nursing and Medicine, and Center for Public Health Initiatives

Scholarly Engagement
- Academically based community service courses engage more than 50 faculty and 1,300 undergraduate and graduate students each year to solve real-world problems in West Philadelphia

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Lead funder of University City District, a multi-purpose business improvement district, with other institutional leaders
- Hosts Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development
- Focus on local and national replication of community school model

the Hackney administration followed." According to Executive Director of Public Affairs Tony Sorrentino, since the beginning of the Rodin effort, Penn has spent over $500 million on a combination of physical redevelopment expenditures (especially build-out costs for new retail and commercial facilities) and ongoing support to other programs, notably annual funding of the University City District business improvement district, the Penn Alexander K-8 School, and the Netter Center for Community Partnerships.[141]

Under Rodin, Penn's efforts were focused in five areas: public safety, housing, retail development, business development (procurement from local businesses), and public school partnerships. The school partnership work built on existing Center for Community Partnerships initiatives, while also expanding the effort in other ways, most notably by creating a brand new public K-8 neighborhood school (Penn Alexander) near campus. The other areas involved a broader effort to leverage institutional resources for community development. Between 1996 and 2003, Penn financed the acquisition and rehabilitation of over 200 rental buildings (most of which are inhabited by community members not affiliated with Penn), developed 300,000 square feet of retail space, boosted its local purchasing (from $20.1 million in fiscal year 1996 to $61.6 million in fiscal year 2003), and employed local residents in construction projects, with over 22 percent of contracts let out to woman- and minority-owned firms. The university was also successful in attracting outside investment. Penn estimates that its $150 million in investments in retail development leveraged an additional $370 million in private investment. An evaluation of the first seven years of the stepped-up Rodin effort found considerable success. Among the key findings: housing values in the neighborhood had more than doubled, while reported crime fell 40 percent.[142]

Amy Gutmann, who became Penn's president in 2004, has taken what might best be described as a middle road between the Hackney and Rodin approaches; the institutional work has continued, but is less heavily emphasized, while more energy has been focused on relationship-building and academic engagement work. Some outside observers believe the result has been reduced Penn attention to West Philadelphia. D. L. Wormley of the community group NeighborhoodsNow puts the matter this way, "[With Penn expanding eastward toward Center City] will Amy [Gutmann] make sure that West Philadelphia gets its due in terms of retail, employees, and services? Maybe. With Judy [Rodin] there was no question . . . With Amy there is a question, 'What does she do, and does she know that we exist?'" Richard Redding, Director of Community Planning for the City of Philadelphia, concurs that direct institutional involvement in West Philadelphia real estate has declined under Gutmann. "Rodin was bigger on physical development," Redding notes.[143]

By contrast, with school partnerships and scholarly engagement, there is no question as to Gutmann's strong backing. Redding emphasizes that under Gutmann there has been "a lot of support" for academically based community service. Netter Center for Community Partnerships Director Ira Harkavy agrees, pointing out that, "Amy [Gutmann] got us an endowment. The [educational partnership] programs at local schools have grown. Our efforts, as a national model, have blossomed under this president." Budget numbers confirm Harkavy's assessment. Since Gutmann's presidency began, direct university support to the Center has increased by 50

percent, from roughly $600,000 to over $1 million, while the Center's overall budget has more than doubled from $2.1 million in 2004–2005 to over $5.3 million in 2008–2009.[144]

One place where Penn's community development effort has been particularly strong is in its use of institutional purchasing. The numbers are impressive. Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing at Penn, notes, "When we launched 'Buy West Philadelphia' in the 1980s we were doing about $800,000. Today, 23 years later, we are on pace to procure locally in West and Southwest Philadelphia [about] $95 million. This year, our total spend year to date is down eight percent, but we've increased the percentage of purchasing from local businesses from 11 to 13 percent and diversity spend [minority business purchasing] has gone from nine to 11 percent of total spend."[145]

Penn has also extended its economic influence in many other ways, according to Tony Sorrentino, Penn's Executive Director of Public Affairs. This includes ensuring that at least 20 percent of the $200 million or so in "large" construction contracts (valued at $5 million or higher) are let out to minority- and women-owned firms. Glenn Bryan, Assistant Vice President in Penn's Office of Community Relations concurs: "There is a lot of responsibility at Penn to train local residents to be in the trades. We do very well in construction—the numbers for minority, women, and local contracting are high." An estimated 35 percent of all Penn construction jobs have gone to minority and women workers. As well, Penn exercises considerable influence through the retail buildings it owns. Sorrentino estimates that Penn owns and operates 450,000 square-feet of retail (roughly twice the square footage of a typical "Wal-Mart" box store), which houses 111 businesses that have combined annual sales of $200 million.[146]

Two other pieces of Penn's economic development efforts are its housing program and its sponsorship of the University Center District. The housing program was a centerpiece of Rodin's efforts. During her tenure, 386 "Penn affiliates" purchased homes with Penn assistance, making effective use of a mortgage guarantee program that had long been available to assist Penn faculty and was expanded to include all university staff in the mid-1980s during the Sheldon Hackney administration. In the past five years, the program has continued with a somewhat slower pace; Sorrentino estimates that at least 200 more have used the program since 2004.[147] The University Center District (UCD) is a multi-purpose business improvement district organization. Initially Penn provided a dominant share of UCD funding. As recently as Fiscal Year 2003, UCD board members, led by Penn, provided 70 percent of its then-$5.2 million budget (or $3.6 million). Today, UCD's annual budget has grown to nearly $9.6 million, but board member contributions have fallen to 40.6 percent of total revenues. Penn remains UCD's largest funder, contributing well over $2 million, but as a whole Penn is now responsible for less than 30 percent of the organization's revenues. Known best for its "safety ambassador" program of quasi-police security guards, UCD has also through its Neighborhood Initiatives program developed streetscape improvements that have helped support local retail development. Since 2008, UCD has been an enthusiastic participant with other community-based organizations in developing a broad array of economic and workforce related programs, such as the LISC-supported Sustainable Communities Initiative-West Philadelphia (SCI-West). To date, the initiative has

attracted millions of dollars of support from the William Penn Foundation, as well as other foundations outside the Philadelphia area.[148]

Partnerships with Philadelphia public schools are one last important area of emphasis for Penn's community work. Penn runs programs in 23 schools and provides training for teachers at even more schools, but most activities are concentrated in nine schools in West Philadelphia. The best known of Penn's efforts is the Penn Alexander School, a K-8 school with an estimated enrollment of 531 students, which Penn helped create and continues to provide $750,000 a year on top of normal public school funding. As James Lytle, Professor of Penn's Graduate School of Education, notes, that kind of money "allows you to do a lot. It's a really nice public school. You could walk in there and you would think you were in the suburbs. It still has a group of African-American families, although that group has diminished. . . Penn Alexander gets regular visitors from across the country. It also gets high involvement from parents — it is the equivalent of a private school education." Demographic data largely confirm Lytle's assessment. In 2004–2005, the first year of full enrollment at Penn Alexander, the student body was 58.4 percent African American, 22.5 percent white, 13.2 percent Asian, and 5.8 percent Latino; by contrast, five years later, in 2009–2010, the student body was 39 percent African American, 32 percent white, 14 percent Asian, 6 percent Latino, and 10 percent "other" (or declined to state).[149]

At the other schools, Penn, through the Netter Center for Community Partnerships, operates in a community school framework, similar to the model described at IUPUI. This approach focuses on utilizing the school as a community center that can provide a wide range of support services, such as classroom assistance, after-school programming, tutoring, literacy training, and nutritional education. The Center's "university-assisted community school" approach is concentrated on a set of schools within three high school catchment areas in West Philadelphia. Sayre High School enjoys one of the most developed efforts. In part due to these supports, Sayre met all 13 targets for "Adequate Yearly Progress" in 2006–2007, one of only five neighborhood high schools in the District (out of over 30) to achieve this goal. The school-based Sayre Health Center (opened in 2007 and staffed by Penn doctors and third year Medical students) now has over 300 users per month. At two community schools (Henry C. Lea, a K-8 school, and Alexander Wilson, a K-6 school), Penn also operates as an "EMO" (educational management organization), which involves an explicit contract with the Philadelphia public school system to provide services that will assist in "turning around" the schools. At these two schools, Penn's Graduate School of Education receives a management fee from the public school district for its services, which works out to about $500 per student (or $350,000 a year) and pays for the schools' classroom and professional development support, focused on training school teachers and principals. Penn's performance as an EMO has been lauded; of the six groups in Philadelphia with EMO contracts, Penn is the only organization to be rewarded by the school district with a multi-year contract.[150]

While less directly related to specific community development objectives, it bears mention that Penn has also put a lot of emphasis on building a culture of engagement on campus. Coordinated by Civic House, founded due to a student campaign in 1998, today more than 1,500 students engage in what Civic House Director David Grossman categorizes as "active

volunteering," while more than 4,000 students annually participate in at least one of Civic House's events. Penn is also a leading supporter of an independent consortium of 36 colleges and universities known as PHENND (Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development) that currently connects over 200 undergraduate students from eight area colleges with over 400 high school students. Academically, the Netter Center also works to engage the curricular end of the spectrum. When the Center began, there were only four academically based community service courses at Penn, which involved a total of three faculty and 100 students. In 2009–2010, there were more than 60 courses involving 50 faculty members and over 1,500 students in West Philadelphia.[151]

University of Cincinnati

Universities, by design, are in it for the long haul, and they have to take a long-term view of all their investments. This is particularly true at an urban institution.

Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, University of Cincinnati (2006–2009)[152]

As with Penn, safety issues have played an important role in shaping the campus-community partnership efforts at the University of Cincinnati. On the hilltops above the Central Business District in an area known as Uptown, crime and blight on campus edges created a sense of urgency for the University of Cincinnati and spurred their active involvement in creating a safe, clean and vibrant community. "We were trying to deal with a situation that threatened our existence," comments Gerry Siegert, Associate Vice President for Community Development at the University of Cincinnati. These circumstances, combined with visionary leadership, took the University's service mission to a whole new level. Over the last decade, the University of Cincinnati has invested significant resources, mainly human and monetary, to develop its surrounding neighborhoods.[153]

Particularly notable about Cincinnati's effort is their decision to forgo the standard university practice of maximizing returns on their endowment and instead leverage that endowment to support the university's social and community goals. Mary Stagaman, former Associate Vice President for External Relations and Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement, explains the University's view of its investment "as patient capital" that can be made available "very long-term, at very low interest rates." This creative use of its endowment allows the university to make a unique investment in the community that it would otherwise be unable to finance. Specifically, over the last ten years, the University has dedicated nearly $150 million from its endowment pool—or approximately 13.6 percent of the school's entire endowment (before the financial crash)—to finance low-interest loans, as well as an additional $8 million

dollars in operating grants for community redevelopment efforts. Siegert states that they have experienced a nearly three-to-one leveraging of their endowment money through tax-exempt debt, loans from banks, and other sources: "In total, our loans represent [an estimated] 20–40 percent of the entire redevelopment effort."[154]

Also notable about Cincinnati's effort is the strong level of collaboration with other area anchor institutions. In 2003, the University of Cincinnati, an urban public university, joined with four other large local non-profit employers (three health care organizations and the local zoo) to form the Uptown Consortium. Holding several summits involving hundreds of community residents, the Consortium developed a plan to invest $500 million to improve the quality of life in Cincinnati's challenged Uptown neighborhoods. Most of the funding provided to date—totaling nearly $400 million, including outside investments—has been directed to real estate development.[155]

Not all community partnership efforts at the University of Cincinnati, of course, date from the creation of the Uptown Consortium. Starting in the late 1980s, under President Joseph Steger,

---

Figure 9: Cincinnati Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Uptown Consortium led to investment of nearly $400 million in community; broad socio-economic goals, but focused on real estate development to date

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Use of $150 million out of endowment as "patient capital"
- Participate in two small state-wide programs that direct purchasing dollars to minority businesses (average 6-8% annually) and goods and services from socially and economically disadvantaged businesses (average 4% annually)
- Open bidding process through Office of Contract Compliance

Local Capacity Building
- Formation of seven community urban redevelopment corporations in Uptown neighborhoods, with majority community representation

Education and Health Partnerships
- Strive, public-private partnership to support young people from cradle to career, with particular focus on college access

- Cincinnati Pride Grant, a "last dollar scholarship" for Pell-eligible students from the local school district
- $20 million to GEAR UP for services to over 4,700 public school students
- Development of STEM schools in community

Scholarly Engagement
- Service-learning part of general education curriculum

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Uptown Consortium: shared resources and goals of major employers in the area
- Agenda 360: collaboration with regional partners to transform Southwest Ohio's economy
- Center for the City: web portal to connect campus to the broader community
- Strong collaboration with multiple City of Cincinnati Offices, including Community Development, Economic Development, and Transportation

the University undertook a new master plan to redevelop its campus from within. This physical transformation set the stage for change in many ways: new student housing transformed the student experience; campus borders became more permeable; and dialogue increased between those internal and external to the university. Faculty, staff and students became increasingly involved in problem-solving curriculum and community partnership efforts; still, the University had yet to affirmatively claim its position as an urban institution and engage in university-wide partnerships.[156]

When Nancy Zimpher arrived as President in 2003, she led a strategic planning process—involving a wide range of university stakeholders—to draft the University's vision for its future. The plan, *UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University*, has helped to re-position Cincinnati as a leading research *and* a leading urban university. "This notion of bringing university resources to address great urban community challenges is in Nancy [Zimpher's] DNA. It has been part of her agenda for a long time," says Rimai. Through Zimpher's leadership, the institution began to understand that leveraging their resources to address urban community challenges was not only the right thing to do, but also that the university's core mission of research, teaching, and service could greatly benefit. This vision was not without some internal dissent, although the tides have been slowing turning. "The mission of UC|21 is great, but now we have to hold people accountable to it," comment Michael Sharp and Kathy Dick, who direct the University's service-learning and student volunteer offices.[157]

Zimpher continued the efforts of her predecessor, Steger, for physical redevelopment, and set out to transform the neighborhoods surrounding Cincinnati's campus through extensive community development. In many ways, the work off-campus became an extension of the transformation of the campus itself. The University's Trustees were on board to make a significant financial investment to these efforts. Of course, it was the full backing of the most senior financial officers of the institution, including the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance and the Chief Investment Officer, that made it "more palatable for institutional budget managers to accept, and support, the initiative," notes Siegert. It was expected that the short-term return on investment would be safer and cleaner neighborhoods that would attract more students to the University and improve town-gown relationships, which would ultimately benefit the bottom-line. Indeed, the University has begun to enjoy initial returns such as dramatically increased enrollment rates in the last handful of years.[158]

As noted above, Cincinnati encouraged a partnership among the area's largest institutions—the University, Children's Hospital Medical Center, TriHealth Inc., the Health Alliance, and the Cincinnati Zoo—to create the Uptown Consortium. Formally established in 2003, the Consortium marked a key milestone in Uptown to have five chief executives come together and share ideas and resources.[159] Additionally, the University established seven community urban redevelopment corporations (CURCs) in the neighborhoods of Uptown. Each has a five-member board consisting of four representatives from the local business and neighborhood associations and one university representative.[160]

The Uptown Consortium, in particular, began with a very broad mission to improve economic opportunity and quality of life in the area. According to Stagaman, this reflects the

idealism and optimism of the executive leaders.[161] However, both the Consortium and the CURCs have remained largely focused on real estate development to date. Other neighborhood goals set out by the Consortium revolved around homeownership, business retention, employment, safety and transportation. According to a market study, between 2004 and 2008, Uptown experienced an 8.2 percent decrease in the total number of Part 1 crimes (the City of Cincinnati overall saw a 10.3 percent decrease during the same period) and a 9.5 percent decrease in neighborhood crimes. A total of 78 permits, representing 199 housing units, were issued in Uptown between 2002 and 2008, mostly dedicated to student housing.[162] The potential of several other programs have yet to be realized. For instance, the Uptown Mortgage Program, modeled after Cincinnati's Walk to Work program, aimed to attract employees to live in the area and, therefore, increase purchasing power; limited finances, however, have led to little traction with either housing program.[163]

The University of Cincinnati has also shown leadership through its educational partnerships, with particular focus on college access. Strive, a public-private partnership aimed to support young people from cradle to career, began when Zimpher convened university presidents in the area to discuss the challenges of college access. She then partnered with the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, which volunteered staff members to begin research on existing data and programs. When Strive was formally established in 2006, the model was based on a "Roadmap to Success," key transition points from pre-K through college, which were identified by university faculty and graduate students. Cincinnati's Dean of the College of Education, Criminal Justice and Human Services, Larry Johnson, continues to be a major organizational leader for Strive, and the University's new president, Gregory Williams, now sits on the Executive Committee.[164]

The University also began the Cincinnati Pride Grant as a "last dollar scholarship" for Pell-eligible students who graduate from Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) to be able to attend the University free of charge. Strive partners are now looking to expand the eligibility to any graduate from CPS, as well as expand the program to other universities. This would be based partly on the Kalamazoo Promise model in Michigan, through which local youth are guaranteed scholarships to any public university in the state. Though the current economy has curtailed fundraising, the University continues to make these scholarships part of their $1 billion capital campaign.[165]

The College of Education, Criminal Justice and Human Services has also directed $20 million to GEAR UP, a federal college awareness and readiness program for low-income youth. The college serves as the program's lead agency and provides administrative and fiscal leadership for the services delivered to over 4,700 public school students. "We hope to leverage our funds to help bring more resources [to disadvantaged students]," says Dean Johnson. "Helping kids graduate from high school is the biggest economic driver we can have."[166]

The University of Cincinnati's leadership, particularly in helping to form the Uptown Consortium, has established a strong foundation for anchor-based community development, as well as brought significant leveraging power. The Consortium now represents "a collective voice," says Assistant City Manager for the City of Cincinnati, Scott Stiles. The University's Community Development office — which oversees the community redevelopment corporations — has a very close working relationship with the City Department of Community Development.[167]

Additionally, the University is a partner in "Agenda 360: a Regional Action Plan" for building talent, jobs and economic opportunity. Agenda 360 has engaged the leadership from many public and private partners all over the region, including several other anchor institutions, providing a variety of expertise and resources.[168]

Looking towards the future, the University's community development efforts are going through a period of transition. A new President, Gregory Williams, was installed at the University in November 2009. Previously at the City University of New York, Williams certainly brings a strong urban pedigree and has affirmed a desire to sustain community engagement in public, but whether Zimpher's emphasis on engagement will be maintained in fact remains unknown. In early 2010, there were other adjustments as well. The Uptown Consortium director left his position after five years, and the Health Alliance had been dissolved. With all of these changes, the work of the Consortium and the University of Cincinnati, as a whole, could head in new directions.[169] Moreover, the redevelopment efforts in Uptown have a long way to go to realize the broad socio-economic goals laid out more than five years ago. With the recent inclusion of community leaders onto the Consortium's Management Operations Committee, and reaffirmation by the Board of its broader social mission, there lies greater opportunity to *begin* to address these greater socio-economic issues.

Yale University

> *There were [34] homicides in New Haven in 1991 . . . But the murder that captured Yale's attention — and sparked a fundamental change in the way the university thought about its hometown — was the February 17 killing of sophomore Christian Prince '93.*
>
> Mark Alden Branch '86, writing for *Yale Alumni Magazine*, 2009[170]

While Penn and Cincinnati are often celebrated for their community partnership and community development work, Yale has received less attention. Unlike Penn, Yale does not target purchasing to promote local economic development. Unlike Cincinnati, Yale has not dedicated more than an eighth of its endowment to capitalizing community development. Nonetheless, in its own way, Yale has made a number of important investments in community partnerships and related community economic development. If Penn's biggest impact has been in the areas of purchasing and school partnerships and Cincinnati's biggest impact has been in its low-interest lending and Strive education partnership, for Yale the focus has clearly been on leveraging real estate development.

As noted above, even more than at Penn, it was tragedy — specifically the murder on campus of Yale student Christian Prince in 1991 — that mobilized the Yale community to greatly expand its community partnership efforts.[171] Sheila Masterson, a co-founder of the Greater

Dwight Development Corporation, a local community development corporation, explains, "True successes are not based on altruism; they are based on need. What happened here in New Haven was that a student was murdered . . . There were people at Yale who got up and said, 'Holy cow! Our pool of applicants has dropped 10 percent and we've got to do something.'" Linda Townsend Maier, Cofounder and Executive Director of Greater Dwight Development Corporation, says an added factor was that the overall high level of crime created "pressure for the community and Yale to say, 'what you're experiencing we are experiencing, so we have to come together.'"[172]

A key difference from Penn, however, was that the roll out of Yale's program was more gradual. In part, this was an accident of university timing. Most importantly, while the murder of Christian Prince occurred in 1991, current President Richard Levin, who oversaw Yale's response, was not inaugurated until 1993. After Levin became President, the pace of activity accelerated. In Levin's first two years, Yale successfully applied for a community outreach partnership center (COPC) grant in the Dwight neighborhood, established a Director of University Real Estate to better manage non-academic real estate property holdings, and began to invest in retail and streetscape revitalization. Additionally, Yale launched its housing program in 1994 (subsidizing New Haven home purchases for 200 affiliates in its first two years), created the

---

Figure 10: Yale Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Support for housing, public schools, libraries, and youth programs in Dixwell, Dwight, and Hill neighborhoods.

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Contract goals of 25% minority, 20% local, 6.9% women, and 14% first-year apprentice hires
- Real estate development: owns 350,000 square feet of retail that is leased to 100 stores
- Yale Homebuyer Program: $22.5 million in subsidy dollars to facilitate over 925 home purchases

Local Capacity Building
- 550,000-square-foot incubator in downtown New Haven; helped start 40 companies, which have raised $450 million in venture capital
- $2 million grant to support community development financial institution, First Community Bank

- Helped secure initial funding for Greater Dwight Development Corporation

Education and Health Partnerships
- Support to 20 public schools, and particularly strong relationships with two magnet schools
- Focus on literacy, arts, and science education with 10,000 public school children participating in University programs annually
- Public health outreach by professional schools

Scholarly Engagement
- Limited service-learning

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Joint planning with the City
- Lead funder of Town Green business improvement district and Market New Haven
- Strong collaboration through long tenures of University President, City Mayor, and School District Superintendent

Office of New Haven and State Affairs in 1995, and made the Office Director a Vice President position in 1997.[173]

Nonetheless, even as Yale under Levin picked up the pace of its community partnership work, it still moved more deliberately to work with existing organizations, rather than create *de novo* organizations like the University Center District, as Penn had done. Part of what allowed for this was scale. The entire population of the City of New Haven (125,000) is roughly half the population of the West Philadelphia section of Philadelphia, for example. Sheila Shanklin, Director of Cooperative Management at Housing Operations Management Enterprise (HOME), Inc. and a co-founder of Greater Dwight Development Corporation, explained the "small town" nature of New Haven this way: "The language of the University and city officials can be different," Shanklin notes, "but I have a good relationship with them all because I have worked in the neighborhood a long time. I knew the Mayor before he was Mayor. His kids went to school with my grandkids. My husband was his soccer coach. I could talk with him differently. If you have relationships with people, what may be difficult for others is easier."[174]

Yale's effort has focused on four areas. President Richard Levin, speaking in 2003, described these components as follows: 1) economic development, with a focus on promoting biotech start-ups; 2) strengthening neighborhoods, with a focus on housing and school partnerships; 3) promoting improved safety, appearance, and vitality in downtown; and 4) marketing the City, an effort in which Yale's retail arm, University Properties, has played a key role.[175]

Notably, while "strengthening neighborhoods" makes the list, reducing neighborhood poverty per se is *not* an explicit goal of Yale's efforts. Jon Soderstrom, Director of the Office of Cooperative Research, who heads Yale's biotech business development support effort, is very direct on this point: "Yale didn't decide, 'Let's alleviate poverty in New Haven.' What Yale decided is — where we could have a positive economic impact, we would try to do so. . . our goal is to remain one of the great universities in the next century. Our goal is not to transform society — in a macro sense, through knowledge, yes — but in a micro sense, no." The scale of Yale's efforts in economic development has been significant. In the past decade, Soderstrom points out, his Office has developed a 550,000-square-foot incubator in downtown New Haven and helped start 40 companies, which combined have raised about $450 million in venture capital. All told these efforts have leveraged $3 billion in total equity, including five companies that have "gone public." Soderstrom also noted that the Center helped create an incubator to support the start-up efforts by students. One student business — Higher One, Inc. — has been hugely successful, raising $10 million and employing 300. There have been a total of 35 start-up student businesses to date, of which 17 have full-time employees.[176]

Yale's contributions to economic development in lower-income neighborhoods have been more episodic, but not unimportant. Overall, Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs estimates that graduate and professional schools have spent $14.39 million on outreach over the past two decades, including $1.27 million in Fiscal Year 2009, as well as provided significant in-kind resources. For example, Yale Law School faculty did pro bono work "which was worth a fortune" to enable the Greater Dwight Development Corporation to attract a Shaw's

Supermarket to the Dwight neighborhood in the 1990s. The CDC has also benefited from pro bono public planning assistance from Yale's Urban Design Workshop.[177]

In terms of its direct neighborhood work, Yale's signature effort has been its homebuyer program, an employer-assisted housing initiative that aims to create more "mixed income" neighborhoods in New Haven by encouraging Yale faculty and staff to become New Haven homeowners, with efforts focused on helping renters become homeowners and encouraging new staff and faculty to buy homes in New Haven. In its 15 years of existence, the Yale Home-buyer Program has provided $22.5 million in subsidy dollars that have facilitated over 925 home purchases (with an estimated combined value of over $150 million or an average home price of about $162,000) in New Haven by Yale faculty, staff, and affiliates. To date, about 45 percent of participants have been unionized staff, 80 percent have been first-time homebuyers and about 50 percent of participants are people of color. According to Michael Morand, Associate Vice President of the Office of New Haven and State Affairs, there have been only two foreclosures in the history of the program. The subsidy amount per household is presently set at $30,000 — $7,500 at closing, and $2,500 a year for nine years for each year of continued residency, with an additional $5,000 for people who buy in the Dixwell neighborhood, a low-income neighborhood near campus, which is a focus area of Yale's current efforts.[178]

In addition to its homeownership program, the other major arm of Yale's neighborhood building efforts has concerned its efforts to improve New Haven public schools. Yale's investment in this area is significant. In Fiscal Year 2009, Yale calculates that its investment in school partnerships was $3.9 million; in the past two decades, Yale estimates it spent $53 million on school partnership programs, or, more than twice the level of expenditure for its homebuyers' program.[179] Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships at Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs, notes that while Yale partners with twenty of New Haven's public schools, it works particularly closely with two magnet schools: Co-op High School and Hill Regional. Co-op High School is a magnet school with 600 students with a focus in five areas of the Arts and Humanities: Visual Arts, Creative Writing, Theater, Dance, and Music. According to Yale Partnership Coordinator Suzannah Holsenbeck, Yale's support work, which includes the establishment of her staff position as an on-site partnership coordinator, as well as access to in-kind resources (including a range of activities from Yale tutors assisting with fundamentals to workshops with graduate students in Yale's drama program) have helped Co-op High achieve "safe harbor" status in math, while reading scores have climbed 20 percentage points over the past year.[180]

Another long-standing partnership is the Urban Resources Initiative, a community forestry partnership program supported by Yale since the mid-1990s. According to Colleen Murphy Dunning, Director of the Initiative, the group works annually with "50–60 organizations on some kind of community forestry." The group aims to plant 10,000 trees in New Haven between 2010 and 2015.[181]

In terms of public safety, one important aspect has been for Yale to make voluntary payments in lieu of the property tax revenues that it would be providing the City were it not a nonprofit institution. In Fiscal Year 2009, Yale's contribution to the City of New Haven was $5.1 million,

which has helped the City finance public services. Over the past two decades, Yale's voluntary payments to the City have exceeded $44.7 million.[182]

Another important aspect of Yale's strategy has been its management of its retail portfolio. While Yale's direct contribution to neighborhood and downtown real estate totaled only $100,000 in Fiscal Year 2009, this figure is deceptive. Over the past two decades, Yale invested a total of $57.5 million in downtown and neighborhood real estate.[183] The benefit of this investment is substantial. As Abigail Rider, Associate Vice President and Director for University Properties, explains, Yale's property ownership enables it to leverage its real estate assets to achieve ancillary public safety and marketing goals. "We treat our portfolio as if it were a mall. So we secure it. We maintain it. We run events. We support our tenants. We have massive and continuous marketing," notes Rider. All told, Yale owns 310,000 square feet of retail, with leases to 110 stores, a residential portfolio of 500 units and a small amount of upstairs (above retail) office space.[184]

According to Rider, Yale's ownership enables it to actively shape city development. "We pay for ourselves, but we are not under pressure to get a 25-percent internal rate of return," Rider explained. "The important thing is to get a decent return, since part of the return of this activity is a social return . . . [so] if there's a small business that we think is unique, we can afford to take a slow approach to rent." Rider adds: "Our ideal is not Rodeo Drive. We want . . . all of the [services] the community needs—hair salons, spas, dry cleaners, laundry, hardware store—these are things that are hard to do. It is harder than clothing or apparel. The flight to suburbia drew these uses out. What we need is a walkable city: where residents can get what they need here."[185]

Looking Across the Cases

Creating an Engaged Community

Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati are all immediately adjacent to low-income neighborhoods. Penn, for example, is bordered on its east by the Schuylkill River and on its west by the West Philadelphia section of Philadelphia. According to the 2000 Census, roughly 220,000 people live in West Philadelphia (a collection of 22 neighborhoods), of whom 71.8 percent are African-American and 23.4 percent are white. The poverty rate as of 2000 was 24.4 percent, while unemployment was 11.2 percent, and the median household income under $21,000. Rick Redding, Director of Community Planning for the City of Philadelphia, estimates that as of 2009 the population of the area has fallen to 209,000.[186]

The University of Cincinnati is located in an area known as Uptown, comprised of several neighborhoods diverse in their socioeconomic and racial makeup. In 2008, an estimated 50,820 people lived in Uptown. African Americans, Asians and other minorities comprise around 58 percent of Uptown's population (compared to 50 percent citywide). The poverty rate in 2008 for Uptown families was 23 percent. With five of the tri-state's top ten employers, however,

Uptown employs around 40,000 individuals, rivaling the Central Business District of Cincinnati (just 1.5 miles from the south end of the University of Cincinnati's campus). Homeowners made up just 23 percent of Uptown residents in 2008, compared to 61 percent citywide.[187]

New Haven is a diverse city with a number of middle class and even wealthy neighborhoods, but Yale University is also close to many low-income neighborhoods, especially on its west side. Indeed, in 1999, New Haven was one of fifteen cities selected nationally for a 10-year "Empowerment Zone" designation (which requires a poverty rate of 25 percent or higher), with a focus on the six low-income neighborhoods of Hill, West Rock, Newhallville, Dwight, Dixwell, and Fair Haven. These six neighborhoods combined have an estimated population of nearly 42,000, a poverty rate above 31.5 percent, and an unemployment rate estimated to exceed 17.9 percent.[188]

Establishing Partnership Programs and Goals

Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale all seek to promote neighborhood revitalization. But all do so with a mixture of motives. On the one hand, there is a genuine desire to be a "good neighbor" and to provide substantially enhanced services to low-income residents who were previously neglected (and sometimes directly exploited) by those institutions. At the same time, all three universities clearly identify their efforts as a response to safety concerns over what happens in adjacent neighborhoods, where many of their students and some faculty live. In some cases, a key (often unstated) goal of "revitalization" is to move the invisible "boundary line" between the resource-rich "gown" and the much poorer sections of "town" just a little further away from campus — or, at the least, to create a safe corridor along these shared edges. In a sense, the development of retail districts along Broadway and Chapel in New Haven; of Calhoun Street in the Clifton Heights district and Short Vine in the Corryville district of Cincinnati; and of 40th Street in West Philadelphia all serve this purpose. Such mixed-use developments help create new urban zones that provide amenities for both town and gown, but with the important ancillary benefit for the university of increasing the safety of the campus community by literally moving the poorer areas of the surrounding city at least a few blocks further from campus. The Penn Alexander School in West Philadelphia, which Philadelphia housing expert Kevin Gillen estimates to have increased the average real estate value of homes within its "catchment" area by "about $100,000," is another example of this effect at work, albeit with a focus on creating a residential, not commercial, buffer zone neighborhood.[189] This is no accident. Again, insuring public safety for the campus community in these cases was *primary* to the entire effort.

At the same time, all three universities aim to go beyond creating safe spaces for students and faculty. As Morand of Yale puts it, "There are extraordinarily deep, broad, thick, marvelous and inextricable bonds of a community institution called Yale. . . Continuous engagement is the reality here. . . We are not mere 'partners' — we are 'part of', fellow stakeholders, fellow citizens, neighbors."[190] While these institutions certainly view themselves as "part of" their community, however, there is no question of the resource and power imbalances that exist. In places like Yale or Penn, but also (albeit to a lesser degree) Cincinnati, once the period of high crime and "crisis" has clearly subsided, an opportunity to deepen and broaden efforts to

be more inclusive of community goals clearly exists. One might even say that the initial crisis response often generates a "need" for a broader response. For example, a 2006 internal report at Penn warned that, "Penn must work to avoid the creation of two West Philadelphias"—one that is close to campus and favored (the urban buffer zone) and the larger region, which risks suffering from continued neglect. In response, the authors made a number of recommendations including strengthening direct hiring and workforce development of West Philadelphia residents, a greater focus on housing for lower-income residents, a strengthening of the local network of community development corporations (CDCs), expanded community health work, and support for local business development through such means as a business incubator and a community development credit union.[191]

Informed by this vision, efforts are under way in at least two of these areas at Penn: local hiring and CDC partnership development. Regarding the former, Netter Center Associate Directory Cory Bowman notes that the key question is, "What can you do to connect West Philadelphians to West Philadelphia jobs? The issue is not that jobs don't exist, but connecting them. . . Every kid should be able to get an entry-level job. We want to identify five-or-six kids at every high school, 800 kids citywide, help them graduate, and then get entry-level jobs or go on to college," Bowman explains. "We're still at square 0.5, but we're making progress." Bowman adds that the Netter Center is now working with large healthcare employers in Philadelphia to develop effective health care career ladders for area residents and youth through the Skills Development Center. In 2007–2008, the Skills Development Center trained 700 incumbent workers at the Penn Health System and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.[192]

Randy Belin, Senior Program Officer at the Philadelphia office of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, describes LISC's Sustainable Communities Initiative-West Philadelphia (SCI-West), a program supported by the William Penn Foundation that aims to coordinate the activities of the University Center District and three local community development corporations. Belin notes, "Penn did a needs assessment in 2004. It lines up well with SCI-West. The main issues are similar: affordable housing, workforce development, public safety, and health." Penn's Assistant Vice President of Community Relations Glenn Bryan serves on Philadelphia LISC's advisory board and his participation is a sign of the university's commitment to this process. "There is only opportunity and potential," Belin says.[193]

At Cincinnati, the university leadership is beginning to think more strategically about how it can leverage all of its resources to align with the comprehensive needs of the community. At this time, however, a disconnect exists between administrative-led initiatives and some of the faculty and staff whose partnership efforts have been built on more grassroots efforts. Michael Sharp speaks frankly about this challenge: "Similar to other large institutions, the left hand of the University and the right hand of the University don't know what each other is doing. But, over the last several years, we've been making strides in the right direction."[194] Communication from the top to the bottom and across schools and centers at such a large institution is often challenging. Yet, both the leadership of the university and those running the partnership centers do agree that increased collaboration and communication—both externally and internally—are essential. In the meantime, the University has created a more visible portal for the greater community

called "Center for the City." The virtual portal is partly intended to make the divisions among engaged centers and faculty invisible to the community. It will connect the university and its resources to local nonprofits, government, and the corporate community. Through efforts like this, and the University's role in Agenda 360 (more below), Cincinnati appears to have turned *some* of its community engagement focus towards citywide partnerships.[195]

At Yale, perhaps because of the continuity of presidential leadership, there has not been as thorough of an evaluation of its community partnership work as Penn experienced after Rodin's departure; nonetheless, the effort at Yale has evolved in recent years. Traditionally, noted Reggie Solomon, Program Director, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale had not invested "in the area between nine o'clock and noon" (northwest quadrant) that extends into the impoverished Dixwell neighborhood." One notable effort to invest in Dixwell has been the "Rose Center" project, where Yale, with the participation of local community members, has built a new police substation and 3,000-square-foot community center, which includes a 16-person computer lab and a 50-person meeting room. Yale has also invested $500,000 in a local park (Scantlebury Park).[196]

More recently, Yale's professional schools have also deepened their efforts. For example, Yale has supported the development of a new community development financial institution, First Community Bank, both with a $2-million capital grant from the Office of New Haven and State Affairs, as well as in-kind assistance from Yale Law School and Yale School of Management. Yale's Medical School has also increased its public health outreach work, with Yale being one of 30 Clinical Translational Science Award grant recipients nationally. The Community Alliance for Research Education, with an annual budget of $300–400,000, is targeting six neighborhoods in New Haven with the worst health status and aims to reach 2,500 people.[197]

Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision

To a large extent, all three schools aligned their institutional priorities for engagement in the immediate post-crisis period. However, the schools have maintained their focus differently over time. Penn has perhaps the most developed structure to support community engagement. Under President Rodin, for instance, the Board of Trustees set up a Committee on Neighborhood Initiatives that would be on par with Finance and other committees of the Board and oversee the effort at the Trustee level; this committee has continued its work under current President Gutmann. A big part of the strength of Penn's efforts has indeed been consistent presidential support, as well as the prominence of the Netter Center. The importance of the Netter Center is signaled by the fact that its Director, Ira Harkavy, also has the rank of Associate Vice President. The Netter Center reports directly to the Vice President of Governmental Affairs and the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, but with a strong link to the university president.[198]

At Cincinnati, from 2003 to May 2009, Nancy Zimpher provided tremendous leadership for the University's repositioning as an urban, engaged university. As President of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, Kathy Merchant, puts it, "Nancy Zimpher brought a gale force wind and enthusiasm for the role that the university can and should play for community economic

vitality and quality of life." Not only did Zimpher understand and support the development efforts, but also there was active participation. As Siegert notes, "Despite the huge demands on the President's daily schedule, time was dedicated to serve on the Board of Trustees of the Uptown Consortium and often communicate directly with neighborhood community leaders who sought counsel with her and/or members of her administrative cabinet." However, many university faculty and staff know that institutional change is not often an easy course. "Nancy tried to set the table on what an engaged university is, but the institution is a big machine and is slower to change. I'm optimistic that we'll get there. . . eventually," says Michael Sharp. Moreover, Cincinnati recognizes that a more conscious linking of the corporate and academic sides of the University could bring about more systemic change, in party by leveraging each other's resources. Professor Michael Romanos remarks, "The School of Planning is supposed to be knowledgeable about urban development in the city. . .we don't even know what the [Uptown] Consortium is doing. We're informed through newspapers of the redevelopment. There is a disconnect between the Consortium and university academic resources."[199]

When Cincinnati began its presidential search after Zimpher's departure in June 2009, there was a public Board Resolution to retain the institution's commitment to the community. Zimpher also elevated the status of her Associate Vice President for External Relations, Mary Stagaman, to Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement. Stagaman has helped orchestrate relations between the University and the broader community, as well as to organize efforts internally. Monica Rimai, who served as Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration and helped to execute Zimpher's vision of community engagement, served as the Interim President. The new President, Gregory Williams, installed in November 2009, hails from City College of New York (where he was President from 2001 to 2009) and thus has a strong urban background, which augurs well for continued commitment to Cincinnati's anchor institution strategy. Still, to ensure sustainability, efforts going forward will likely need to engage a broader range of university leaders.[200]

Yale has relied largely on the leadership of President Richard Levin. His sixteen-year term has allowed for the institutionalization of a broad effort coordinated by the Office of New Haven and State Affairs and the Office of University Properties. Since 1998, when Bruce Alexander, a Yale alumnus who formerly worked for the Rouse Corporation, a leading real estate firm, was hired, the Director of the Office of New Haven and State Affairs has had the status of Vice President (with the formal title of Vice President of New Haven and State Affairs and Campus Development), giving the Office "cabinet rank." Jon Soderstrom, Director of the Office of Cooperative Research, confirms the centrality of presidential support to the whole effort.[201]

Michael Morand, Associate Vice President at the Office of New Haven and State Affairs, describes the work as follows: "Our office is about doing, not telling. Incorporating facilities work with community engagement has a major impact: our guys in facilities get it. They implement local and minority construction programs — no arm-twisting required. First floor retail — it works more seamlessly here. You have senior officers of the University focused on New Haven. Local impacts are at the table when corporate decisions are made. And the President of the University supports this, so you have the bully pulpit effect."[202]

Securing Funding and Leveraging Resources

Each of the three institutions has contributed considerable financial resources that total in the hundreds of millions of dollars. For the University of Pennsylvania, this investment has involved both annual expenditures as well as more substantial one-time capital expenditures. Regarding the former, the contributions remain relatively modest: direct Penn contributions to the Netter Center, Penn Alexander School, University City District, and employer-assisted housing program total roughly $5–6 million a year — and perhaps with other partnership programs might reach $10 million a year. Of course, these programs also leverage much greater external support, with UCD raising more than $5 million for landscaping and transportation from 1997–2003, and Netter raising more than $4.5 million in 2008 alone. Regarding the latter, capital expenditures during the Rodin period are estimated to total $510 million; in essence, this was done by leveraging existing real estate and construction budgets to serve both real estate development as well as broader community development goals.[203]

The University of Cincinnati has committed $148.6 million, over a ten-year period, out of its endowment to real estate development. According to Siegert, a good portion of the nearly $150 million invested has been recovered as projects matured or as alterative funding sources were identified and implemented; however some loans remain outstanding. "Although the outstanding balance of original endowment loans has ranged between $80 and $90 million, the diversity of the projects funded with these loans has attracted over $250 million in other financing resources," notes Siegert. Reserves have been provided to recognize the fact that not all investments may be recovered. These reserves include approximately 20 percent of principal and a portion of accrued interest. In addition to endowment loans, the seven community redevelopment corporations have collectively received an average of one million dollars in operating funds each year, over the last eight-to-nine years, from the University's general funds. The University's Chief Investment Officer Tom Croft takes a long view on how these investments fit into the university's endowment portfolio: "While these loans aren't publicly traded, investment-grade bonds, we are comfortable that we will get our money back over time and ultimately see a return on our investment. Moreover, these investments, which are appreciably improving surrounding neighborhoods for both our students and the community, have strategic value that goes far beyond their direct rate of return."[204]

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation has also invested in the University's community development efforts, in addition to funding health and education initiatives. Most recently, the Foundation has provided program specific funding through low-interest rate loans, similar to the University's investments. Program investments are going directly into real estate deals with expectation of repayment long-term.[205]

Yale has also made a sustained investment to community development in New Haven. According to an estimate compiled by the Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale spent over $7.7 million on outreach and community development programs in 2008–2009 and $164 million since 1990. If one includes Yale's voluntary payments to the City of New Haven — which are on top of state-mandated PILOTs (Payments in Lieu of (Property) Taxes) — then the total

Yale expenditure for 2008–2009 increases to $12.8 million and the total expenditure since 1990 rises to $209 million.[206]

Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion

Penn has taken very deliberate efforts towards economic inclusion, and is using its economic and purchasing power to create opportunities for local, minority and women business owners. Penn's local purchasing effort began in the 1980s, as discussed above, and has continued to grow in breadth and depth over the last couple of decades. One recent change made by Penn has been to strengthen its community outreach by partnering more with nonprofit groups with similar aims, such as the Pennsylvania Minority Business Development Council and Minority Business Enterprise Center. Additionally, economic inclusion has become more embedded into the institutional culture at Penn: "We used to have a Director of Minority Business Development. But by having that position, we had created silos. We constantly ran into battles between that position and sourcing managers. Our decision when the Minority Business Development director left was to not replace that position and instead make economic inclusion a core duty of each sourcing manager. . . A single structure creates no excuses for incompetence," says Maier. University City District, in partnership with the Netter Center, has also recently embarked upon more focused workforce development efforts, including running an apprenticeship program with the University of Pennsylvania Health System for 18- to 24-year-old high school graduates from West Philadelphia, as well as developing a database of entry-level jobs at the institutions in University City.[207]

At Cincinnati, the University's Office of Contract Compliance works closely with the Central Purchasing Department to offer assistance to minority and disadvantage suppliers, although their reach has been limited. This is achieved primarily through administering two state-wide programs: 1) The Set-Aside program, which sets goals for state entities to have 15 percent of purchasing dollars go to state-certified minority business enterprises (MBEs) participating in the program; the University averages six-to-eight percent each year; and 2) The EDGE program (Encouraging Diversity, Growth, and Equity), which sets a five percent goal for goods and services from socially and economically disadvantaged businesses; the University averages four percent each year in this area. By state law, the University is allowed to give a 10 percent economic advantage to certified MBEs for goods and services only. The Purchasing Department keeps a very open bidding process, inviting minority and disadvantaged businesses to visit their office and review old bids, both successful and unsuccessful.[208] Several other Uptown Consortium partners have been closely attuned to workforce development and minority inclusion. For example, University Hospital has been working with the City to form a healthcare workforce development track for underemployed workers within the hospital. The City's Workforce Development Board has adopted this model for tracks in construction.[209]

Yale has done relatively little in the areas of workforce development and purchasing, but has a very strong program in contracting. Michael Morand, Associate Vice President of the Office of New Haven and State Affairs, notes that Yale requires "our contractors to meet the same goals as

the City in terms of local, minority, women, and first-year apprentice hires. These goals are 25 percent for people of color, 20 percent local, the federally determined 6.9 percent for women, and 15 percent for first-year apprentice hires. Yale does $100 million in construction this year. We probably did $200 million last year. Trades jobs pay $25 a hour and include benefits."[210]

Sustaining Participatory Planning and Robust Relationships

All three institutions have spent time developing relationships with their local neighborhoods as well as involved residents and other stakeholders in the planning of their community development initiatives. But, in general, the universities have taken more of a direct leadership — rather than "partnership" — role. Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in the decisions by Penn and Cincinnati to form new community organizations to be their primary "community" partners, rather than choosing to partner with existing community organizations and work to build community capacity. At Penn, the most important of these partners has been the University City District. At Cincinnati, of course, the most important partner has been the Uptown Consortium, along with seven community redevelopment corporations that Cincinnati also set up from scratch. Given the high level of university funding of these groups, it is obvious that, at least initially, these partner organizations served more as outreach conduits than truly independent interlocutors. One explanation for this lack of independence at Penn, of course, is the "emergency" conditions that led to the efforts in the first place. Lucy Kerman, who worked in the Office of the President under Rodin, and coauthor John Kromer note that one reason Penn rejected "a CDC-driven structure was the time required to organize and implement the Initiatives through a separate entity with its own mission, board leadership, and staffing. University leadership was convinced that immediate action was required and that taking the time to establish a nonprofit/CDC leadership and administrative role was not an option."[211]

Michael Romanos suggests that it was declining enrollment linked to poor quality student housing that led the University to take action in the late 1990s. "The only way UC could solve this problem was to work with the community; thus, the first community development corporations in the Uptown were formed," writes Romanos. It should be noted that university officials intentionally allotted themselves non-majority seats on the redevelopment corporation boards in an effort to empower the community, although university leadership and resources in establishing these new organizations (as well as continued financial support) have certainly maintained a certain level of influence and occasionally created tension from differing expectations.[212]

Meanwhile, the Uptown Consortium leaders made explicit goals to include the community in the planning and design process. Three Uptown Summits were held between 2004 and 2005 for the Consortium to interact with community residents, with each Summit growing in attendance. This was one of the opportunities for Consortium leaders to hear about community-identified problems and for partners to collectively identify solutions. Key changes were made in the Consortium's plans based on residents' feedback at the summits. Several town-hall meetings, workshops, and public forums were also held to include residents in the planning.[213] However, these events slowly petered off, and communication between the Consortium and the

community diminished. The first big development was completed, which was a parking garage for Cincinnati Children's Hospital. As Matt Bourgeois, director of one of the redevelopment corporations puts it, while parking was a necessity, this fed the community's fears: instead of the socio-economic goals they were promised, the community saw the institutions' neighborhood revitalization plans as "a conduit for institutional goals." The Uptown Consortium continued to set the agenda and consult with the community only moments before implementation. Over the next couple of years, tension grew between some of the neighborhood organizations and the Consortium.[214]

Yale, too, has relied largely on its own organizations, notably University Properties and the Office of New Haven and State Affairs. However, unlike Penn or Cincinnati, Yale has a long-standing partnership with an independent CDC, Greater Dwight Development Corporation. Yale helped the CDC secure its initial funding through a grant from the Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The CDC has gone on to develop a supermarket in the Dwight neighborhood to the west of Yale's main campus. It has also been an important partner in Yale's efforts to reduce crime through community policing, led the effort to develop a neighborhood master plan, and taken a leadership role in developing neighborhood childcare. To be sure, the partnership has not proceeded smoothly at all times. Greater Dwight Cofounder and Executive Director Linda Townsend-Maier notes that there have been times where some individuals at Yale tried "to control us. They helped create our CDC, but we were not a Yale CDC." Sheila Masterson, a fellow Greater Dwight co-founder agrees: "I remember rumblings that we were Yale's CDC. Maybe that was everybody's version on the Yale side, but we were strong. It's been a learning process from both sides." Nonetheless, the partnership has survived and grown through the conflicts. Greater Dwight staff and community members concur that the partnership has helped achieve broader community goals.[215]

More recently, both Penn and Cincinnati have sought to strengthen their collaborative efforts. Penn, while operating largely outside the framework of existing community development corporations, has long endeavored to include community members in other ways. Particularly important has been its monthly "First Thursday" program, at which community members are invited to share breakfast, listen to a speaker from Penn, and provide critical feedback with Penn administration leaders in the room. D. L. Wormley of Philadelphia's neighborhood-focused intermediary organization, NeighborhoodsNow, notes that, "One of the best things that Penn has done is First Thursday. People are beginning to try to resolve issues."[216]

The Netter Center also has a specific community outreach component, which includes a Center-wide Community Advisory Board, as well as program-specific community advisory groups. The Center's strategic plan, published in February 2008, however, identified the lack of integration of the community advisory board with Center governance as an institutional weakness and called for changes in structure to address that. Center Director Ira Harkavy indicated that in the year since the strategic plan came out, "the Community Board has been getting more aggressive and stronger" and has played a key role in setting the Center's partnership agenda.[217]

More broadly, Tom Burns of Urban Venture Group, who has worked as a consultant with LISC on the Sustainable Communities Initiative-West Philadelphia (SCI-West) program, says that he senses a shift in Penn. There may be, Burns suggests, "an opening to move away from the 'do it our own way' approach to an approach that seeks out opportunity for sensible collaboration that is well aligned with the institution's goals. Potentially it is a much more mature framework in place for sustaining some of this work." Burns suggests the goal of community partnership should be what he labels *shared development*. "It has a planning frame," Burns notes. "Underlying the idea is the principle of shared development that locks anchors and CDCs in a development agenda of mutual interest. I don't think we have that in West Philly at this point," Burns cautions, but he is hopeful that the SCI-West effort could develop in that direction.[218]

In Cincinnati, community groups have responded to past shortfalls by approaching Consortium leaders, including the University, about the need for stronger community representation. This led to a year of dialogue. Much like the Consortium itself, the ability of five Community Councils to come together with a collective voice not only was a significant milestone but also has given community leaders greater leverage. In 2009, the Uptown Consortium partners, in collaboration with the five community councils, re-examined the Consortium's mission. As part of that process, the Consortium committed to increasing community participation in decision-making and to working more collaboratively. One example is that two Community Council representatives have been invited onto the Consortium Management Operations Committee (one rung below the Board, but where key decisions get made). Leadership recognizes that they must still build a way for these representatives to take the messages back to the neighborhood, so everyone is engaged and aware of the process.[219] Going forward, it will also be essential that the University—as a key leader of the Consortium and additional community development efforts—set appropriate expectations to both the internal and external community. "When we first began, we became the solver of all problems regarding economic development, and the community and city began to expect that," reflects Rimai. "We [eventually] came to recognize our own limitations, be transparent about why and how we were doing what we were doing, and communicate that to people in a way that they understood. We've come a long way; we are much more open and much more honest about each other's needs, wants, and abilities. Our partnership has never been stronger."[220]

Yale has modified practices over the years as well. Like Penn, Yale has a "First Thursday" breakfast event to provide a regular monthly site for interaction between community members and Yale administration staff. Unlike Penn, Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs lacks the formal community advisory board structures that Penn's Netter Center has. Another key component of Yale's community outreach worth emphasizing has been close collaboration with city leaders. Here Yale has had a unique advantage that neither Penn nor Cincinnati have enjoyed. As Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships at Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs points out, since the mid-1990s in New Haven, "We've had the same mayor, the same high school district superintendent, and the same university president. That's not to say there haven't been changes under them, but we have these partnerships and these partnerships are stable."

Broadly speaking, Yale's approach has been more initiative-by-initiative, rather than the formal comprehensive efforts launched at Penn and Cincinnati. Associate Vice President Michael Morand characterizes Yale's approach as follows: "You can try the grand-slam approach to urban revitalization—a mega mall or a stadium—but if you can hit enough singles and a couple of doubles, you'll get more runs on the board." Yale's community collaboration efforts likewise largely follow this model.[221]

Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Residents and Neighborhoods

Because of the intense revitalization efforts focused on low-income neighborhoods immediately adjacent to resource-rich universities, all three efforts bear a gentrification—or, to use a less loaded term, displacement—risk. On one hand, all three schools have clear, physical impacts on their communities through real estate investment. All three schools have also made significant investments in community institutions, especially through partnerships with local public schools. On the other hand, the impact on quality of life for residents has been more mixed. Certainly, the neighborhoods are more pleasant, with greater retail availability, improved façades and streetscapes, and improved neighborhood safety. At the same time, there are obvious shortfalls. Except for the construction industry, none are all that strong on hiring locally or providing workforce development. Purchasing, even at Penn, has holes in terms of its effectiveness. More broadly, the poverty rates of the surrounding communities remain high. The cover article in the May-June 2009 issue of *Yale Alumni Magazine* touts the undeniable reality of a "New Haven Renaissance" and yet the same article cites data showing that New Haven's poverty rate has climbed slightly since the mid-1990s and stood as of 2007 at 20 percent. Of course, to be fair, as noted above, reduction of poverty per se was *not* a Yale objective. One is reminded of the comment of Paul Grogan and Tony Proscio in their analysis of the role of community development corporations in reviving the South Bronx, in which Grogan and Proscio observe "that what changed the South Bronx from Fort Apache to a functioning community was not a sudden influx of wealth, but a careful restoration of order." In short, the challenges faced by universities that undertake comprehensive community engagement efforts are not altogether different than the challenges faced by community developers in the United States more generally.[222]

Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale have dealt with these challenges in different ways. At Penn, to prevent a bifurcation of West Philadelphia into "two west Philadelphias," the goal has been to broaden the "catchment" area. To some, this has meant a reduced focus, but to others it represents an opportunity to rebalance and refocus efforts. In the words of a January 2006 internal Penn memo, "The goal of 'engaging locally' includes strategies for both the so-called 'inner' ring (campus to 52nd St, Haverford Ave to the River) and the 'outer' ring (52nd to 63rd, north to Parkside, and inclusive of Southwest Philadelphia), as well as the eastern campus development. Fundamental to Penn's efforts is a commitment to ensuring that long-time residents throughout West and Southwest Philadelphia benefit from developments around campus, and an appreciation of the need to work collaboratively with the community to address their needs and

interests." Various policy changes have been made at Penn to implement this vision, including a shift in the employer-assisted housing program to cover a larger geographical area. Tom Burns of Urban Ventures views the new initiative positively. "I am kind of a hopeful guy," Burns says, "This could be a period when a more mature relationship emerges with the leadership of the community, who are in some ways less angry and possibly more strategic in thinking about how to work that relationship in ways that deliver benefits to the community.[223]

Cincinnati is at an earlier stage in its efforts, but is building on its experiences, both positive and negative, regarding community development. Unfortunately, some of the redevelopment has had unintended consequences: as retail prices increased dramatically, some smaller businesses have been forced to leave; low-income individuals have also been displaced by new market-rate apartment buildings around campus. To avoid some of these consequences, the Uptown Consortium has made several more focused efforts to help existing residents and businesses benefit from revitalization.

For example, with around 16,000 residents and 32 percent of families below the poverty line, Avondale is the second largest, and poorest, neighborhood within Uptown. It is comprised of roughly 90 percent African Americans, unemployment stood at 14 percent in the 2000 census and the business climate has been fairly stagnant.[224] Revitalization in Avondale's Burnet Avenue business district is the result of an $85-million joint project of Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, the Avondale Community Council and the Uptown Consortium. This mixed-use development will have retail on the first floor and house the *Cincinnati Herald* (the city's only African-American newspaper) on the second floor. The architect for this project is an African American who partnered with a local construction company to create opportunities for minority involvement in the construction. According to former Consortium director Tony Brown, "We plan to subsidize about 7,500 square feet of retail to attract small businesses to come back into the neighborhood." Drugs and crime have been a significant problem in Avondale. According to Brown, the Consortium first weeded out businesses that served as store fronts and then, "contracted with the Greater Cincinnati Micro Enterprise, a CDFI, to help existing, legitimate businesses with a business plan, while UC's Community Design Center is helping them work on design plans." The Consortium has also partnered with a residential development firm that attracted $13 million in low income tax credits to build approximately 80 units of affordable rental housing and low-income senior housing in Avondale.[225]

Unlike Penn or Cincinnati, Yale has never made poverty reduction an explicit goal, but its community revitalization efforts continue to evolve in a direction that may hold promise for poverty reduction nonetheless.[226] In particular, a new area of focus at Yale has been sustainability. In 2005, Yale committed to reducing its carbon emissions by 43 percent by 2020 (10 percent below 1990 level). By 2008, it had achieved a 17 percent reduction. To date, much of Yale's effort has focused on improving building energy-efficiency and transportation. However, Yale has also brought its Dining Services in-house to be able to more effectively promote local food purchasing. Ironically, sustainability is often disconnected from community development, but in some areas the push for sustainability may lead to new opportunities to link the two. For example, Yale has an $11 million Dining Services budget. Because of its sustainability goals, it is now seeking

to have 60 percent of its food locally sourced. If implemented, this would mark Yale's first significant foray into local purchasing. Another significant development is the formation of First Community Bank, a local for-profit community development financial institution. Bill Placke, CEO of the Bank, says that Yale has been a major backer of this effort, contributing $2-million in capital and providing major in-kind technical assistance. Yet Placke also sees Yale playing an even more critical role in the future by leveraging its investment capacity. "We need businesses to shift money from big banks to our bank. And one of those businesses is Yale," Placke said. "So that's one other area where I am counting on Yale's help."[227]

Chapter Three: University as Convener

Community Partnerships at Syracuse, Minnesota, LeMoyne-Owen, and Emory

The four schools reviewed in this chapter — Syracuse University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; LeMoyne-Owen College; and Emory University — are marked by their strategic choice to engage in collaborative community development efforts. Not faced with an immediate safety threat (such as Penn, Cincinnati, and Yale), but still embracing their institutional mission, these schools have the flexibility to focus partnerships and resources on the broader community. With the vision of comprehensive neighborhood revitalization, the institutions described here have chosen to adopt a place-based strategy as a part of a larger community engagement agenda, focusing resources on a non-adjacent neighborhood(s), where issues of poverty and economic decline are most acute. (LeMoyne-Owen being the notable exception, as the College is located within its community of need.)

Critically, these institutions have all worked to forge liaisons — both human and physical — to more closely align themselves with the needs and voices of the community. As conveners, these schools bring in community organizations and residents as co-participants in planning and operations, and ultimately as "owners" of neighborhood revitalization. In a similar fashion, these universities help to build capacity among residents and community institutions. Project-based partnerships in health and education are seen at each of these institutions, often in support of the broader community development agenda.

Support from top administration, as well as some degree of institutional alignment, has helped focus university-wide resources on key community initiatives. However, unlike the efforts of Penn, Yale, and Cincinnati, direct corporate investment has been more limited. Instead, these institutions have relied on leveraging public and private funds in support of their community development agendas. The logic of these four schools' strategies is explored in further detail below.

Syracuse University

This is our identity as an institution. Our areas of excellence are completely compatible with the future opportunity of these neighborhoods, so it really is mutually beneficial.

Chancellor Nancy Cantor, Syracuse University[228]

As a private research university that literally sits up on a hill overlooking downtown Syracuse and its surrounding neighborhoods, Syracuse University could easily exist in its distant ivory tower. Indeed, in the early 1990s, Chancellor Shaw took a very intentional move to consolidate the university on its main campus. His thinking was that, if the city fails, Syracuse University could survive. When Chancellor Nancy Cantor—a social psychologist and leader in the higher education engagement movement—arrived on campus in 2004, however, she viewed the university as "an incredible test bed of how a private university, as a place-based institution, could play a role in the public good."[229] Cantor has defined the university's neighborhood as the City of Syracuse. At the same time, the University has demonstrated its public commitment by engaging in very intentional partnerships with two particular neighborhoods in need of revitalization.

The most visible of these efforts has taken place in the Near West Side. In 2007, when the state of New York agreed to forgive universities' loans if the money were invested in an urban economic development project, many institutions simply used the money to build new campus buildings. Cantor instead made the decision to invest in the Near West Side. Syracuse gave all $13.8 million of its Debt Reinvestment Funds (i.e., forgiven loans from the state) to begin a comprehensive neighborhood revitalization effort that seeks to use the power of art, technology and innovation, *in keeping with neighborhood values and culture,* to revitalize the ninth poorest census tract in the United States. Specifically, $8 million was dedicated for property acquisition and renovation; $2.5 million was allocated for architecture, including engaging Syracuse students in urban redesign; and $2.5 million was given to Syracuse's Center of Excellence to improve energy and environmental performance of homes. An additional $5 million was acquired from the Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative, Restore New York Communities grants (awarded by the state to the City of Syracuse), and private sources.[230]

Community revitalization efforts are being directed through the Near West Side Initiative (NWSI), a nonprofit corporation formed as a collaborative network of business, educational, and nonprofit leaders, neighborhood residents, and development professionals. NWSI's Board Chair, Marilyn Higgins, also serves as the Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, whom Cantor appointed to this new university position in 2007. Higgins has been responsible for acquiring 74 abandoned properties in the Near West Side as well as strip of abandoned warehouses. She hopes that her $8 million will leverage another $50 million needed for full construction. For example, debt reinvestment funds have been combined with grants from Restore New York to rehabilitate the Case Supply Warehouse, a 200,000 square-foot, turn-of-the-century structure, to house the region's public broadcasting station along with

artist condominiums and the international literacy organization, Pro-Literacy International. This rehabilitated warehouse — partners hope — will serve as an anchor project for neighborhood revitalization. Although Syracuse provided significant seed funding and is responsible for much of the oversight of the initiative, the University had tried to remain out of the spotlight. "When Nancy [Cantor] came to the first NWSI Board meeting, she said very clearly that this is NOT a University initiative," reflects Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director of the Rosamond Gifford Charitable Corporation, and Co-Chair of the NWSI Board. "This provided clarity from the beginning that partnership was key." It also meant that Syracuse wasn't going to provide ongoing financial support but rather encourage NSWI to become a self-sustaining entity.[231]

The Gifford Foundation is responsible for leading the neighborhood capacity building effort in the Near West Side. This has seen its challenges: with two competing minority populations

Figure 11: Syracuse Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Near West Side Initiative: revitalizing neighborhood through property acquisition and renovation and rehab of existing homes, with a focus on arts and culture, in 11-block area
- South Side Initiatives: efforts towards community-owned businesses

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Support to minority- and women-owned businesses through trainings and mentorship, as well as exclusive bid opportunities (8% total purchasing to MWBEs)
- Convey economic inclusion principles to contractors
- Home Ownership Grant and Guaranteed Mortgage Program extended to Near West Side

Local Capacity Building
- Near West Side Initiative established as independent 501(c)3 with shared leadership
- Southside Innovation Center supports women and minority entrepreneurs (assisted in development of 45 new businesses and profitable turnaround of 58 others)
- South Side Initiatives working to develop food co-op

- Partnership with Gifford Foundation for resident training in Near West Side

Education and Health Partnerships
- Say Yes to Education, in partnership with Syracuse City School District, provides comprehensive services, including promise of free college tuition

Scholarly Engagement
- "Scholarship in Action": more than 400 students and 75 faculty involved in Near West Side Initiative alone
- Tenure and promotion changes to support engaged scholarship
- Imagining America (housed at SU): public scholarship in the arts, humanities and design
- Entrepreneurship Initiative through the Kauffman Foundation

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Connective Corridor: multi-sector partnership creating cultural strip that connects University Hill to downtown
- Leader of Say Yes to Education consortia of more than 100 private and public higher education institutions

in the area, some of the Latino community views the University's and NWSI's efforts as marginalizing. Rita Paniagua, Executive Director of the Spanish Action League and an NWSI Board member, comments, "There is still a long history of distrust and disinvestment. We have a really poor Latino community here. They need to see tangible change — the new houses are a start, but there is a long way to go." A new Latina Cultural Center, which aims to bring university staff, faculty, students, and the Latino community together around culture, arts, and education, is being planned for the Near West Side. Faculty leaders hope this permanent site will signal university commitment to engagement with and access for the Latino community.

Another key member of the NWSI network is Home HeadQuarters, a nonprofit who provides mini-grants to homeowners for green renovations, constructs new homes, and provides apprentice training for low- and moderate-income individuals from the neighborhood interested in the construction trade. Syracuse's Center of Excellence facilitates home audits to determine where the mini-grants could have the most impact, and students help design groundbreaking green technology for the homes. "Centers of Excellence are usually traditional science think tanks; here, we're having a real impact on the neighborhood," comments Ed Bogucz, Associate Professor and Center Director. The Center is largely focused on the 17 percent of existing homeowners in the community. "This neighborhood has been very discriminated against and underserved, so trust with the homeowners is huge," says Bogucz. "We have to keep them strong and engaged, so we can attract new homeowners." A Syracuse graduate student, employed as an "Engagement Fellow" with the Initiative, has visited the small businesses in the Near West Side to explain the Initiative, evaluate their assets and challenges, and invite them to be involved. "We're building on what's there now," Bogucz comments. The Dean of the Law School has also urged the School's Center on Property, Citizenship, and Social Entrepreneurism to help design resident-owned business models for the Near Westside.[232]

Syracuse's second focused revitalization effort is in the South Side. The South Side Initiatives formed in 2005 to connect the resources of the university with the community-identified needs of this neighborhood. "The litmus test for all our partnership projects is, when Syracuse University is no longer there, [can] the community sustain the business or project?" says Associate Vice President Linda Littlejohn. For example, Syracuse matched state funds to develop the South Side Communications Center. This Center will house a community technology room, as well as a new community newspaper, where both Syracuse students and residents will be trained. Ownership and operation will eventually be turned over to the community in an effort to retain talented residents in the neighborhood. The South Side Initiatives is also working towards a cooperatively owned grocery store. In addition, the University's Whitman School of Management operates a South Side Innovation Center that supports women and minority entrepreneurs in the area through one-on-one counseling, workshops, and incubator space. This is part of the South Side Entrepreneurial Connect Project, which, since 2006, has assisted the development of 45 new businesses and in the profitable turnaround of 58 others. [233]

Another key revitalization effort led by Syracuse University is the Connective Corridor. This cultural strip aims to connect University Hill with downtown Syracuse, stimulate economic development, and showcase art, technology, and sustainable designs. A Community Working

Group, representing the City's neighborhoods, arts community, businesses, and nonprofit organizations, has been engaged in all the important steps along the way. "We're looking at all the arts and cultural organizations in the city and finding ways that SU can support them, particularly through leveraging the intellectual resources on campus," comments Eric Persons, Syracuse's Director of Engagement Initiatives. A student artist team from the College of Visual and Performing Arts, for example, developed the innovative Urban Video Project which projects artwork and other cultural video displays daily in three public venues. Another key partner is the Chamber of Commerce who is steering the business development side of the Corridor, including setting up a revolving loan fund for hospitality businesses. Persons says, "We've shied away from development opportunities that do not directly serve an institutional need." The Corridor will extend to the Near West Side, helping to stimulate the revitalization of that neighborhood.[234]

Also tied into the Connective Corridor development, and extending to the Near West Side, is Syracuse's Guaranteed Mortgage Program, which the University has provided for over 100 individuals since its beginning in 1994. The Home Ownership Grant Program—providing a $1,000 grant from SU matched by $1,000 from Home HeadQuarters—also encourages faculty to live in the area.[235]

Syracuse's business office has undertaken deliberate efforts to support disadvantaged women- and minority-owned businesses (MBE/WBE), including training opportunities provided by major contractors and university staff. Contractors are strongly encouraged, but not mandated, to support the institution's goals of inclusion. "We really go above and beyond to assist women and minority business owners," comments Eric Beattie, Director of Campus Planning, Design, and Construction. "We invite them to bid; if they're not successful, then we sit down afterwards and explain how they missed the mark. . .we're trying to get them to a level playing field so they can be competitive." In 2008, eight percent of Syracuse's purchase orders were issued to MBE/WBE vendors or suppliers. In the last three years, 17 different firms were successful in bidding and being hired to perform work on 24 different projects that were set up with opportunities exclusively for MBE/WBE firms.[236]

Internally, Chancellor Cantor aims to further institutionalize university-community engagement efforts through embedding collaborative, cross-sector partnerships in every school and college. These efforts are being substantially supported through a five-year, $3 million grant from the Kauffman Foundation for a Campus-Community Entrepreneurship Initiative. Notably, Syracuse has made several policy changes, including alterations to its tenure and promotion guidelines, to encourage engaged scholarship. Cantor knew that she had to take, head on, the policy and practice implications: "The work can't just be on the back of dedicated staff and faculty. It needs to be embedded in the reward structure, and the mission." Today, "Scholarship in Action" is the bold vision of the entire institution. Put simply, Cantor defines this as "intellectual capital focused outward in a mutually beneficial way."[237]

Higgins emphasizes the leadership of the Deans and the role of faculty/student engagement in making the Chancellor's vision "come to life" and sustaining the initiative: "As courses and projects are developed, and students become regularly engaged in this work, the community realizes that this is not temporary effort but an integral part of the University's culture, and something they can depend upon."[238]

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Perhaps our greatest challenge — and the greatest opportunity — is to strengthen the connection between our research and education missions and the needs of our society.

Robert H. Bruininks, President, University of Minnesota[239]

As one of the nation's public land-grant universities, and one of the few located in a major metropolitan area, the University of Minnesota has been officially committed to "service" for over a century. Yet, like many land-grant institutions, the University of Minnesota developed an academic culture that often ran contrary to the idea of playing a public role. Overcoming organization inertia has proved challenging. Peer faculty interviews conducted at the University of Minnesota by Edwin Fogelman and Harry Boyte in 2001 and 2002 found that the "desire for public engagement in scholarly and other activities was widespread. But an equally widespread comment went something like: 'I could never discuss this with my colleagues.' We found strong norms of silence about that. We also found administrators that were supportive, in part because university support from the state was declining. We had a feeling there was a lot to build on."[240]

Inspired both by a Kellogg Commission for land-grant institutions in the 1990s, as well as internal activists such as Boyte and Fogelman, the University of Minnesota began rethinking its role as an engaged land-grant university. The university's shift towards a vision of itself as an "urban land-grant university" was solidified with a strategic planning process in 2004 that called for an "urban agenda;" this process also established Minnesota's goal of becoming one of the world's top three public research universities by 2014.[241] Although these objectives are complementary in an ideal future, wherein public engagement is used to advance the university's research goals, the country's current academic culture, which remains centered on the publishing of papers in academic research journals, creates some tension between Minnesota's two goals.

Prior to establishing its urban land-grant vision structurally, the University of Minnesota had taken a number of administrative steps to advance its engagement work. One of these was to create the position of Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, established in 2006, responsible for promoting and aligning engagement strategies across the University's five campuses and further institutionalizing public engagement across the research, teaching and outreach functions of the University. Associate Vice President Andrew Force works to transform the University culture in ways that embrace community engagement as a strategy for producing research of significance, conducting quality teaching, and meeting the needs of the local and broader society. Guiding this position is Senior Vice President Robert J. Jones, who has been deeply invested in the University's comprehensive engagement plan and strategic urban agenda.

Across the campus, there are several dozen units and centers that support this new direction. For example, the University's Office for Business and Community Economic Development (OBCED) has an explicit focus on leveraging university assets and resources to improve economic opportunities for underserved minorities. Established in 1999 by the Board of Regents,

"to advance the University's interests in promoting economic development and training opportunities for historically underrepresented groups," the office combines business and community development in a single office — something found in few universities. What guided the office's formation, according to its director Craig Taylor, was the University's acknowledgement that simply relying on undirected university spending to spur community improvement was proving inadequate. "[The University] realized that a focused, intentional, and strategic effort was needed that leverages resources to do much more."[242]

To comply with the Regents' Policy (1999), Taylor created a Small and Targeted Business Program, which, eleven years after its formation, now requires 10 percent of all base contracts to go to minorities and small businesses. Taylor also established formal policies and procedures to make sure these goals became an integral part of the bidding process. For several of the recent, large capital projects the University has set higher goals. Its new football stadium, for example, saw 23 percent of the $300 million project go to women- and minority-owned businesses.

Figure 12: Minnesota Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- University Northside Partnership and new Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC), with focus on education, health, and economic development in North Minneapolis

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Minimum 10% of base contracts to minority- and women-owned business enterprises; 34% inclusion in $2.8 million UROC construction
- Hiring policies for contractors to recruit 29% minorities/women/disabled workers from unions, and local partnerships for apprenticeship training

Local Capacity Building
- Management and Technical Assistance Programs for Small Businesses and Nonprofits through Office of Business and Community Economic Development
- FIPSE grant aimed to enhance capacity and collaboration of existing organizations in three focus areas
- CURA Northside seed grants have linked more than 20 community-identified projects to university resources

- New Business and Technology Center in UROC (includes training and incubator space)

Education and Health Partnerships
- Five Hundred under Five: early childhood intervention program for 500 North Minneapolis children and families
- Medical School Program in Health Disparities Research
- Urban Area Health Education Center designed to introduce youth to health careers

Scholarly Engagement
- Estimated 100 service-learning courses each year partner with more than 200 nonprofits in and around Twin Cities
- Participatory action research with faculty, students, and community residents
- Community Engagement Scholars Program (20 students/year)

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Leading new Regional Higher Education Consortium

These efforts paid off when the University decided to establish its first place-based urban research center in North Minneapolis. The targets set for the renovation of the first Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center set a new standard in this area of compliance. The University's usual bottom line of 10 percent was tripled. By the completion of renovation in September 2009, targets for inclusion of women- and minority-owned business enterprises and for women and minority participation in the workforce had exceeded all expectations at 34 percent.[243]

On the purchasing side, the University has become more creative in negotiations with large contractors. For example, when Time Warner approached the University to bid on cable services for student housing, OBCED negotiated that Time Warner must provide 1) $50,000 in scholarship funding for students of color, 2) $100,000 towards a Management and Technical Assistance Program for Small Businesses, and 3) hire three women or minority interns every year. Taylor says, "We believe that if the contractors can't hire minority people, then we can use seed capital they provide to create programs that will build capacity and provide technical assistance." The University now uses this strategy with many of its preferred vendors: IBM has committed computers, hardware and software, and financial support to provide computer training and technology technical assistance with small businesses and nonprofits. In FY 2008, $75 million of the university's $700-million spend on goods and services went to women- and minority-owned businesses. According to Jones, Taylor and OBCED have "really invoked a different way of doing business for the university," including innovative thinking on minority participation, process transparency, and bidding opportunities.[244]

One of the most strategic elements of the University's urban-focused engagement approach was the creation of the University Northside Partnership, which grew out of the University's new urban vision and a series of town hall meetings wherein the community in North Minneapolis expressed its concern over the University's recruitment of a very high profile researcher who wished to work in this urban community. While there was substantial support for the University's presence, there was a small but vocal minority who felt they had not been consulted enough, resulting in a number of protests that grew into a series of difficult dialogues in community meetings with the University. "People were really nervous that the university was going to come in and then leave once they got what they needed," reflects Sherrie Pugh, Executive Director of the Northside Resident Redevelopment Council.[245] After much discussion, and with the support of a community vote, the University Northside Partnership was formed to not only convene community residents and organizations of North Minneapolis with university faculty and staff, but also to bring representatives from city and county government to the table.[246]

Out of this set of relationships, President Bruininks and Senior Vice President Jones proposed to the University's governing board the idea to establish the first Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC) as a way to anchor the University's presence in the community and to deliver on its mission as an urban research university. UROC focuses on three core areas identified through community discussions and votes: education, health, and community and economic development. Underpinning the University's approach is participatory action research, through which community residents are engaged as collaborative partners

working alongside university faculty and staff. This approach has begun to build new, respectful, reciprocal, and sustainable relationships between the University and the North Minneapolis community.

The university administration made a significant financial investment through its purchase of a 21,000-square-foot shopping center to house UROC. The University used money from its general funds to purchase the building at fair market value of $1.25 million from the Northside Resident Redevelopment Council. The University invested an additional $2.8 million to renovate the facility and provides an annual operating budget (inclusive of salaries) for UROC of $900,000. The Center also attracted external support before it opened. In fall 2007, a three-year, $750,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) supported the creation of UROC by fostering partnerships in the areas of health, education, and economic development. In addition, OBCED received a $300,000 Empowerment Zone grant in fall 2007 to establish the Business Tech Center now located in UROC.

The establishment of UROC in the Northside community takes the University's urban mission formally and physically to the community. UROC founding Executive Director Irma McClaurin envisioned the building itself to represent a commitment to collaboration. In an early interview she stated, "With UROC we are forging new terrain, [facing] a new frontier if you will, and we're trying to figure out the best way to do that. . .We can't just replicate the University's Research and Outreach Centers that serve rural Minnesota. And we're not a social service. We are truly trying to establish a partnership where we can be good neighbors. We believe in this place [the Northside] and we're here to stay."[247] The University hopes that its physical presence in North Minneapolis will continue to leverage both public and private investment in the area.

UROC opened its doors in October 2009, with a grand opening in May 2010, and currently houses new and existing university-community partnership programs, including The Center for Early Education and Development's "500 Under 5" early childhood intervention program; The School of Medicine's Center for Health Equity (funded by NIH and significant resources from the University); the first Urban Area Health Education Center designed to introduce youth to health careers; Extension programs in urban youth development, nutrition education, and family development; and the University Northside Partnership Community Affairs Committee. OBCED's new Business Tech Center is also located in UROC, and provides programs in youth entrepreneurship, small business training, and computer training and refurbishing. The programs at UROC are intended to eventually reach all urban corridors throughout the Twin Cities area. In the words of Senior Vice President Jones, "Since North Minneapolis is where these issues are most acute, we are introducing best practices for our urban engagement here."

Minnesota is also looking to other partners to help drive development in the Northside. "The University wants to inspire, support, and make sure all the issues are addressed, but not do all of the addressing itself," comments UROC's strategic plan consultant Reynolds-Anthony Harris of the Lyceum Group. In agreement, Jones says, "We will need support from our partners—city and county government, business, and the philanthropic and non-profit communities—to sustain these efforts." One such partner, Erik Hansen of the City Department of Community

Planning and Economic Development, observes, "UROC is a physical presence that signals commitment, and there is great potential for the programming to really make a difference in the community... There is a nice rapport happening with organizations working in [North Minneapolis] right now—community, city, university, philanthropic—this area hasn't seen that type of commitment in a long time... But you can't undo 40 years of neglect in a three-year project. Only time will tell."[248]

Looking towards long-term collaboration, individuals across the University are beginning to better appreciate how community and cultural knowledge can complement academic knowledge. One faculty member described the desired interaction as "vital involvement," with the goal of meaningful engagement where all participants are open to change. There is also a strong sense of having all partners involved in framing the research questions and providing an opportunity for the community to "own the data." Faculty member Sarah Axtell, who holds the relatively new position of Community-Campus Health Outreach Liaison, speaks about the need for universities to think about the capacity for internal transformation: "In five-to-ten years, how will the campus be different? Unless there is reciprocal transformation, it is not a true partnership." [249]

LeMoyne-Owen College

> We knew that the College was going to go through changes. As people saw community buildings go up [through the work of the CDC], it has kept hope alive that LeMoyne-Owen wasn't going to close. Most people didn't know they were separate entities. The LeMoyne-Owen CDC is something that the College can be proud of, because it's attached to it and it brings credibility.
>
> Minister Suhkara, Community Activist, Soulsville, TN[250]

LeMoyne-Owen College is situated in the heart of south Memphis, Tennessee, and is tied closely with the identity of its local community now known as Soulsville. Like many historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) across the country, LeMoyne-Owen College has provided critical educational and economic opportunities for thousands of African Americans. Indeed, for over one hundred years, the overwhelming majority of Memphis's black leadership came from LeMoyne. Through the realization of integration, particularly at public institutions, however, many HBCUs are struggling to find their niche today. In the early 2000s, LeMoyne-Owen came close to losing its accreditation due to decreased enrollment numbers and significant financial difficulties. The work of the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation has played no small part in this HBCU's survival.

LeMoyne-Owen has always been a strong partner with its community, providing needed resources and outreach in K-12 education and public health programs. In 1989, the

College established the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation (LeMoyne-Owen CDC) to institutionalize its commitment to community investment and improvement. However, it was another 10 years before the CDC hired its first Executive Director, Jeffrey Higgs. From 1999 through 2009, Higgs helped the College secure seven HBCU grants from the Office of University Partnerships at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as well as raise over $150 million in public and private funds. The CDC has an annual budget today of nearly $5 million and serves as the leader of revitalization efforts in the Soulsville community.

As local neighborhood association president, and former LeMoyne-Owen CDC employee Eric Robertson explains, the CDC was established as "the branch to extend the College's arm to the community. We were out there doing education and workshops to the community; we brought the College to the people and made it seem more accessible."[251] Indeed, LeMoyne-Owen College has developed a strong reputation for community development because of the work of its affiliated CDC. The CDC, in turn, has led the effort to re-brand the community—formerly known as LeMoyne Gardens after a large public housing development in the area that was torn down in 1997—as Soulsville, marketing the community's rich history and assets.

Figure 13: LeMoyne-Owen Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Establishment of the LeMoyne-Owen College CDC, which focuses on housing, community, and economic development

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Modest efforts to direct purchasing to support local supply chains

Local Capacity Building
- Revolving loan fund supports emerging small businesses
- Business Development Institute has graduated 800 people and created 75 businesses and 183 jobs
- Career Express Program has trained 502 people in highway construction, with a job placement rate over 70%
- Neighborhood residents hired for an estimated 80% of local development projects
- Homebuyers' training for residents

Education and Health Partnerships
- CDC's Family Life Center provides after-school programs and social services
- Health and Wellness program engages college students as health ambassadors and community peer educators (e.g., delivering asthma education series to more than 200 parents in public or low-income housing)
- Student teachers work with local schools
- Public high school on campus that provides college credit

Scholarly Engagement
- Small service-learning program
- Community-based participatory research; community service included in faculty evaluation

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Partner with City for low-income housing development

Since the hiring of Higgs in 1999, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC has become increasingly independent. In 2001, the CDC began acting as its own fiscal agent, and in 2004, it completely took over management of its accounts. "We think we have a model that works well," says Higgs, "because it insulates the College from a lot of stuff—exposure, liability, etc.—and the community benefits from a lot of things that the College might not otherwise want to be involved in, because they are focused on their mission of education."[252] The CDC's programs and activities, meanwhile, have been concentrated in three core areas—housing, community development, and economic development.[253]

Taking on its first major real estate development—and elevating its work to "an entirely new level of sophistication"—in 2003, the CDC began acquiring properties for the four acres of land where the $11.5 million Towne Center project is now located. The CDC envisions that the building will be 77,000 square feet when complete, with about 30,000 of that occupied by a new, locally owned grocery store. Roughly 30 percent of the remaining space is to be reserved for community residents to have storefronts. Retail and mixed-use commercial space is planned for the first floor, including clothing stores and a food court. "We hope to have goods and services at the Center for residents and visitors that rival anywhere in the county," says Higgs. A 100-seat call center is planned for the second floor, established by the Veterans Corp and National Economic Opportunity Fund. This will provide opportunities for veterans and local residents to start at entry-level jobs and be trained for more advanced skills and salaries. In the spring of 2010, the CDC staff moved to the new space, and the regional health clinic will soon follow. All in all, the CDC expects the Towne Center to create over 200 jobs. The CDC is working on a façade program with existing small businesses in the area to be able to compete with the new retail.[254]

The Towne Center aims to be an anchor in bringing sustainable, mixed-use and mixed-income development back to Soulsville. An 11-house subdivision is being built adjacent to the Towne Center to be sold at market rate for middle-income families. With the model home pre-sold for $250,000 in 2007—in a neighborhood with an average sales price of around $33,000 in 2000—the CDC's efforts certainly seem to be catalyzing the market. Investment into the project includes $2 million from the CDC's own equity, $500,000 from a federal appropriation, $2 million in New Market Tax Credits and another $5 million in personal debt from Wachovia Bank, private funds, as well as other federal, city and county resources. The LeMoyne-Owen CDC will retain 100-percent ownership of the building. "This is truly a public-private partnership," comments Higgs. "It is also the first major development in the area, so it is important for us to see it through."[255]

To support local entrepreneurs, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC runs a Business Development Institute. An average of 30 students enroll every quarter in the 10-week course that is offered for free to residents in Soulsville and throughout Memphis. This program is directed by the CDC's Chief Financial Officer, Dr. Austin Emeagwai, who also serves as an assistant professor of accounting at the College. (Emeagwai teaches two courses at LeMoyne-Owen but receives release time to serve in this capacity at the CDC.) Besides Emeagwai, who also has a private CPA practice, professionals from across the city teach the business courses. Funded through a Small

Business Administration (SBA) Program for Investment in Micro-Entrepreneurs (PRIME) grant, at least 50 percent of the grant dollars must go to low-income individuals. The LeMoyne-Owen CDC's program exceeds these expectations, serving approximately 75 percent low-income, 70 percent females and 90 percent minorities. Since 2002, 800 people have graduated from the program, and 75 businesses and 183 jobs have been created. When the Towne Center is complete, the CDC plans to offer incubator space for seven emerging small businesses.

As part of their SBA grant, the CDC is also a micro-lender for West Tennessee. In its early years, the CDC's revolving loan pool experienced an 80-90 percent repayment rate. As of February 2007, the CDC had made 33 loans valued at roughly $830,000. Over time, however, some entrepreneurs went out of business. The CDC now has $700,000 in outstanding loans, and thus, has not been able to make many new loans in recent years.[256]

For the past four years, LeMoyne-Owen CDC has been collaborating with the Tennessee Department of Transportation on a statewide job-training program funded through a grant from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Working in the Soulsville neighborhood in Memphis, and in three other cities across the state (with local CDC partners), LeMoyne-Owen CDC provides a 16-week program in life skills and on-the-job training in highway construction. The program is geared towards recipients of Tennessee Assistance for Needy Families, high school drop-outs, and ex-offenders. In four years, the program has served 502 individuals, with a job placement rate over 70 percent; in 2009, the placement rate exceeded 80 percent statewide.[257]

Higgs hopes to create wealth for Soulsville residents through homeownership. To date, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC has built 14 new affordable homes in Soulsville, and rehabbed seven others (with most of this work completed from 2002 to 2004). The CDC provides extensive homebuyers training with residents to prepare them for ownership, and thus, according to the CDC leadership, the recent foreclosure crisis has been less acute for their "clients." The neighborhood as a whole has been unable to avoid this national trend. Community input—formalized through the Community Action Coalition—has helped shape the CDC's activities. For example, the CDC initially intended to build multi-family rental development, but the Coalition indicated that the community instead wanted more single-family homeownership opportunities; the CDC heeded this request. The CDC's next real estate initiative will likely involve redevelopment of 18 lots, many of them vacant, at the entrance to the neighborhood from downtown.[258]

Within the College, service-learning courses and other scholarly activities engage LeMoyne-Owen students and faculty from multiple disciplines. A Health and Wellness Program, for example, engages college students as health ambassadors who conduct community-based participatory research. Students also serve as community peer educators through the Partnership for Asthma Trigger-Free Homes, a program in partnership with Abt Associates to provide educational workshops to families in public and low-income housing. "We create leadership opportunities for our students and set expectations for their involvement in the community," says Sociology Professor Dr. Femu Ajanaku.[259]

The CDC is looking to further institutionalize its collaboration with the College, partly by expanding its student internship program—through which students participate in a semester-long paid internship with the CDC or another local community group while often receiving

service-learning credit — as well as developing a stronger community development curriculum to be offered at the college. For now, there remains great opportunity to more strategically align the College's outreach efforts (let alone its existing capital expenditures) with the community development work of the LeMoyne-Owen CDC; however, many of these outreach programs have weakened in recent years because of financial and staffing limitations at the College. As LeMoyne-Owen College implements its 2008 Transformation Plan, they are looking to increase their community engagement efforts, and "claim a leadership 'niche' in urban higher education by building on our expertise in teaching urban students and catalyzing urban community development."[260] First, however, they must continue to build their enrollment and guarantee survival. Meanwhile, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC seems well positioned to help gradually transform Soulsville into the vibrant, mixed-income community it was 50 years ago.

Emory University

> *What we have done is select five-to-six communities that are our focus areas, where we can pair community-based [scholarship and learning] with our investments to better meet the needs of our neighborhoods. Not in two years, not in five years, but over a decade or more, then we'll have a long enough longitudinal set of data to know if we are succeeding. [So far], no one has had the patience to stay the course long enough to know what works or what doesn't.*

> Earl Lewis, Provost, Emory University[261]

Geographically speaking, Emory and LeMoyne-Owen are not so far apart. And yet, the differences between the two schools are vast. At LeMoyne-Owen, the school's endowment stood in 2010 at an estimated $12 million. By contrast, Emory's endowment ranked 16th in the nation and its endowment stood, even after the 2008 financial crash, at $4.3 billion. Another key difference: LeMoyne-Owen in the pre-civil rights era was the leading school for educating Memphis' black leadership; Emory was home to Atlanta's *white* elite. In fact, Emory still sometimes finds itself having to downplay its old reputation as the "chill on the hill."[262] Despite these differences, however, Emory has gradually moved to prioritize black Atlanta in its community development strategy.

Unlike Minnesota, Syracuse, or LeMoyne-Owen, Emory to date has no signature multi-million dollar projects. The one major exception to this came as a crisis response. Recognizing the critical role that Grady Hospital (at which roughly a third of Emory medical faculty work) plays in providing health care for Atlanta's least fortunate, Emory agreed in December 2008 to forgive $20 million of the $62 million in debt it was owed from the hospital as part of a community effort to restore the hospital to fiscal health. Emory's action is particularly remarkable

considering that it came just months after the September 2008 world financial panic had sent endowment values tumbling.[263]

At Emory, the notion of service has a strong "echo," in part because Emory comes out of a Methodist tradition. Although highly secular today — Theology Professor David Jenkins claims that most students would ask "What's Methodist?" if one mentioned Emory's religious denomination — Emory remains home to the Candler School of Theology, which enrolls approximately 425 divinity students in its 3-year program. The Candler School itself requires all of its first-year divinity students to do eight hours a week of a non-church ministry, which involves a mix of pastoral and social service work. Service sites include three area hospitals, Metro State Women's Prison, the Poverty Rights Center and the Decatur Cooperative Ministry, a homeless shelter.[264]

The Candler School is hardly unique in its service work. The School of Nursing at Emory requires that all students, be they undergraduate or graduate, have "a service-learning experience at least once in their academic career." Campus-wide, 24 percent of Emory College undergraduate students engage in "community-benefiting activities" as part of their coursework. At some of the professional schools, these numbers are much higher — Nursing, of course, is 100 percent since community learning is a School requirement, but numbers are also high in Theology (87 percent) and Public Health (85 percent).[265]

Figure 14: Emory Anchor Strategies

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization
- Moving towards place-based strategy in neighborhoods of Greater Atlanta

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment
- Focus on sustainability: 48% of produce purchased locally

Local Capacity Building
- Support to existing community development organizations, with continuity provided through OUCP
- OUCP hires from within the community development community
- Community Building and Social Change Fellows Program involves multi-year ongoing partnerships
- $20 million debt forgiveness to help maintain the viability of Grady Hospital, Atlanta's leading charity hospital

- Resource development in immigrant communities, such as immigrant radio station (Sagal Radio)
- Neighborhood indicators and data provision for community development initiatives

Education and Health Partnerships
- Individual faculty projects, loosely coordinated

Scholarly Engagement
- Service-learning participation high: 24% college-wide; 100% School of Nursing; 87% Theology; 85% Public Health

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships
- Community development partnership effort led by community foundation in formation
- Partnership Center hosts Equity Atlanta, a public policy and foreclosure mitigation coalition
- Developing urban health initiative with local place-based foundation coalition

While Emory's service numbers are impressive, the path from "presence" to "impact," as Emory's Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Strategic Partnerships Alicia Franck puts it, has been complicated.[266] Indeed, Emory has pursued two paths that have operated largely independently of each other. One, the Clifton Community Partnership, aims to improve relations with Emory's immediate, largely middle-class neighbors. Meanwhile, Emory's community outreach and partnership center has focused on building relationships in low-income neighborhoods.

The Clifton Community Partnership, as Emory's Associate Vice President of Finance David Hanson explains, was prompted by the fact that Emory for years "had not had the best relationship with the community." The Clifton initiative, which focuses resources within a three-mile radius of Emory, was formally established in spring 2006. The Partnership has helped plan an 870-unit housing project (with 20 percent of the units set aside as below-market rates), has conducted planning charrettes that have resulted in many neighborhood streetscape projects, and coordinates an advisory council that oversees Emory partnership programs with the local schools. Hanson estimates the initial annual cost to Emory at close to $1 million a year. Now, Hanson says, the need for expensive planning consultants has diminished, but the university continues to pay about $500,000 a year for core staff.[267]

While the Clifton Partnership has focused on Emory's immediate neighborhood, the Office of University Community Partnerships (OUCP) has concentrated on the more impoverished sections of metro Atlanta. Founded in 2000, in its early years, OUCP was a small center with three full-time staff and one part-time employee. In 2002, OUCP began to run an innovative program directed at community building and social change. The exact shape of that program has changed over time, but the basic theme of having a small, dedicated groups of students, guided by faculty and graduate students and working in teams on intensive summer projects has stayed fairly consistent. Community Building & Social Change Fellows now receive a stipend of $3,500 to work 32 hours a week during the summer (an effective wage rate of roughly $9 an hour) as well as free housing and a summer tuition waiver.[268]

The fellows' projects vary, but they are designed in close consultation with community partners—indeed, the three 2009 project teams each worked in one of the three priority areas identified by Atlanta's place-based funders (including the Community Foundation of Greater Atlanta and three foundations that have concentrated grants in these neighborhoods). One year's projects at Emory build on previous years. Kate Grace, OUCP's Director of the Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program, notes that, "In the first few years, there were open calls for proposals. Now we have shifted to longer-term partnerships with community groups. This has benefits for the students—they can see how they fit into a longer continuum—and it also better matches the needs of the organizations." Indeed, two of the three focus areas in 2009 were also focus areas in 2002. As Nathaniel Smith, OUCP's Director of Partnerships and Research for Equitable Development, puts it, "It is how we operate as OUCP. . . We build relationships with the community."[269]

In 2006, Emory's administration committed to invest $12 million over five years to boost OUCP's ability to link Emory with the community. This has enabled OUCP to expand its staff from three-and-a-half to 13, and they have given priority to hiring employees who have worked

with community groups and thus are able to serve as effective liaisons or translators between the university and the community worlds.[270]

Adding staff has allowed OUCP to boost its capacity in two key areas: 1) data analysis, such as the ability to use geographic information systems (GIS) mapping tools, which enables OUCP to be a key data supplier for community groups, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies working in Atlanta neighborhoods; and 2) convening and community outreach. For example, in 2008, OUCP agreed to act as the host of "Equity Atlanta," a regional alliance of community groups, nonprofit organizations and government agencies, which are working with the national group PolicyLink on issues of regional equity and equitable development in metropolitan Atlanta. Recently, Equity Atlanta helped spearhead efforts to ensure that funds provided by the 2009 economic stimulus bill reached disadvantaged neighborhoods.[271]

The level of trust OUCP has built up among community groups is impressive and has enabled OUCP to play a broker role that few universities are positioned to provide. "People are showing a greater willingness to coordinate their activities," notes OUCP Director Michael Rich. "Our role is to provide research, data, and try to work as a matchmaker. Where are the communities in most need? Can we find a way to develop a holistic coordinated approach? Can we help build local capacity for planning and action?"[272]

At the same time, Emory faces broader challenges as it struggles to implement a new, more focused, place-based approach. Rich notes that, in 2008, Emory "had school projects involving 42 school districts and 350-plus schools across Georgia. We are now trying to adopt a place-based strategy that better aligns Emory's resources with [communities and schools] that need help and assistance." In particular, Emory has chosen to focus on five geographic areas: Edgewood, East Lake, Pittsburgh-Mechanicsville (or, more broadly speaking, Neighborhood Planning Unit V),[273] Northwest Atlanta, and Clarkson in central DeKalb County. The first three neighborhoods correspond with areas of focus of Atlanta's place-based funders (two family-based foundations and the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Atlanta Civic Site), while Northwest Atlanta and Clarkson represent two other neighborhoods where OUCP has been engaged since nearly its founding. The Emory administration is on board with the approach. David Hanson, Associate Vice President of Finance, notes that these days, when one talks about community at Emory, "We are normally talking about Greater Atlanta. It is a balanced approach. In the early years, we focused a lot on the immediate community relationships [in the Clifton Road Corridor], which were not great. Now we think more broadly.[274]

Looking Across the Cases

Creating an Engaged Community

Syracuse, Emory, and Minnesota are immediately surrounded by middle to upper-middle income neighborhoods. Yet all three have chosen to focus university resources in non-adjacent, underserved and impoverished communities as a part of their broader engagement agendas.

Syracuse University has taken on the entire city as its 'neighborhood,' most visibly seen through its leadership in the Connective Corridor, while maintaining focused neighborhood initiatives in the South Side and Near West Side. Minnesota also takes on a view of the larger community. As Andrew Furco puts it, "We are the only research university in all of Minnesota, and a public institution—ultimately, we have responsibility to address issues across the state."[275] The University also partners with the neighborhood organizations and business associations directly surrounding its campus, through the University District Partnership Alliance. Minnesota's urban efforts, on the other hand, are being manifested through its work in North Minneapolis—a community located six miles from campus that is one of Minneapolis's most diverse and most economically challenged. Whereas Syracuse has intentionally designed the Connective Corridor to extend to the Near West Side, as well as expanded their employer-assisted housing programs to the area, University of Minnesota's homebuyers program is focused exclusively in the University District, and—beyond the recent placement of UROC in North Minneapolis—there have been no other efforts to physically connect the campus and the Northside community.[276]

For many years, Emory has engaged in partnerships with the surrounding upper-middle class Druid Hills and Clifton Corridor neighborhoods, which has absorbed considerable time and energy. Emory, especially through OUCP, however, has begun to direct its mission—and resources—to target specific low-income neighborhoods in Greater Atlanta. Unfortunately, Emory's failure to do this before 2009 has reduced the impact of interventions, as well as limited opportunities for institutional resources to be strategically invested.

LeMoyne-Owen College stands alone amongst this group, as the work of the LeMoyne-Owen CDC is focused almost exclusively on revitalizing the community surrounding the campus now known as Soulsville. As President of the Community Foundation of Greater Memphis, Bob Fockler, puts its, the College is "in and part of this" historically underserved neighborhood, which has a strong African-American heritage and soul music legacy, and is located just a couple of miles from downtown Memphis.[277] The connection between the welfare of LeMoyne-Owen College and its community is more immediate than at Syracuse, Minnesota, or Emory.

Establishing Partnership Programs and Goals

Syracuse, Minnesota, and LeMoyne-Owen are reaching towards comprehensive neighborhood revitalization, while Emory's efforts are more focused on neighborhood capacity building. Education and health partnerships are strong at all four of these institutions, as is some degree of service-learning or scholarly engagement. Some of these curricular and project-based partnerships are in support of the larger community development agenda; others are only loosely connected. Neighborhood and nonprofit capacity building is prioritized among all institutions in this cluster.

Syracuse University's engagement initiatives, in particular, maintain strong principles and rhetoric of sustainability and community ownership. The Near West Side Initiative in Syracuse builds on the strengths of each member organization and the assets of the neighborhood. "NWSI has strong institutional partners, with their own missions and their own tools," comments

Higgins. "Instead of the traditional process of setting up a 501(c)3 (hiring a Director, etc.), we decided, no, let's make sure the resources are really going into the neighborhood. So the five main entities each dedicate staff to work on this effort." The University marches forward with real estate development, home renovations, and student and faculty engagement, while the Gifford Foundation has taken on the process of community capacity building. "There is a constant tension trying to keep residents' voices heard, but keeping the engine going around real estate development," says Goldfarb-Finding. "You have to really balance the capacity needs of the neighborhood with very real economic needs. Neighborhood development takes a long time; real estate development, relatively, takes no time at all."[278]

Syracuse has also taken on the largest education initiative amongst this cluster, through its partnership with Say Yes to Education and the Syracuse City School District. In this district-wide program for public school students, university volunteers and interns provide mentoring, curriculum, and even legal support, according to Rachel Gazdick, Executive Director for the Say Yes to Education Syracuse Chapter. Syracuse also leads a network of 23 private institutions and nearly 100 New York public institutions to offer a free college education for any student who graduates through the Say Yes program. By building stronger schools and a stronger workforce, Syracuse Say Yes to Education intends to serve not only as a model of urban education reform but also of urban economic development.[279]

Prior to the establishment of the University Northside Partnership or the Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center, the University of Minnesota's Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) had been involved in North Minneapolis for 40 years. CURA is the University's oldest center for institutionalized community engagement efforts, founded to match community requests with university resources, particularly responding to the "demands" from low-income and minority communities, many of which were located in the Northside.[280] The launch of the University Northside Partnership (UNP) in 2005 signified the first university-wide, administrative-led, collaborative effort with the community. After much discussion with the community, the Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC) was then established to serve as the anchor mechanism through which university resources could be coordinated in North Minneapolis.

Minnesota's commitment to an urban vision is manifested through UNP and UROC and is focused on three key areas identified by the community as priorities—education, health and wellness, and community and economic development. Those involved in UROC, and others like CURA with its deep connections to North Minneapolis, hope that matching community-identified priorities with university resources will enable them to strategically see solutions to the complex and most pressing issues facing North Minneapolis and other urban communities in the Twin Cities, and track measurable outcomes. This alignment is not always easy; according to a report prepared by the Lyceum Group, faculty have their own agendas, and when establishing new university-wide centers, there is sensitivity as to who was doing what first.[281] Some programs have chosen to keep their distance from the effort to coordinate urban engagement at an institutional level because they have already established their own relationships and partners in the community and would not necessarily benefit from greater university alignment.[282]

On the other hand, the Lyceum Report suggests that the community would like to see greater coordination of the University's efforts, and have better access to the reports and findings that result from individual research projects.

Emory's community development partnership efforts have had transformational effects on partner organizations. Andy Schneggenburger, Executive Director of the Atlanta Housing Association of Neighborhood-based Developers, the City's association of community development corporations, explains the reasons for Emory's high standing. "The ability to have access to the resources of Emory through OUCP is a tremendous help," Schneggenburger notes. "They are very aware of the resources that they have and the importance of not enforcing an approach or attitude towards community work. They are very congruent in the need to let the community's voice be heard and play a primary role in the decision-making process."[283] But while Emory's OUCP office has strong connections to community groups, OUCP is just beginning the process of coordinating partnerships in specific regions to achieve more concentrated impact. At present, many Emory health and educational partnerships, for example, are individual faculty projects that are loosely coordinated, rather than strategic interventions.

LeMoyne-Owen College's community development efforts are directed through its affiliated CDC, while the College oversees opportunities for students to be engaged in service-learning, health and education outreach, and urban leadership. In addition to its housing and economic development activities, the CDC runs a Family Life Center, providing after-school programs and social services, particularly for boys with behavioral problems. With a strong teacher education program, the College also provides tutoring and student teaching to local schools as well as operates a public high school on campus that provides minority students an opportunity to earn both a high school diploma and two years of college credit.[284] Because of the focus on the Soulsville community, these efforts present a holistic approach to neighborhood revitalization; however, the activities of the College and the CDC remain largely distinct.

Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision

To a large extent, Minnesota and Syracuse have aligned their institutional priorities for engagement, from top administration through partnership centers to faculty and staff. Due in large part to its size and broad land-grant mission, however, Minnesota continues to have urban-focused partnership efforts that remain diffuse and disconnected; the establishment of UROC as a coordinating entity is an attempt to correct this situation and invest strategically in local urban communities. Emory's community partnership center and the LeMoyne-Owen College CDC, on the other hand, have strong support from their administration, but remain largely independent in their focused missions and activities.

When Nancy Cantor became President and Chancellor of Syracuse University, she pushed a new philosophy throughout the university: that scholarship in action was critical to a vibrant local community and economy, and mutually beneficial for the institution and its partners. This took Syracuse to a new level, although many throughout the university were already committed to community engagement and economic inclusion. "This has always been a belief of ours;

no one had to sell this to us, but it did take on a new emphasis with Cantor. It became more of a priority for the entire institution," comments Louis Marcoccia, Syracuse's Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. Marilyn Higgins' role as Syracuse's Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development puts her in a critical position of power for bringing the university's resources to bear on key community initiatives. And, as Chair of the Near West Side Initiative Board, Higgins provides critical oversight of the real estate development in this community, as well as engages faculty, staff and students in the comprehensive revitalization efforts. "Our students are deeply engaged in the NWSI. . . in real problem solving — feet on the ground — engaged scholarship. I would estimate that over the past three years the number [of students involved] is close to 400."[285]

Minnesota's President and Senior Vice President are committed to public engagement and to their urban vision in particular. "It's not enough to be a land-grant . . .we have to more strategically focus our resources and expertise with the community and with others' resources and expertise," says Senior Vice President Jones. Jones was appointed by University President Bob Bruininks, who took his position in 2002, and whose scholarly work in child psychology has made him a strong leader for community engagement. Central to a new policy adopted by the Board of Regents in governing university purchases was creation of the Office of Business and Community Economic Development (OBCED). Bruininks' and Jones' no-tolerance policy on discrimination has further supported the OBCED Director in creating innovative and sustainable initiatives. Probably the most significant change that has occurred at the University, which has not been replicated elsewhere, is the Board of Regents' approval of changes to the tenure and promotion policy to now include scholarship that promotes "ideas of significance and value to society" and teaching that is "not limited to classroom instruction" among its criteria for tenure and promotion.[286]

Emory's community partnership center has significant support from the administration and a growing budget, despite university-wide cutbacks. The Center's Director, however, is not an Associate Vice President (as seen at many of the other institutions in this study), which inherently limits some institutional alignment. Moreover, at least until this was clarified in 2009, there had been some conflict and confusion in Emory's strategic direction with respect to the community between those who emphasize relations in the narrow three-mile radius of campus and those who see a mission to serve the needs of the disadvantaged neighborhoods of Greater Atlanta.

When President Burnett Joiner established the LeMoyne-Owen CDC in 1989, it was originally staffed and operated by the College Dean and faculty on a part-time basis. Although the initiative received strong support from top administration, little was achieved without dedicated staff. Now a distinct entity from the College, the CDC has maintained a leadership team of at least six full-time staff. The College President and two vice presidents sit on the LeMoyne-Owen CDC's Board of Directors. "One of the big advantages is that the CDC doesn't have to wait for our College Board to meet to move its ideas and projects forward," remarks President Johnnie B. Watson. Beyond board representation and limited involvement of faculty and students in

CDC programming, there is no formal structure in place through which the College is involved in the CDC's community development work.[287]

Securing Funding and Leveraging Resources

Financial commitments towards community development from the four institutions in this cluster, while limited in comparison to Penn, Yale and Cincinnati, are still significant and have attracted major public and private investments. University trustees have also continued to play a strong role. According to Chancellor Cantor, Syracuse's Trustees "get the idea of a place-based institution, both the pragmatic and ethical responsibility." They were excited about the $13.8 million loan repayment being redeployed to the Near West Side Initiative (NWSI), which has attracted significant public and private investment. Trustees also raised $350,000 in tuition scholarships for Say Yes to Education when the state fell through on providing these funds. Cantor has learned, however, that, "In an economic crisis, you have to hone in on the rhetoric about why this work is good for the institution. When we're talking about salary freezes, but still carrying out our neighborhood initiatives, I have to explain." Although significant in-kind support will continue to filter through Higgins' office, the Center of Excellence, and other faculty, the NWSI hopes to be self-sustaining.[288]

Minnesota made a significant financial investment of over $3 million to purchase and renovate the new UROC building, and an additional $900,000 annually for UROC's operations. Half of the Office of Business and Community Economic Development's $1.5 million budget also comes directly from university administration (with the other half coming from grants and contracts). Most recently, the University used over $700,000 of its own resources to serve as a match to a federal grant proposal. In December 2009, Minnesota was the only university to receive funds through the Department of Commerce Broadband Technology Opportunity Program. The $2.9M grant will be administered through UROC in collaboration with OBCED and a community partner, Minnesota Multicultural Media Consortium. The three-year grant provides for nine existing public computer centers in empowerment and enterprise zones in Minneapolis and St. Paul to receive new equipment, furniture, training, and staffing, and for two new centers to be established, including one in a public housing facility. This "demonstration model" also will result in job creation for community members as UROC Broadband apprentices.[289]

LeMoyne-Owen College began the work of its CDC with modest operating funds nearly 20 years ago. In the last ten years, they have received seven HBCU grants (most recently, $800,000 in 2009) as well as raised nearly $150 million. Starting in 2001, the CDC has acted as its own fiscal agent, with the College serving as the conduit through which HUD HBCU funds could be accessed. "The HBCU funds still have the least restrictions, which is a major advantage," says Emeagwai. "They've allowed us to acquire, demolish, build, and purchase assets." The CDC's largest real estate effort, the $11.5 million Towne Center project, has brought in numerous public and private resources, including $7.3 million from Wachovia through New Market Tax Credits and their own debt. "It is still a challenge that it requires so much public investment to

attract the private sector," comments Robert Lipscomb, Director of City of Memphis Division of Housing and Community Development and Executive Director of the Memphis Housing Authority, as well as Chair of LeMoyne-Owen College's Board of Trustees. The College's financial support for the CDC has primarily involved in-kind donation of office space, utilities, and technology support. Regarding the College's investment into community development, Lipscomb adds, "We would like to see the College even more involved: more technical assistance to small businesses, more summer programming for kids and families. . . But it's a matter of resources—how to identify the dollars to do that. The Trustees have bigger concerns right now—mainly, can we sustain this business model for the College? It's about survival."[290]

Emory's community partnership center has support from the administration and a growing budget. Staff has grown from 3.5 to 13 since 2002. Their budget has also grown to over $2 million a year, and, in 2009, when other departments got cutbacks, the administration reaffirmed its support and held funding nearly constant, though small cuts in funding did occur.

Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion

Both Syracuse and Minnesota have taken very deliberate efforts towards economic inclusion, and are using their economic and purchasing power to create opportunities for local, minority and women business owners. "When utilizing small, inexperienced contractors and vendors for the first time, the University is required to provide significantly more supervision effort," says Marcoccia of Syracuse. "Until practices and processes are fully understood by both parties, the chance is greater for error or misunderstanding. By increasing communication and physical supervision efforts, practices and processes become routine. . . We had concerns in the past of whether [economic inclusion programs] would work, but now we are pretty confident."[291]

Inspired by the University's new urban vision, Minnesota's Office of Business and Community Economic Development has created unprecedented policies and goals for the university's capital projects, purchasing/supply chain, and job creation. Director Craig Taylor aims to leverage university assets and resources—intellectual property, research, and technology transfer—to impact the quality of life in local communities as well as shift the university's business practices. The unusually high targets (over 30 percent) set for the renovation of UROC, in particular, can serve as a model for how the University can be inclusive—every aspect of UROC's development involved community engagement.

Emory University, on the other hand, has not given much focus to the impact of its business practices on local or underserved populations. There are some institutional efforts to buy food locally, but (like Portland State) they largely focus on sustainability—an important issue at a campus that has the most square feet of LEED-certified buildings of any university in the United States—rather than community economic development. Ciannat Howett, Emory's Director of Sustainability notes, "We are trying to flex our muscles in the marketplace in relationship to food to influence what supply is available. We certainly aren't to our 75 percent goal yet, but we have a written plan, we are working with our food vendor . . . it is in process—we've increased our purchases of local food significantly, especially produce—48 percent of produce is locally

purchased." But Howett concedes that purchasing is "one of the areas we have done the least at Emory historically." Ozzie Harris, Senior Vice Provost for Community and Diversity at Emory also acknowledges that Emory is still at the early stages of aligning its business practices with its partnership work, but wants to move in this direction. "Hiring, recruitment, temporary service, procurement—we should at least take the easy steps," Harris says.[292]

Because LeMoyne-Owen's community development efforts are directed through its CDC, all related activities are geared towards creating local economic opportunities. Its new Towne Center, for example, plans to create over 200 new jobs, incubate new businesses, and provide services for all residents. "We've said to the tenants that we expect you to hire locally. It's in the language to [our funders]. Urban economic development is about hiring locally—that's what we do," says Higgs. Through agreements with contractors, the CDC has also helped employ residents from the neighborhood on an estimated 80 percent of local development projects. The College itself now owns a decent amount of property in the neighborhood, including a recent purchase of a vacant lot for new student dorms, which they turned over to the CDC to develop and manage—a $5 or $6 million project. Although the CDC has reached great measures of success in building economic opportunities, leaders agree that more must still be done to build local wealth through workforce and business development.[293]

Sustaining Participatory Planning and Robust Community Relationships

All four of these institutions have spent time developing relationships with their local neighborhoods as well as involved residents and other stakeholders in the planning of their community development initiatives. At Syracuse and Emory, in particular, the institutions have strived to be invisible in their partnerships—the focus is on the partner and the community, not the university. Nancy Cantor's first year at Syracuse was called "Discovering the Soul of Syracuse." She spent her first 16–18 months on campus going to church dinners and neighborhood gatherings and listening to the voice of the community. "She told them, 'Where we have excellence and can have impact, we will work with you. It's good for us, and its' good for you, and we want it to be sustainable'," reflects Bogucz.[294]

"We've seen in other cities that when the university is the gorilla in the room, people are just habituated to go with what they want. Not here. [In Syracuse], there is a healthy give and take. The university provides a fulcrum through which strategy and vision can be catalyzed through resources they have that wouldn't otherwise be available," comments Frank Caliva and Kevin Schwab from the Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York.[295]

As discussed previously, the University of Minnesota spent over two years in dialogue about the potential of having a physical presence in the community before UROC was agreed upon. Although the community's desire to establish a community benefits agreement has yet to be realized, the University has established several activities that have provided ongoing opportunities for communication and collaboration. UNP work groups, FIPSE work groups, the Community Affairs Committee, and participatory action research groups are four specific initiatives that engage community residents, who work alongside university faculty and staff,

on focused neighborhood projects. Most significantly, UROC's strategic planning process to set direction for its first three years was inclusive of community voices from beginning to end. Guided by a Futures Conference model, led by founding Executive Director Irma McClaurin and Erline Belton of the Lyceum Group, the strategic planning process included a two-day conference attended by over 50 community residents, leaders, and elected officials to envision what UROC might be in the future. Afterwards, an Action Planning Team comprised of 15 members (of whom the majority were from the community) crafted six goals, a set of belief statements, and the guidance partnership principles that are the cornerstone of UROC's three-year strategic plan. In draft form, the plan has been shared with those who attended the original conference, focus groups, as well as faculty. At every stage, a draft of the plan was available on line for everyone to follow its development. "Transparency is what we have aimed for, in the building (which has glass windows in the front and back), and throughout the strategic planning process," says McClaurin.[296]

Critical to effective communication and trusting relationships is having "translators" on staff. In this vein, LeMoyne-Owen College perhaps has the most direct relations with its community. President Johnnie B. Watson grew up across the street from his current office in the LeMoyne Gardens housing project. He and his five sisters all attended LeMoyne-Owen. Minister Suhkara A. Yahweh, who has played a significant role in the evolution of the College's community development initiatives, has been a community activist for several decades. Managed expectations and strong communication have helped keep residents content. "This community understands that development takes time," says the Minister. "I also let them know about road blocks. They feel they have input, and it keeps our efforts visible. After 41 years here, I've got my fingerprints on all changes. I have a reputation and respect in this community."[297] Although the LeMoyne-Owen CDC Director himself is not from the neighborhood, Higgs spent his first months on the job meeting all the leaders from the community and establishing relationships. He also formalized the Community Action Coalition, a group of resident stakeholders who advise and guide the work of the CDC.

Notably, Emory's Office of University Community Partnerships has always valued the role of translators. With its expanded budget and staff, OUCP has hired from within the community development community. They also ensure continuity in their partnerships and have been very effective in building nonprofit capacity. Their Fellows program, for example, involves small teams of undergraduates working with three nonprofit partners each year, which has provided ongoing connections with many of these community-based organizations. Guided proposals for students and faculty, rather than open calls, has also helped ensure continuity and increase impact. This has helped establish Emory's OUCP as a trusted partner with Atlanta-area CDCs, a phenomenon unknown to many universities, even if Emory as a whole still has not fully lived down its reputation as the home of the Atlanta elite.

The University of Minnesota has several community liaisons with community organizing backgrounds. One of these people is Makeda Zulu-Gillespie, university-community liaison for the University Northside Partnership and UROC, whose involvement started when she was working as a community organizer for a CDC in North Minneapolis. When the University

approached the CDC about working together, she helped initiate critical meetings between the University and the larger community. Zulu-Gillespie now co-chairs the Community Affairs Committee, which serves as the working body of the UNP, along with a community resident. The UROC building will also serve as a "physical translator" between the University and the North Minneapolis neighborhood.

Another physical translator is Syracuse's "The Warehouse," a former furniture warehouse at the western edge of downtown and neighboring the Near West Side, which the University purchased and renovated in 2005 — an action driven by the vision of Mark Robbins, Dean of the School of Architecture. The Warehouse now serves as a multi-use facility that brings 600 students, faculty and staff into the central business district on a regular basis. Syracuse's Office of Community Engagement and Economic Development (overseeing the NWSI and the Connective Corridor), as well as COLAB (a new interdisciplinary initiative based in the College of Visual and Performing Arts) are housed at the Warehouse. In addition, twenty percent of the building space is reserved for community activities, including a gallery for local artists and a lecture hall for public events. Robbins also initiated an international design competition that has led to construction of three of the nation's most innovative green homes in the Near Westside.[298]

Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Residents and Neighborhoods

With goals of comprehensive neighborhood revitalization, these institutions must be patient in their desires for change in the quality of life and economic opportunities for local residents. The LeMoyne-Owen CDC's perseverance and leadership over the last 10 years has begun to realize tangible impacts. "I measure our success by per capita income. In 1999, it was $8,000 in this neighborhood," says Higgs. "Now, it is $13,500 and climbing." Tk Buchanan, Senior Research Associate for the Center for Community Building and Neighborhood Action at the University of Memphis, confirms that "the 'poorest of the poor' [in the zip code containing Soulsville appear to] have also made progress: in 2009, 47.3% of tax filers made less than $10,001; yet, in 2000, that figure was higher, at 68%." The CDC continues to work to increase homeownership and support workforce and business development in Soulsville. "The goal is to be self-containing, self-sustaining, and self-maintaining," says Minister Suhkara. However, the community has not been able to escape national trends resulting from the subprime mortgage and foreclosure crisis. Buchanan observes, "Before the foreclosure crisis, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC was among the most proactive, effective CDCs in our city and did great work creating homeownership opportunities for their service area. Post-housing-disaster, they're bailing water as fast as they can, but this knocks them (and their homeownership agenda) back a few decades." Despite these setbacks, significant community development and re-branding efforts led by the CDC have caused attitudes towards Soulsville (and, by default, LeMoyne-Owen College), both within and outside of the community, to slowly but significantly improve.[299]

This reputation change in Soulsville is something that UROC hopes to create in North Minneapolis. The building and investment into UROC signals new levels of commitment from the University; however, the potential is yet to be fully realized. According to UROC's strategic

plan consultant, Reynolds-Anthony Harris, one challenge is that the need in North Minneapolis is so great, and the University needs to focus on just a couple of attainable goals that can be realized within the first three years of UROC's opening. "The University has to remind itself to go slow to go fast," says Harris. University leaders hope that their physical presence in the Northside will build community infrastructure, stimulate commercial development, and attract other organizations to set up satellite offices. They made a strong initial investment by having more than 30 percent of their $2.8 million renovation for UROC be awarded to women- and minority-owned businesses. The University is now beginning to leverage this opportunity to meet broader social and economic challenges of the community.

Syracuse's work throughout the City, and particularly the Near West Side, is also young, although they have made great strides in only a couple of years. "Through the Connective Corridor, we're already seeing development by private developers. But we have to be patient for change. . . The University is playing an increasing leadership and catalytic role," say Caliva and Schwab. In the Near Westside, new homes have been built, old homes have been greened, abandoned warehouses are being renovated, and residents are being engaged in the efforts. A city agreement has allowed for a seven-year tax exemption for the vacant lots being redeveloped with subsidized funding through NWSI; this is an effort to protect current homeowners. Of course, some are concerned about the sustainability of using public dollars to subsidize new development. The hope is that, in seven years, revitalization will create greater economic prosperity for everyone in the community through newly created jobs and greater real estate values. "You can never underestimate how much patience and persistence this work takes," comments Daniel Queri, a private developer and consultant to NWSI. "We can't go just to go. We have had to execute our plans with real discipline."[300]

Emory's work so far has been more process than outcome-oriented — as well as less geographically-focused — and hence difficult to measure. On the one hand, the strong relationships that OUCP has built with community-based organizations, particularly in the East Lake, Edgewood, and Mechanicsville-Pittsburgh neighborhoods, have enabled it to take a leadership role in convening a number of Atlanta community forums, particularly geared to foreclosure issues, equitable development, and the 2010 census. But while OUCP's efforts are increasingly focused on specific neighborhoods, the greater University's community work has not yet gotten there. Emory's strong relationships leave it well positioned but still aware of the challenge ahead. "You need internal change agents," Emory Provost Earl Lewis observes. "Major movements of institutions require these. Ten years from now we are likely to be part of the way to where we would like to be."[301]

Section Three:
Best Practices

As can be seen from the vignettes and comparative analyses presented in the previous section, the ten universities selected for this study have demonstrated highly innovative and effective approaches to community engagement. Here, we describe in further detail some of the best practices found among these ten universities for key anchor institution strategies aimed at community development:

- Comprehensive neighborhood revitalization;
- Community economic development through corporate investment;
- Local capacity building;
- Education and health partnerships;
- Scholarly engagement; and
- Multi-anchor, city, and regional partnerships.

We also describe best practices in navigating through several of the major issues faced when implementing this work:

- Institutionalizing an anchor vision;
- Securing funding and leveraging resources;
- Building a culture of economic inclusion; and
- Sustaining participatory planning and robust community relationships.

Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization

Penn — Institution-Wide, Multi-Pronged Approach

For more than 20 years, the University of Pennsylvania has partnered with its West Philadelphia neighbors to improve the community surrounding campus, beginning during the administration of President Sheldon Hackney in the mid-1980s. Much of this collaboration has been led by the Netter Center for Community Partnerships, which directs resources from across the university — particularly the academic and human resources of its faculty and students — to improve the quality of life in its local community, and the University Center District, a business improvement district organization that focuses on promoting public safety, streetscape and façade improvements, and retail development. Community development efforts peaked in 1996 when President Judith Rodin launched the West Philadelphia Initiatives, a university-led, multi-pronged approach to restore and revitalize the neighborhood.

The Initiatives sought to simultaneously address five critical areas: safety, housing, commercial and real estate development, economic development, and education. As stated in Penn's *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization,* "To address and tackle the challenges of the community, a tactic of Penn's strategy was simultaneous action of addressing all of the most pressing issues facing the community. Success depended upon mitigation in all areas, as ignoring any area could potentially undermine all other areas."[302]

Notably, this multi-pronged approach committed the university, as an *institution,* to revitalizing the surrounding neighborhood by linking its academic and research expertise with significant financial commitment and policy changes. Penn collaborated with neighborhood residents and businesses as well as other anchor institutions to determine mutually beneficial goals for revitalizing West Philadelphia. Still, the University took a clear leadership role in driving the Initiatives forward. As Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director of University City District, puts it, "Penn is not the only game in town, but Penn's the leader. It's the engine of the region." The West Philadelphia Initiatives became a top university priority, with responsibility delegated across all of Penn's major administrative departments. Within each of the five focus areas, Penn and its partners established innovative and efficient tools to achieve its goals, many of which are still in effect today, such as University City District and "Buy West Philadelphia," a supplier diversity program to support locally owned businesses. At the same time, Harkavy recognizes that the University's role in broader West Philadelphia (i.e., both the neighborhoods that were and were *not* part of the Initiatives) still has much further to go to address

---

Figure 15: Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization at Penn

Strategy
Coordinated tools to transform neighborhood surrounding campus, including University City District retail development and Netter Center for Community Partnerships programs

Key Features
- Enlist leadership from the top
- Create institution-wide engagement (academic, corporate, human resources) in focused geographic area
- Simultaneously address all critical community issues
- Use public schools as centers for community development efforts

"the still deep, pervasive poverty and highly-inadequate schooling that characterize much — if not most — of West Philadelphia."[303]

Penn's work has continued to evolve under the leadership of President Amy Gutmann. For example, the Netter Center for Community Partnerships has received growing support under Gutmann — to the tune of nearly one million dollars in annual operational funds as well as a ten million dollar endowment from a Penn alumnus. Each year, the Netter Center supports nearly 50 Penn faculty in teaching academically based community service courses, which engage over 1,300 students in solving universal problems of education, health care, and poverty as they are manifested locally in West Philadelphia. The vast majority of these students, along with hundreds of community work-study students and student volunteers, work with the Center's university-assisted community school programs, which reach nearly 5,000 low-income children, youth, and families each year. The university-assisted community school strategy assumes that "public schools can function as environment-changing institutions and can become the strategic centers of broadly based partnerships that genuinely engage a wide variety of community organizations and institutions." As Cory Bowman, Associate Director of the Netter Center puts it, "What we're really interested in is systemic university-community change."[304]

Penn has also worked with the University City District, the William Penn Foundation, local elected officials and community organizations to stimulate commercial and economic development on two commercial corridors, Baltimore and Lancaster Avenues. Revitalization on Baltimore Avenue includes a 5-block area where partners have done façade improvement, business recruitment, and pedestrian lighting. Wendell comments, "It's a real success. . . Baltimore is all ma-and-pa businesses. The African community is quite strongly represented." As of 2007–08, 98 percent of University City's available retail space was leased or committed (compared to 75 percent in 2003–04). West Philadelphia residents have filled more than half of the jobs created by Penn's retail planning and development.[305]

In examining the lessons learned from Penn's comprehensive approach, a few key factors stand out. First, leadership from the top is critical to linking the different initiatives as well as actively engaging the full resources of the university (corporate, academic, human, and cultural); second, linking academic work to focused community work provides the legitimacy to have staying power even as administrations change; third, the public school provides a valuable focal point to locate efforts in the community; and, fourth, focusing retail and commercial development on supporting local business can have a powerful job creation impact.

Syracuse — Revitalization through Coalition Building and Using Institutional Strengths

Syracuse University has taken a different approach to neighborhood revitalization than Penn, but has demonstrated an equal commitment to improving the quality of life for its neighbors. Building on the specific strengths of their institution and their region, arts and green technology are at the forefront of Syracuse's partnership efforts. Like Penn, Syracuse's projects "are large in scale and complex in partners; engage faculty and students in work that furthers their disciplines while addressing pressing issues of the community; and draws collaborators from all sectors including business, neighborhood, government, schools, and not-for profit organizations," as Chancellor and President Nancy Cantor described in a 2009 article.[306] Distinct from Penn, however, Syracuse has tried to stimulate neighborhood revitalization in a way that directly enhances community capacity. This is seen, for example, in their collaboration to establish the Near West Side Initiative as the vehicle for neighborhood transformation. "We're all committed to the Initiative becoming part of the neighborhood; neighborhood leaders will eventually be running the show," says Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director of the Gifford Foundation.[307]

> **Figure 16: Revitalization through Coalition Building at Syracuse**
>
> **Strategy**
> Near West Side Initiative — a non-profit network of community organizations, institutions, and businesses investing into 11-block mixed-use development effort — and Connective Corridor cultural strip
>
> **Key Features**
> - Draw collaborators from all sectors (business, government, neighborhood, schools, nonprofits)
> - Build on strengths of institution and community (e.g., arts, culture, technology)
> - Focus on community capacity building and ownership

The Near West Side Initiative (NWSI)'s activity was jump-started through a financial commitment from President Cantor in 2007: $13.8 million from the state, which the University had received for "debt forgiveness," was reinvested directly in the effort. Although the University is a lead partner, NWSI operates as an independent non-profit network of community organizations, institutions and businesses. Other lead partners include the Gifford Foundation, Home HeadQuarters Inc., the City of Syracuse, the Syracuse Center of Excellence, National Grid, and local residents. "We are a team," says Marilyn Higgins, Vice President of Community Engagement and Economic Development. "I chair the Board, but it is full of strong leaders. We all assign staff to volunteer for the Initiative."[308]

The NWSI strategy is focused on commercial, residential, and mixed-used economic development in an 11-block area. The University's $13.8 million, for instance, was used to acquire and renovate 74 abandoned properties and a strip of abandoned warehouses. The University raised $2.2 million in federal funds and asked housing partner Home Headquarters to use it to purchase and renovate the residential properties while they concentrated on the commercial buildings. The University's Center of Excellence is also engaged in home rehabilitation through implementation of sustainable green technology, including rain gardens and super-insulated

walls. Redeveloped warehouses are being designated for mixed-use facilities, including a green technology incubator and artist live-work space. These efforts are aimed at restoring the residential and commercial vibrancy of the neighborhood while keeping with community values and culture. Like Penn, much of the development is also focused on building schools as community centers. The Gifford Foundation has helped promote inclusive planning and community capacity building, including through residents' meetings and leadership trainings.

A second part of Syracuse's strategy that focuses on community and economic revitalization through art, culture, and technology is the Connective Corridor, "a signature strip of cutting-edge cultural development" connecting University Hill to the city below, which Syracuse is developing with local, state, and federal partners. The Connective Corridor aims to demonstrate the interdependency between campus and community by featuring art, technology, and sustainable designs developed by Syracuse faculty and students working in partnership with community artists and residents.[309]

Syracuse's revitalization efforts are younger than Penn's and much of the impact remains to be seen. In the meantime, Syracuse must continue to nurture its inclusive practices. Jan Cohen-Cruz, Director of Imagining America and a member of the Connective Corridor Working Group, comments, "Syracuse's campus-community partnerships are grounded in genuine recognition that people whose knowledge comes from different sources bring different assets to the table. Like anchor institutions everywhere, we face the built-in challenge of keeping the partnerships equitable even as [the University is] perceived as bringing more financial resources." "It is definitely a balancing act," echoes Eric Persons, Director of Engagement Initiatives at Syracuse. "So much is about building relationships. We have to use SU's weight strategically."[310]

Looking at Syracuse's approach to comprehensive neighborhood revitalization offers a number of innovative ideas that could benefit other university's embarking on similar work. Two of the most notable features include: first, creating an independent network of community organizations, institutions and businesses to lead the effort, which allows for reciprocity, shared ownership and greater accountability; and second, building on the existing strengths and assets of both the university and the community, which allows limited resources to be used more efficiently.

Community Economic Development through Corporate Investment

Minnesota — Leveraging Contracting Dollars

The University of Minnesota has partnered with city government, community-based organizations, unions, and general contractors to implement innovative strategies for minority and women inclusion in all University construction projects. Established by the Board of Regents in 1999, the Office for Business and Community Economic Development (OBCED) oversees these initiatives, and with the more recent establishment of Minnesota's urban vision and its first Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC), these practices have become increasingly focused on *local* economic inclusion. In conjunction with Capital Planning and Project Management, OBCED requires general contractors to establish levels of participation for targeted businesses at the start of every project. Director Craig Taylor's "boiler plate for all bid packages" requires 10 percent of base contracts to go to minority and small businesses. "This is a goal-based program [with] strong compliance — we have had a 96–97 percent success rate, and we probably have one billion dollars in construction going on now," comments Taylor. This effort is facilitated and monitored by a monthly compliance report all contractors must submit to OBCED.

> **Figure 17: Leveraging Contracting Dollars at Minnesota**
>
> **Strategy**
> Office for Business and Community Economic Development, which oversees minority and women inclusion in university construction projects, and an Urban Agenda that has re-focused efforts
>
> **Key Features**
> - Require general contractors to establish levels of participation for targeted businesses; raise targets when opportunities arise
> - Set inclusion requirements for union construction workers
> - Provide apprenticeship opportunities, with help of local partners

The Office for Business and Community Economic Development also works with general contractors to employ minority and women construction workers on University capital projects. Most of the projects are unionized, so Minnesota has set inclusion requirements for specific groups from the union: 15 percent unskilled minorities; eight percent skilled minorities; four percent women; and two percent disabled. "This forces construction groups to move past the hierarchy of unions," notes Taylor. OBCED and UROC have recently teamed up with a number of local trade schools and workforce development programs to provide apprenticeship opportunities for minorities. "The fact is that there are a minimum number of on-the-job hours to become journeyed, and then become unionized, and many minorities haven't been able to meet that. By setting inclusion requirements [for our capital projects], they can log those hours on the job," says Taylor.[311]

With Minnesota's recent focus on urban engagement, efforts have begun to far exceed Taylor's "boiler plate." For example, the University's $300 million stadium dedicated 23 percent of the contract towards women- and minority-owned business enterprises (WMBE). "We also gave a contract to Summit Academy [a nonprofit educational and vocational training center] to train 14–16 apprentices; once they matriculated through, we hired them," says Taylor. The

$2.8 million renovation of the first Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC) in 2009 then raised the bar, with a minimum target of 30 percent for WMBE construction services. By the completion of renovation in September 2009, targets for WMBE inclusion and for women and minority participation in the workforce had exceeded all expectations at 34 percent. Notes founding Director Irma McClaurin, "UROC's presence, and President Bruininks support [for an urban vision] has allowed for the 'usual ways' of university business to be changed dramatically."[312]

Although Minnesota has had economic inclusion principles for University construction in place for some time now, their recent experience points to the new possibilities afforded by a university-wide vision of urban engagement. In addition, their success demonstrates the importance of setting specific goals and targets for levels of participation and ways to benchmark the progress. Finally, by focusing locally and enlisting other local partners, the University has been able to expand its efforts for community economic development, including a new workforce development program.

Penn — Local Purchasing

Penn launched its "Buy West Philadelphia" program in the 1980s. Since then, local procurement has grown from roughly $1.3 million a year to $94.8 million. "What we have made is an institutional decision that economic inclusion is one of our top business priorities. Each year we have set goals institutionally. Our sourcing managers, in part, are compensated by how well they do," says Ralph Maier, Director of Penn Purchasing.[313]

Tracking the impact of local purchasing, however, is difficult. Steven Williams, Executive Director of Partnership CDC, located in West Philadelphia, offers a skeptical assessment, claiming that the "community is not tapping into the economic benefits." To be sure, "local" purchasing as measured by Penn includes a seven zip-code area, a region that includes nearby Southwest Philadelphia, which has a higher concentration of business activity. Maier identifies two major restrictions to the program's impact specifically on West Philadelphia:

> **Figure 18: Local Purchasing at Penn**
>
> **Strategy**
> Buy West Philadelphia: supplier diversity program promoting procurement of goods and services from local vendors
>
> **Key Features**
> - Establish robust local purchasing goals and compensate staff on performance
> - Mentor local vendors to help become "first tier" suppliers on large contracts
> - Leverage results by working with other anchor institutions
> - Work with local organizations to reach out to minority vendors

"West Philly is largely a residential community. Small mom and pop businesses don't have the capacity to handle the kind of products we buy. The other major restriction is, because of technology and the priority of cost containment, we needed to shift focus to doing business from small to larger business. How do we match contracting opportunity with qualified suppliers?"[314]

Nonetheless, the initiative has had a major impact. Wormley, although critical of Penn for not doing more to encourage purchasing specifically within West Philadelphia (as opposed to

the broader seven zip-code region), concedes that Penn's focus on local purchasing has brought some benefits to the community. "Telrose is probably the biggest success story," Wormley says. As Maier explains, "Office Depot had a minority partner [Telrose] doing delivery and customer service. We negotiated a flip on ownership of our existing office supply contract with Office Depot and created an opportunity for this partner to become a national tier one supplier. In the 1990s we did a similar flip with Staples."[315]

Maier estimates the Telrose contract alone is worth $4.8 million a year; Penn has also worked with nearby Drexel University to shift $1.8 million of its orders to Telrose. Wormley notes that Alpha Office Supplies, University Copy Services, and some West Philadelphia catering businesses have also benefited from Penn's local purchasing initiative. Maier adds that some efforts, such as promoting minority purchasing in research departments, are less visible, but provide tangible benefits; he estimates that these efforts alone boosted Penn purchasing from African-American-owned businesses by $5.5 billion.[316]

In recent years, Penn has looked to partner with nonprofit organizations. Maier reflects, "We realized that supplier representatives were intimidated by coming into the purchasing office." In response, beginning in 2007, Penn Purchasing has worked with the Minority Business Enterprise Center, which hosts an event with 20–25 of their certified suppliers. University purchasing staff attends and goes through a series of interviews. "It creates a more productive environment for negotiating purchasing agreements," says Maier. "Vendors are more at ease. It also creates greater awareness of what's going on in the community and greater awareness of the university in the community. We expect greater results going forward."[317]

Penn's local purchasing initiative, which has been sustained for more than two decades, offers a number of lessons. First, setting local purchasing goals and tying rewards to achieving these goals is essential. Second, to succeed requires a long-term vision that mentors local vendors by, for example, starting them as "second tier" suppliers that can later "move up" to "first tier." Third, you can leverage results by working in concert with other universities and anchor institutions. And, fourth, partnering with nonprofit organizations can help meet local vendors "where they are at" and hence extend the program's overall impact and success.

Local Capacity Building

Emory — Supporting Community Organizations

Community Development Corporations (CDCs) in Atlanta did not have much of a presence until the late 1990s, at which point they had "a very scattered history of capacity and performance," according to Michael Rich, Director of Emory's Office of University and Community Partnerships (OUCP). "Emory by choice does not have a CDC of its own, but supports existing CDCs," notes Rich. For example, since 2002, OUCP has run a Community Building and Social Change Fellowship Program. Each year approximately 15 student Fellows are selected for the year-long program that combines study in the classroom with real work in the community. As program director Kate Grace explains, "It begins in the fall. There's a foundation course open to all students. This is done for two reasons. First, it's tough for students to make a year-long commitment and sign on to a specific community partnership sight unseen. And, second, it's tough for us to identify students who are appropriate for the program." In the

Figure 19: Community Capacity Building at Emory
Strategy Office of University and Community Partnerships: use of students, faculty, and staff to build capacity of community organizations through partnerships and research **Key Features** • Develop year-long fellowship program for continuum of engagement • Engage partners in extensive front-end planning • Be proactive in designing collaborative interventions at critical moments • Hire staff with backgrounds in community organizations

spring, there is a second course, open only to those students who have applied and have been accepted to continue in the program, that is focused on developing the work plan students will use during the summer for their collaborative community building project. During the summer practicum, the third course in the sequence, the fellows [perform] 32 hours a week of project work in collaboration with their community partners, with input from faculty, staff, and grad students."[318]

   While the program began with open calls for proposals from community partners, OUCP soon began cultivating potential projects with community partners in order to ensure a set of activities that would both provide a variety of neighborhood contexts and issues as learning opportunities for students and ensure that the projects were feasible for students to complete over the summer, as well as provide a tangible contribution to advance the work of the host partner organizations. The program also began mapping out specific partnership goals in the spring. "We start that negotiation early, so the students are already three months into their relationship with their community partners before they start the summer project," says Grace. In 2009, one student team worked with community members in the East Lake Terrace neighborhood to develop a comprehensive neighborhood action plan. A second team worked with two public schools in the Edgewood neighborhood, conducting focus group research to help the schools and their community partners address the causes of enrollment decline. A third team worked on compiling a profile of a group of five neighborhoods near Turner Field (including

Mechanicsville and Pittsburgh) to assist their community partners in gathering the data needed to bring a green job-training site to the area.[319]

Emory has also provided more direct assistance to building the capacity of Atlanta's small network of CDCs. Andy Schneggenburger, Executive Director of AHAND (Atlanta Housing Association of Neighborhood-based Developers), comments, "We enjoy the collaborative nature of working with OUCP. . . They are very congruent in the need to let the community's voice be heard and play a primary role in the decision-making process as opposed to imposing a structure." In 2008, OUCP worked with AHAND to conduct interviews and listening sessions with Atlanta CDCs to help the CDCs identify their strengths and weaknesses during a very trying time financially. "The survey allowed us to get our heads around how bad the [financial] crisis was for the 9–12 CDCs theoretically still functioning. We needed to figure out a way to partner in an ad hoc situation. We conducted the survey in August 2008. It allowed CDC leaders to anonymously share where their funding was pre-2007, and now, and how many staff members were going unpaid. It was an important profile for the industry, and a very appropriate role that Emory could play," says Nathaniel Smith, OUCP's Director of Partnerships and Research for Equitable Development. "We could then let the leadership of AHAND deal with the information. The result has been many facilitated conversations regarding what the industry might look like in the future."[320]

The strong relationship between existing CDCs and Emory's OUCP is notable, particularly because the rationale often given at other schools for *not* working with existing CDCs — i.e., lack of CDC capacity — was obviously not absent in Atlanta. Emory's work over the past eight years, however, shows that a sustained effort to build CDC capacity can achieve results. Keys factors have included: first, a willingness to engage in highly detailed, front-end design work in developing community partnerships; second, keeping the university's "ear to the ground" and taking a proactive role in designing collaborative interventions at critical moments, such as with the foreclosure crisis; and third, hiring staff who have experience working with community groups. For example, both Grace, the fellowship program director, and Smith, who worked on the foreclosure-response effort, hail from community organizations themselves.[321]

Education and Health Partnerships

IUPUI — Supporting Community Schools

IUPUI's work with local community schools launched in January 1998, when the University's Office of Neighborhood Partnerships received a COPC (Community Outreach Partnership Centers) grant, in collaboration with the Westside Cooperative Organization, to focus on several areas of community revitalization. At this time, the neighborhood high school had been closed for academic failure. The newly formed Westside Education Task Force, after visiting model schools across the country, presented the Indianapolis Public Schools Superintendent with a plan — to reopen Washington High School as a community school. The school began with middle school grades and slowly phased back in high school grades. In 2001, IUPUI became one of 20 schools to receive a replication grant from the University of Pennsylvania to adapt its university-assisted

> **Figure 20: Supporting Community Schools at IUPUI**
>
> **Strategy**
> Westside Education Task Force: collaboration to develop community schools in neighborhood
>
> **Key Features**
> - Participate in inclusive stakeholder group with ongoing dialogue
> - Adapt programming to fit needs and interests of students, families, and broader community
> - Demonstrate loyalty during adversity (e.g., school closings, principal turnover)

community school model. The partnership grew from there: George Washington Community School teachers took graduate level classes at IUPUI to implement service-learning into their classrooms; IUPUI students begin serving as math and literacy tutors through the federal America Reads/America Counts program; and undergraduate scholars began mentoring students through a college preparatory curriculum. Today, the school has 48 community-based partners in addition to IUPUI.[322]

IUPUI continues to adapt its programming to fits the needs and interests of the community. For example, they recently held a bilingual predatory lending forum and financial literacy workshop series at George Washington Community School for nearly 200 residents. They also launched the "Fit for Life" Program, a partnership between the Schools of Nursing and Physical Education, to offer physical fitness programming for youth and their families at the school. IUPUI physiology students fulfill their service-learning placement at the Fitness Center and serve as personal student trainers for community residents for just $20 for an entire year.[323]

The Office of Neighborhood Partnerships (ONP) has begun to build relationships with other Near Westside schools that are attempting to adopt the community school model. Lana Coleman, a long-time resident and retiree after 37 years with Indianapolis Public Schools, observes, "IUPUI has been instrumental in helping us get the things we need for [Wendell Phillips Elementary] School 63. The Nursing Department sent student nurses to the school as we were getting established. We serve as a site for English-as-a-Second-Language classes, and IUPUI's Language Department helped translate documents. Dental students provided free care on site — they gave sealants to all of the kids!" When asked about the common challenges of teacher and principal turnover, Starla Officer replies, "ONP and our community partners are clear that we're there *as*

partners. When the principal turned over at School 63, we met with the new principal before she even started. We made it clear that we're not going anywhere." Since 2008, ONP has also coordinated the Central Indiana Community Schools Network—an informal network of those engaged in community school initiatives.[324]

Today, the partners at George Washington Community School have helped local students achieve dramatic success. As the principal reported in spring 2009: two years ago, student attendance was 88 percent; this year, student attendance reached 96.2 percent, exceeding the district goal of 95 percent; an incredible 100 percent of 2009 graduating seniors were accepted into post-secondary education; and, in fall 2008, Washington community partners received the first federal Full-Service Community School funding to the tune of $2.4 million out of a national total of $4.9 million (the other $2.5 million was divided between nine school communities across the country).[325]

Key factors behind IUPUI's community school partnership success include: taking advantage of the window of opportunity to develop strategic university-community-school partnerships; an inclusive stakeholder group that builds upon existing community leadership while embracing diversity; and flexibility to adapt programming to fit the evolving needs, strengths and interests of the community.

Yale—Using Human Resources to Focus on Science Education

Yale has particularly close relationships with two area high schools. One long-standing relationship is at Hill Regional, a magnet school with over 700 students that focuses on science and technology. Michael Ceraso, Principal at Hill Regional since 2007 and a member of the school faculty and administration since the school's founding, notes that when partnership efforts began in the mid-1990s, "There was great fear that the folks from the university would come in and be very prescriptive . . . But the people sent from the university were genuinely interested in their role of being resource people, not prescriptive."[326] Ceraso says a formal partnership agreement with Yale was worked out in 1998. "Since we were a magnet school, we were given an opportunity to make a program that might attract students from the suburbs outside New Haven. The whole concept was really radical," Ceraso emphasizes. One sign of success, according to Ceraso, is that roughly 40 percent of Hill Regional's students come from outside city limits today, compared to less than 20 percent when the magnet school began.[327]

> **Figure 21: Science Education Partnerships at Yale**
>
> **Strategy**
> Public School Partnerships: support to more than twenty New Haven schools, primarily through student volunteers and interns
>
> **Key Features**
> - Provide educational and human resources, rather than prescriptive model
> - Build sustainable partnerships through trust, in-kind resources, and creative leveraging of external funds
> - Put effective coordinators in place, both in management positions and as student liaisons

More broadly, Yale works less intensively with about twenty New Haven public schools. However, this collaboration did not happen without putting the right communication — and people — in place. According to Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships at Yale, who taught in New York City in the 1970s, "The university people didn't speak school. The school people didn't speak university. My work was pretty easy. I spoke both. That's why this partnership is still standing." Each partner school is assigned a student intern. These interns are on site six hours a week and may bill the Office of New Haven and State Affairs for an additional four hours a week of prep time. Their main role is to act as a conduit of Yale volunteer assistance, so that volunteers meet school needs and arrive in a coordinated fashion. Abby Benitez, Principal at the bilingual (English/Spanish) K-8 Christopher Columbus Family Academy, notes that Yale assistance for her school has ranged from field trips to Yale museums, to Yale students tutoring K-8 students in math or helping with the school's gardening project, to professors doing guest lectures and demonstrations in science classes.[328]

Yale's science program reaches out in other ways as well. Merson notes that federal prodding was key: "Beginning in 2002, the National Science Foundation (NSF) said every basic science grant had to have a broad impact, a K-12 component." To meet this need, in 2007 Yale combined grant funds (two-thirds) and internal provost funds (one-third) to create a full-time K-12 high school science position. Yale has also sought to step up its contact with communities of color in New Haven through the Yale Peabody Museum. Since the mid-1990s, the museum has developed an annual Martin Luther King, Jr. poetry slam competition (attended annually by 5,000) and an annual Fiesta Latina event. In 2006, David Heiser, Head of Education and Outreach at the Peabody, notes that the museum also began a mobile outreach program to attend community events. This program, Heiser, estimates, now reaches 3–5,000 people a year.[329]

Yale's science partnerships with K-12 schools, which have been sustained on a formal level for over a dozen years, illustrate a number of key features that other universities seeking to undertake such an initiative might want to consider. First, the history of Yale's educational programs highlight the importance of establishing and maintaining trust, particularly if the anchor institution has been viewed with suspicion in the past. Second, Yale's effort highlights the importance of staff who can act as "translators" between the K-12 and academic worlds. And, third, their evolving work illustrates how federal programs, such as grant requirements for "translation" by the National Science Foundation, can spur new efforts and indeed help leverage external support that can buttress already existing community outreach programs.

Scholarly Engagement

IUPUI — Aligning Academic Resources with Community Development Goals

IUPUI's Office of Neighborhood Partnerships was founded in the mid-1990s to restore relationships with the Near Westside community. The Office became part of the University's Center for Service and Learning in 2003, facilitating the concentration of academic resources in this community. More recently, through the University's engagement with the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI), these academic resources have been focused on the collectively identified target areas for community revitalization: housing, public safety, beautification, business and economic development, education, health, and civic engagement. Director Bob Bringle comments, "We encourage our faculty to work other places, too, but they have largely stayed focused on the Near Westside."[330]

While the GINI plan was being finalized in 2007, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships was funded by Indiana Campus Compact to host several community dialogue sessions. One of the key activities developed, as a result of these discussions, was the Faculty Community Fellows program. Through this program, IUPUI's Center for Service and Learning committed to reallocating dollars for faculty engagement in the Near Westside community. To specifically create an impact in the focus areas of the GINI quality of life plan, five Faculty Community Fellowships were awarded in the 2008–2009 academic year, each linked with a specific community organization.[331]

Bringle says of the three-year grants to Faculty Fellows, "It's an interdisciplinary effort — we're trying to get them to work together on issues in the community." The Fellows program is designed to deepen faculty and student practice in service-learning and community-based research by addressing community-identified needs in the Near Westside; increase departmental and campus support for partnerships with the Near Westside by developing a cadre of faculty experts in service-learning, community-based research, and the assets and needs of the Near Westside; augment the capacity of community organizations and residents to achieve community goals; and support faculty development by advancing the scholarship of engagement and documenting practices of engaged teaching and research.[332]

Faculty Community Fellow Darrell Nickolson speaks on the importance of applied scholarship and research: "The idea is that our Design Department should be using our skills and resources to directly impact the neighborhood most impacted by the university. Students see you involved and it gives them the impression that community development is something they

---

Figure 22: Scholarly Engagement at IUPUI

Strategy
Faculty Community Fellows Program: three-year grants to engage faculty and their students in local neighborhood

Key Features
- Direct academic resources to collectively identified areas of need in community
- Promote interdisciplinary service-learning and community-based research through dedicated resources to faculty
- Develop a cadre of faculty experts in the scholarship of engagement

should be involved in too — that architecture is more than just aesthetics. Residual impacts like this outweigh anything they learn about design."[333] More broadly, Bringle's Center promotes service-learning throughout the university, directing academic resources to more than 250 community partner organizations. In 2008–09, IUPUI estimates that almost 4,000 students contributed nearly 75,000 hours of service to these organizations.

IUPUI's approach to scholarly engagement is remarkable particularly because of its alignment with broader community development goals. Their experience points to the importance of several key factors in creating this connection: first, the increasing focus of faculty and student academic work in a concentrated geographic area; second, the realignment of dollars for faculty engagement with community-identified goals; and third, a centralized unit on campus helping to create opportunities for faculty to work together and sustain their community-based research.

Multi-Anchor, City, and Regional Partnerships

Portland State — Alignment with City Economic Development Goals

Portland State's motto, "Let Knowledge Serve the City," was adopted in 1994 under President Judith Ramaley. This mission shift stemmed largely from state pressure to assume an explicit urban focus and was accompanied by a curriculum overhaul centered on connecting students to the community. Fifteen years later, Portland State published their *Economic Development Strategy: a 10-year plan for strengthening PSU's contribution to regional economic growth*. This 2009 document is a symbol of the deep and growing collaboration between the University, as a whole, and the City of Portland. As President Wim Wiewel writes in the introduction of this document, "Joint planning is the key to successful economic development. . . We will align our academic and research programs with regional economic development goals to assure that Portland State contributes strategically to the regional knowledge base, to innovation in technology and business practice, and to human capital creation."[334]

> **Figure 23: City and Regional Partnerships at Portland State**
>
> **Strategy**
> Economic Development Strategy: a 10-year plan for strengthening the university's contribution to regional economic growth
>
> **Key Features**
> - Align academic and research programs with regional economic development goals
> - Collaborate with city departments on long-term real estate and economic development plans to leverage additional resources as well as achieve broader community goals

The University has worked particularly closely with the City's Bureau of Planning and its Portland Development Commission. Speaking of Portland State's *Economic Development Strategy,* Lew Bowers, Central City Division Manager for the Portland Development Commission, says, "We crafted this with them over the last five years. It was done in conjunction with their Master Campus Plan and accompanies the citywide Economic Development Strategy [also completed

in 2009].” Adds Senior Project Manager, Lisa Abuaf, “They are becoming more institutionally aligned [with the City]. This plan adds more vigor to their efforts.”[335]

Working with city partners encourages Portland State to keep broader goals in mind: “We want them to think about how they can become the spark plug—not just economic impact because they're a large institution,” says Bowers. And, in some cases, the partnership mandates community development goals: “We work closely with the Portland Development Commission. They have their own agenda, put on in part by the City, which includes lots of regulations. For example, our real estate development in an Urban Renewal Area must include 30 percent affordable housing,” says Mark Gregory, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration. [336]

Wiewel is a leading expert in urban land use and the role that universities play in real estate development. Speaking of Portland State's growth, the President says, “Our development is primarily driven by our needs to accommodate our growth with students and faculty. That's why we do it ultimately. But we do it in a way that contributes to the vitality of the south end of downtown. We have mixed-use buildings, and all new developments have retail on the ground floor. Our own development is part of the City's overall development to keep it a vibrant area.”[337]

Portland State's 10-year economic development strategy specifically commits the University and the City “to align their expertise and resources with those of the private sector and other regional public entities” to achieve several objectives, including to create new jobs in strategic economic clusters identified by the City; build on Portland's “reputation and commitment to sustainable development” by partnering on projects such as the new Oregon Sustainability Center and creation of an EcoDISTRICT on campus; strengthen Portland State's position as a workforce development provider; enhance the University's capacity as the think tank for regional problem solving; and extend their contribution to physical development in the University City District in “a pattern that values partnership, mixed-use, and sustainability.” Several of the specific tools to achieve these objectives are described in the plan, while others remain to be developed.[338]

Portland State's collaboration with the City of Portland offers several key lessons for universities trying to implement this type of anchor strategy. First, strategic, collaborative, long-term planning allows institutional partners to capitalize on each other's strengths and resources for broad objectives. Joint planning with city partners, in particular, can also help achieve mutually beneficial outcomes by securing funding for university real estate plans while regulating university resources for community development goals. Finally, focusing on mixed-use development can help gain public support (by keeping newly developed property on tax rolls) as well as contribute to the vitality of the university *and* community.

University of Cincinnati — Uptown Consortium

In 2003, the University of Cincinnati catalyzed a public-private partnership that led to the creation of the Uptown Consortium. The Consortium is currently comprised of the leaders of four of the largest employers in Cincinnati's Uptown neighborhood: Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati Zoo, TriHealth, Inc, and the University itself.[339] The CEOs of the Consortium first began meeting on an informal basis. They then hired a real estate finance and economic development consulting firm to help determine their shared needs and interests, as well as the needs and interests of the community. In 2004, they hired their first president, Tony Brown. "The chief executives hoped that group action, where members worked together and pooled common resources and experience, could have a greater impact than the disparate investments of individual organizations," writes Michael Romanos.[340]

Figure 24: Multi-Anchor Partnerships at Cincinnati
Strategy Uptown Consortium: non-profit collaboration among the leaders of the four largest employers in Cincinnati's Uptown neighborhood **Key Features** • Work with other local anchors to pool resources • Collaborate with the city to help achieve broader community development goals • Provide opportunities for meaningful community participation and shared leadership

Collaboration with the City is a notable feature of the Consortium's work. "After we raised our investment capital and local government saw us make sizable investments, we gained the respect and credibility of the City as a valuable community development partner, so much so that we now work closely with the City to coordinate our plans," said Tony Brown in a 2007 interview. For example, the Consortium recently consulted and assisted the City transportation division in the design of a new way-finding system for Uptown. Consortium partners provided the required 25 percent match in order to receive federal dollars for this initiative.[341]

From 2004 to 2009, nearly $400 million was invested in Uptown for neighborhood revitalization, primarily in real estate development. Gerry Siegert, Cincinnati's Associate Vice President for Community Development, speaks to the Consortium's progression: "The bricks-and-mortar development showed the community that the University and the other big employers were committed. Now, eight to ten years later, we're starting to see some good things happen as a result." Siegert recognizes the [often uneven] role that institutional preferences play in dictating the nature of many community efforts, which may "shoot higher than where the real problems lie." He stresses, "An important part of any community directed program should begin with, and continue seeking, ongoing community input of what *they* see as the basic needs of the local populace as opposed to what the institution thinks is needed. We have recently begun using this approach and find striking differences in the perception of the problems, depending upon at which side of the table you sit."[342]

"We are at a point in the evolution of Uptown Consortium. It is very exciting," says Mary Stagaman, Cincinnati's former Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement. "Bringing the community to the table at an earlier point is an incredibly important lesson. It took a year of

discussion, but everyone [the University, the Consortium, the community], now understands the importance. It has been a real transformation in the way the Consortium operates." In a similar vein, Bill Fischer, Business Development Manager in the City's Department of Community Development, comments, "The Consortium laid out broad socio-economic goals, but there were certain goals they had to accomplish first. They just invited the Community Council [representatives] to be on their board, so I think they will start tackling some tougher issues."[343]

The University of Cincinnati's leadership in the Uptown Consortium offers valuable lessons for multi-anchor partnerships. Chiefly, incredible resources can be leveraged when local institutions pull their assets and leadership together for community revitalization. This collective force can also hold significant weight as a collaborative partner with the city, working to achieve shared objectives. With such power, however, institutional preferences can often outweigh or overlook important community feedback; focused efforts are needed for meaningful community participation and shared leadership.

Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision

Syracuse — Leadership for a Shared Vision

Since taking office as Chancellor and President in 2004, Nancy Cantor has aimed to institutionalize community engagement at Syracuse University through several approaches. Under Cantor's leadership, the University's vision, Scholarship in Action, represents "a commitment to forging bold, imaginative, reciprocal, and sustained engagements with our many constituent communities, local as well as global."[344] This vision entails a view of the university as an anchor institution in its community, and is being manifested throughout the many community development initiatives spearheaded by Syracuse. "The Chancellor's strategy is very multifaceted. We may have radically different strategies [to engagement] but there is *one* philosophy throughout the university," says Ed Boguez, Director of Syracuse's Center of Excellence.[345]

> ### Figure 25: Institutionalizing an Anchor Vision at Syracuse
>
> **Strategy**
> Presidential Leadership: vision and actualization of university as an anchor in its community
>
> **Key Features**
> - Create university-wide philosophy of engagement, and communicate it internally and externally
> - Enlist faculty leaders and embed into student curriculum
> - Create supportive policy, both in academic reward structure and in business practices

Cantor shares her lessons from the past several years: "First, you have to have the stomach for doing the hard work of cross-sector partnerships. It shouldn't just be the institution. Large-scale projects take partnerships. They also take a long, long time." According to Cantor, institutional engagement also requires getting as many

faculty, schools and colleges on board with the ambitious initiatives being undertaken by the administration, so that there is a breadth of representation. "We look for faculty leaders." says Cantor. Of course, some faculty have been engaged in community initiatives long before Cantor's arrival: "We've been developing these efforts for many years from the ground up, supported by grants," says Marion Wilson, who serves as the Director of Community Initiatives for Syracuse's School of Visual and Performing Arts. "Now that our work is validated through Nancy [Cantor]'s Scholarship in Action. . . this has really thrown the hierarchy of the university on its head."[346] Marilyn Higgins speaks of the work of faculty such as Marion Wilson and Stephen Mahan who partner with local high schools: "These programs have proven to be some of the most sustainable efforts between Syracuse and the community — faculty are committed to the work because they are advancing their own scholarship!" She also emphasizes the "important role of the Deans in making the Chancellor's vision come to life." Higgins, as Vice President of Community Engagement and Economic Development and Chair of the Near West Side Initiative Board, helps implement faculty ideas and academic resources into the neighborhood in a mutually beneficial way.[347]

Institutionalization also requires embedding engagement into student curriculum and life, says Cantor: "The Kauffman *Enitiative* grant is helping to embed collaborative, cross-sector partnerships in every school and college. The grant provides course relief and back up dollars to faculty; lots of students are involved." *Enitiative* is a five-year, $3 million grant that aims to infuse entrepreneurship across the curriculum and create productive campus-community partnerships. Higgins estimates that the Near West Side Initiative alone has engaged nearly 400 students (and 75 faculty) in revitalization of the neighborhood over the last three years.

Cantor notes that it is critical to take the policy and practice implications "head on" so the work is "embedded in the reward structure, and the mission" and not just "on the backs of dedicated staff and faculty." "We're now rewarding tenure and promotion for more non-traditional kinds of scholarship," notes the Chancellor. "After five years [of deliberation], we finally had a unanimous vote from the Senate." Policy changes for engagement have also occurred on the business and financial side of the university, though some of this spirit was already in place before Cantor. "[Economic inclusion] is part of our core values. We talk regularly about it. That's been key — it's driven down through the organization to all of our staff, and out to our contractors and subcontractors," says Douglas Freeman, Director of Purchasing and Real Estate, speaking about the university's local and minority purchasing programs. Cantor concurs that the University's business team was "very on board from the beginning."[348]

Finally, Cantor elaborates on the importance of communication, both externally and internally. "I take, and took, too much for granted that students and faculty. . . would see the value [of scholarly engagement] and think appropriate for the core of the institution. But it's hard to define, and the communication task is enormous! So many of us are doing this because we see it at the core of what we do; we forget that it needs constant justification to the world." More recently, the economic crisis has also forced Cantor to "hone in on the rhetoric" of the mutually beneficial outcomes of community engagement, validating to the Senate Budget Committee the expenditures on neighborhood initiatives in the midst of salary freezes. Having deans and

senior leadership on board is a necessary part of the equation. The Chancellor also uses her personal capital to leverage city and political support for the university's initiatives, and she understands the importance of institutional commitment: "We're in it for the long haul, and it's going to be a long haul! Players do come and go, but the initiative stays strong."[349]

Syracuse's experience in institutionalizing an anchor vision points to several critical factors: a unified philosophy throughout the university, and engagement of a breadth of faculty and students, to leverage the institution's full resources; policy changes on both the academic and corporate side of the university, rooting engagement into the rewards structure and the mission; and ongoing communication (internally and externally) to foster understanding and sustainability.

Securing Funding and Leveraging Resources

University of Cincinnati — Community Investment of Endowment Assets

The University of Cincinnati's Community Development Office is a separate department within the Finance Division. Under the direction of this office, the university has made significant financial commitments to community development in the Uptown neighborhoods through several methods: loans through investments of its endowment portfolio; operating grants through its general funds; and master leasing of selected spaces.

As of the fall of 2009, the University of Cincinnati had committed a total of $148.6 million out of its $833 million endowment to real estate development in Uptown. This comes from a "commingled endowment" provided through the university's equity along with that of the university foundation. "We eventually learned to treat this investment separately [from the rest of our endowment]," says Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration.

Figure 26: Community Investment of Endowment Assets at Cincinnati

Strategy
Patient Capital: investment of university endowment into community revitalization with long-term view of return

Key Features
- Create understanding of long-term financial and social return on investment
- Use endowment funds to leverage outside investors (e.g., other anchors, city government, and private developers) and build community capacity
- Provide ongoing communication/transparency

"Of course there has been some questioning, in these difficult financial times, 'Should we have done this?' But I believe that universities, by design, are in it for the long haul, and they have to take a long-term view of all their investments. This is particularly true at an urban institution."[350]

University leaders refer to their investment as "patient capital" — at four-percent interest rates, an investment that requires a deeper understanding of the long-term financial and social return. At the same time, this approach did create some mixed expectations. Rimai believes that

more time could have been spent on the front end, educating the university, trustees, university foundation, and community at large about the intentions of Cincinnati's engagement and advocating for the "long-term view" on investments. Currently, over $80 million of the University's endowment loans remain outstanding; yet the loans have leveraged significant additional funding from other public and private resources.[351]

Collectively, the seven community urban redevelopment corporations supported by the University have received an average of one million dollars in operating funds each year, over the last eight-to-nine years, from the University's general funds. In the late 1990s, for example, the University and the City of Cincinnati each put in roughly $50,000 for a planning process to redevelop the Clifton Heights neighborhood. "Then, to make it actionable, they formed the Redevelopment Corporation in 2001, with three business association members, one community neighborhood association member, and one university representative. The University basically said, 'We'll fund you from an operational and developmental view, but we'll let you guys do the work,'" says Matt Bourgeois, Director of the Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation (CHCURC). "Our operations have been funded fully by UC since 2001, with the long-term goal being to reduce our reliance on these funds via project revenues as they come online," adds Bourgeois.[352]

Details of the first major development project in Clifton Heights sheds some light on the financing mechanisms through which the University has leveraged significant assets. This development, University Park, includes 291 units of student housing, 36,924 square feet of retail on the first floor, and a 1,118 space parking garage below. Funding for this project included $55 million in tax-exempt bonds, issued by the County and guaranteed by the Bank of New York/ Citizens Bank LOC and an $11 million University endowment loan for retail construction. In addition, CHCURC has joint use and retail use agreements with the University (e.g., the University must lease any retail spaces if retail revenues do not exceed $818,000 per year). "We're recognizing the risk, but also know we're building capacity among these community-based organizations," says Stagaman. CHCURC also used some of its operating funds to match city grants for a $1 million Façade Improvement Program in the neighborhood's old business district. As a result, Bourgeois notes, these businesses have also profited from the new retail and housing developments that have occurred down the street.[353]

Finally, the University and its partners in the Consortium funded a $52 million loan pool. This leveraging power brought in an additional $52 million from local banks through federal New Market Tax Credits (NMTC), and more than $300 million in other public and private resources (including tax-exempt bonds, tax increment financing, new market tax credits, and developer financing). The NMTC investors expect to see a faster return than some of the University's dollars that are being used as collateral, but the Consortium has not seen enough of these projects mature to know how they are going to work. "Transparency is critical. Folks need to understand, in a very open way, why the institution is doing what it's doing, and what resources and limitations we have. New Market Tax Credits are very technical, so the university has to communicate in a way that people understand," says Rimai. The Uptown Consortium

received an additional $45 million in NMTC in 2009, which will allow partners to continue planned projects in the Uptown area, particularly in retail and small business development.[354]

One lesson that Rimai offers is that universities have to approach community development efforts, "with a high degree of business acumen. You need to know what you're good at and what you're not good at. . .recognize your limitations. Part of the institutional investment has to be in [developing] partnerships as well. . . We didn't [initially] approach our investment with business discipline, which contributed to the inappropriate expectations that the community held."[355] Additional lessons from Cincinnati's experience include — one, university endowment funds invested into community revitalization efforts must be treated as "patient capital;" two, when invested strategically, these funds can not only help build capacity within the community but also leverage significant outside investment; and three, the intentions and limitations of the university's investment should be communicated properly from the beginning.

LeMoyne-Owen College — Leveraging Public and Private Dollars

From 1999 through 2009, LeMoyne-Owen College received seven Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) grants from the Office of University Partnerships at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). While the College was the actual applicant for the HUD HBCU grants, the CDC received these funds directly. These grants averaged $550,000 for each year received and have provided core operating funds for the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation to carry out its neighborhood revitalization activities on the College's behalf. Furthermore, this funding has supported a level of organizational stability, including a staff of charismatic leaders at the CDC who have leveraged millions of dollars in additional public and private investments for programmatic activity.[356]

One of the CDC's largest projects underway is the $11.5 million, mixed-used Towne Center. This development will complement the $20 million development of

> **Figure 27: Leveraging Public and Private Dollars at LeMoyne-Owen**
>
> **Strategy**
> Creative Financing: HUD dollars used as core funding to operate an independent entity and to attract millions of dollars in public and private capital
>
> **Key Features**
> - Build on initial funding to first provide stability and then leverage additional resources
> - Seek investment from a wide variety of public and private sources (e.g. New Market Tax Credits, federal appropriation, private developers)
> - Invest in sustainable development (e.g., housing development and homeownership training; job creation)

the new Stax Museum and Stax Music Academy in the Soulsville community, as well as the earlier transformation of the LeMoyne Gardens public housing development into a mixed-income development, College Park. The Towne Center project was largely made possible by the $7.3 million loan from the Wachovia Community Development Financing group using New Market Tax Credits as well as the bank's own debt. It was also supported through a one-half million dollar federal appropriation from a Tennessee Senator. CDC Director Jeffrey Higgs says of the Senator's support: "We had a track record and people believed in our vision."[357] Additional

grants were secured from the City of Memphis, Shelby County, the U.S. Economic Development Administration, the Office of Community Services, and the CDC's HBCU funding from HUD. (The City's contribution included funding for the demolition of existing structures on the four-acre property as well as an additional $250,000.) "We invested a lot of equity into [the Towne Center] on our own — about $2 million from our budget," adds Higgs. Indeed, at times, the CDC has had to rely heavily on its own line of credit and cash reserves to cover development costs.[358]

Seeing as both Cincinnati and LeMoyne-Owen have taken advantage of New Market Tax Credits (NMTC) in their major redevelopment efforts, it is worth exploring this mode of financing a little further. The New Market Tax Credit Program was established in 2000 as part of the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the United States Treasury Department. It allows institutions to invest in a community development organization that works in a low-income neighborhood in exchange for a tax credit. The credit provided to the investor totals 39 percent of the cost of the investment over seven years: five percent in each of the first three years, and six percent in the final four years. In other words, it is a "shallow but not deep subsidy" that helps realize inner-city investments that are on the margins of being made. As Higgs puts it, "If it's a good deal from the start, [the tax credits] make it even better." Since higher education institutions themselves do not have tax liabilities, they can not derive any tax benefits from the New Market Tax Credits. Private investors, such as local banks, however, can invest money in the development organization for a portion of the New Market Tax Credit, which they can then apply to any federal taxes they may owe. Meanwhile, the development organization now has capital to invest in its neighborhood revitalization activities.[359]

Putting the NMTC to good use, the Towne Center will be 100-percent owned by the LeMoyne-Owen College CDC when complete, at which point it is expected to be worth over $15 million. It is also expected to provide more than 200 jobs, incubator space for emerging local businesses, as well as first-class goods and services for neighborhood residents, including many LeMoyne-Owen students. The CDC is also working on a façade program with existing small businesses around the Towne Center.

In addition to such large-scale projects as the Towne Center, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC has leveraged and directed significant funding towards housing development and home ownership in Soulsville. For instance, the CDC is a housing development partner in the City of Memphis's Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which is funded by $63 million in federal grants awarded to the city, county, and state. "We have built 14 new homes and done seven rehabs [in Soulsville]," says Higgs. With the addition of homebuyers' training, this has "helped to increase homeownership among people who were renting in the neighborhood." The CDC also receives $500,000 from the City to do house repairs for seniors and low-income residents. "We have done at least 100 repairs all over Memphis," adds Higgs.[360]

LeMoyne-Owen College's approach to community development is unique from most other higher education institutions in several ways — chiefly in that the College allows significant federal funding to be deposited directly into the account of its associated CDC, which then carries out focused objectives independently from the institution. Operational and financial

autonomy have permitted the CDC to react quickly and deploy resources as needed. This rarity in itself sheds light on an innovative approach to financing and carrying out an anchor strategy, however, one that may be most applicable to HBCUs, which continue to receive considerable federal funding from HUD (particularly in support of HBCU-sponsored CDCs). At the same time, LeMoyne-Owen CDC's success points to several universally applicable lessons when leveraging resources for community development strategies: first, build on existing resources and reputation to provide organizational stability and create a strong, shared vision; second, seek a diversified portfolio of public and private investment to carry out programmatic activities; and third, use this investment to not only guarantee the organization's sustainability but also the sustainability of the neighborhood.

Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion

Miami Dade College — Creating Opportunity for All

Miami Dade College's commitment to personal economic development through education is seen clearly in its open-door policy and synchronization of its professional schools with the region's target industries. "The opportunity to learn and build workforce skills is the fundamental building block of city revitalization," claims President Padrón. By way of example: 61 percent of Miami-Dade County public school graduates who attend colleges and universities in Florida attend Miami Dade College (MDC); MDC students represent 178 countries and more than 50 percent report a native language other than English; more than half are the first in their families to attend college; 74 percent need college preparatory coursework; 61 percent are low-income and 39 percent are below the federal poverty level; 68 percent of enrolled students are Hispanics and 19 percent are Black Non-Hispanics; and MDC ranks second in the nation for the number of Pell Grants awarded to public colleges and universities.

> **Figure 28: Building a Culture of Economic Inclusion at Miami Dade College**
>
> **Strategy**
> Opportunity for All: reach nearly all residents through open-door policy, job training, small business development, and employment
>
> **Key Features**
> - Focus primary resources on support services to underserved student population
> - Provide workforce training to low-income residents and connect to actual jobs
> - Support local economic development through micro-entrepreneurship training in minority business corridor
> - Develop inclusive hiring policies

The College's support services to this unique student body are leading to results: 80 percent of 2006–07 Associate in Arts graduates transferred to Florida colleges and universities immediately after graduation; 96 percent of Associate in Science graduates and Vocational Career Certificate graduates were placed in jobs related to their studies within a year of graduation or chose to continue their education; and nine out of

10 Miami Dade College students stay in the region and contribute to the local economy after graduating.[361]

Miami Dade College also connects low-income residents of Miami-Dade County to job opportunities and small business development, particularly through its Schools of Business and Community Education and the Carrie Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center. For instance, the College — with a $100,000 grant from a local community redevelopment agency — launched the Hospitality Institute "to specifically connect job opportunities in the local hospitality industry with Miami's inner city residents through customer service and job readiness training." The School of Business hosts the Institute in Overtown, one of Miami's oldest and poorest neighborhoods. "[The program] offers individuals a certificate of completion, gift certificates for professional attire from an area thrift store, and job placement services," says Geoffrey Gathercole, Director of the School of Community Education. From January 2008 through December 2009, 628 individuals participated in the trainings and receiving completion certificates. The School of Business estimates that 223 graduates secured a job with 149 employers in the area during these two years.[362]

Serving the African-American neighborhood of Liberty City, a locale that has struggled to develop a thriving business center, the Meek Center is a "partner for renewal" by "equipping local business entrepreneurs with the skills and support to undertake the challenge of small business ownership." For example, the Meek Center offers a FastTrac Entrepreneurship course in collaboration with the City of Miami and NANA (Neighbors and Neighbors Association) that currently provides training for 55 micro-enterprise businesses in Liberty City.[363]

Finally, President Padrón takes pride in the fact that, "The College's workforce very closely mirrors the larger community and our hiring efforts are very conscious of maintaining and furthering the diversity and equity that we value." Across its eight campuses, Miami Dade College employs 6,200 faculty and staff. Ethnic minorities account for 74 percent of full-time employees; 59 percent of full-time faculty are ethnic minorities and 53 percent are female. The College's total payroll and benefits budget is approximately $240 million.[364]

Miami Dade College's experience creating 'opportunity for all' points to several important aspects for higher education institutions seeking to promote economic inclusion. First, a multi-faceted approach to creating education and workforce opportunities helps reach a greater population. Second, when dealing with an underserved student population, primary focus must be given to helping them succeed in higher education. Once necessary resources and energy have been dedicated to this mission, additional funding (and in-kind resources) can be leveraged to support targeted programs/trainings to those most in need in the broader community. Critically, these programs should be connected to real job and business opportunities. Finally, existing institutional resources can also be re-directed to support economic inclusion, such as local and minority hiring policies.

Sustaining Inclusive Planning and Robust Community Relationships

Minnesota — Overcoming Mistrust through On-the-Ground Collaboration

The University of Minnesota has worked hard to overcome a history of mistrust with some of its Northside neighbors, and things still do not always go smoothly. When the university embarked upon its urban agenda in 2005, some community leaders said that they should have been approached earlier. For example, the University called its effort the "University Northside Initiative." "We challenged that name, and changed it to *Partnership*. This meant it was going to be a participatory relationship," says Sherrie Pugh, Executive Director of the Northside Resident Redevelopment Council. Additionally, the University had recruited a world-renowned child psychologist to establish a child and family center that would focus on the community's large number of children in foster care. This played on some members of the community's fears of university research, which had historically been transactional in nature.[365]

> **Figure 29: Sustaining Inclusive Planning and Robust Relationships at Minnesota**
>
> **Strategy**
> Mutually beneficial partnerships: opportunities for ongoing communication, collaboration, capacity building, and shared ownership
>
> **Key Features**
> - Enter into genuine dialogue to reach a shared vision and engage stakeholders in strategic planning process
> - Create opportunities for on-the-ground collaboration through focused work groups with shared leadership
> - Invest in building capacity among existing organizations and partnerships

The university spent over two years in dialogue with the community about the potential of having a physical presence in North Minneapolis. Though not always pleasant, this dialogue eventually led to a shared vision in which three focus areas were identified for collaborative research, outreach and engagement: education, health and wellness, and community and economic development. In 2006, 65 percent of the community (who cast ballots) voted to allow the partnership to come into their neighborhoods;[366] as a way to deliver on its promises and demonstrate its commitment to sustaining the relationship, the university established the Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC) as the anchor through which resources could be coordinated in North Minneapolis. In 2006, a team of university students conducted community asset mapping, as the university made it explicit that they did not wish to compete with existing assets and resources. Although the community's desire to establish a community benefits agreement has yet to be realized, the University has established several activities that have provided ongoing opportunities for communication, on-the-ground collaboration and capacity building.

For example, the University Northside Partnership encouraged the formation of the Community Affairs Committee (CAC) in 2006 to "inform the process, procedures, and practices of the partnership."[367] Beginning in 2008, UROC's Executive Director recommended that the CAC be co-chaired by a university and a community representative. The CAC facilitated a series of meetings to identify potential collaborative projects in the previously identified themes of

education, health and wellness, and community and economic development. Work Groups in these three core areas, as well as the arts, now meet regularly to define goals, strategies, and timelines for these issues. More than 60 community individuals have signed up to participate along with 100 faculty, students, and staff. Collaborative leadership oversees the work groups, who have been trained in participatory action research. Community leaders, in particular, play a critical role in bringing community knowledge to the table. "The work groups are partly to harmonize the fact that the university is about process, process, and process, and the community is about, action, action," says Makeda Zulu-Gillespie, University-Community Liaison and CAC Co-Chair.[368]

The FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education) work groups are another form of interdisciplinary teams, each led by a university and a community chair. Within the urban agenda's three focus areas, FIPSE projects are centered on Out-of-School-Time, Healthy Foods, and Youth Entrepreneurship — subjects of shared interest and where some level of partnership already existed. The FIPSE budget (two-thirds provided by the U.S. Department of Education, and one-third of which is an in-kind match provided by the University) has primarily been invested in capacity building. "We knew that if we funded [new] programs, the money would run out. So instead, we build capacity for existing organizations and programs," says Geoff Maruyama, FIPSE grant principal investigator. According to community leaders, this strategy appears to be working: "FIPSE has served as a real catalyst for Out-of-School-Time groups to talk to each other. We are matching up resources, and I can now find support for other pieces of that continuum [of child and family support]. This collaboration has also brought legislators in, and we're talking about funding and policy best practices. University resources were able to provide for what we haven't been able to do alone," says Mary Fitzpatrick, Executive Director of Seeds of Change.[369]

The FIPSE grant was largely seen as a way to get the University Northside Partnership going, and UROC will also provide ongoing support for these activities. In addition, UROC has facilitated three participatory action research groups to focus primarily on healthy homes and issues of foreclosure. Within these groups, UROC has placed several community members in paid, part-time positions to work alongside a paid research assistant and a couple of faculty and staff. These research teams also consult with a larger stakeholder group. Efforts like these are beginning to address a key community concern: for research to be driven by what the community needs and wants.[370]

Finally, leading up to the development of the UROC building, Minnesota embarked upon a strategic planning process that deeply engaged community stakeholders. This has not always been easy, according to founding Executive Director Irma McClaurin: "Everyone wants community engagement without investing in it and recognizing that it's a process. It needs to be built into the timeline and the costs. Our budget did not include community engagement, so we had to get creative." She asked her architectural team to convene a community workshop to engage residents in the design of the UROC building. "We want the space and the design to reflect the collaboration," says McClaurin. This includes having offices without doors, large and open shared workspace, community artwork on the walls, computers in the reception area for

public use, and free coffee.[371] Following initial interviews with a number of key stakeholders by UROC's consultant group, more than fifty community and university people attended a strategic planning conference in February 2009 (before the building opened) around the theme of "Coming Together to Create a Shared Future for North Minneapolis." Both events allowed residents to develop ideas for UROC that they are beginning to see come to fruition. McClaurin says this is helping residents take ownership over UROC's creation. "The University has a 'good faith effort.' They're at the tipping point now, for an opportunity for change, and that's why I'm engaged," says Raymond Dehn, the community Co-Chair of CAC. "Our biggest concern now is to have engagement and revitalization without displacement."[372]

The University of Minnesota's relationship with its North Minneapolis neighbors, particularly over the last five years, holds several lessons for building mutually beneficial partnerships between anchors and their communities. First, ongoing opportunities for communication and on-the-ground collaboration are critical for gaining trust and community buy-in. Next, in a similar vein, participating in inclusive practices from the beginning leads to shared ownership of the process. Third, focusing on a few identified priority issues and drawing upon existing community strengths, organizations, and relationships helps build local capacity as well as revitalization efforts that can be sustained.

⋮

As we discuss in the next, and concluding, section, these best practices — taken together — form the building blocks to a comprehensive anchor institution strategy. Learning from the successes and limitations of current efforts, we hope, will provide valuable tools and practices to other universities implementing anchor-driven community development initiatives. To fully realize their anchor mission, however, will require universities to develop internal organizing strategies that consciously engage their comprehensive resources — human, academic, cultural, and especially economic — with their communities in collaborative and sustainable ways. It will also require significant support from funders and public policy.

Section Four:

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

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

Henry Louis Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo[373]

Steps on the Road: Building Internal Constituencies for Partnership Work

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

> ## Figure 30: Internal Steps to Build an Anchor Institution Mission
>
> - Institute high-level administrative commitment.
> - Employ the university's resources fully and consciously—human, academic, cultural, and especially economic.
> - Link university hiring, real estate, purchasing, and investment strategies to community partnership goals.
> - Engage community residents and groups in mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships.
> - Learn from "best practices," from each other.
> - Adopt a strategic, place-based approach to capitalize on existing resources.
> - Leverage university economic power to support jobs for community members at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale.
> - Ensure Carnegie "engagement" classification takes into account community-supportive practices in the corporate areas of purchasing, hiring, investment, and real estate.

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

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

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

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

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

⋮ **Catalyzing Change with Philanthropy**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

> ### Figure 31: Building the Anchor Institution Mission through Philanthropy
>
> - Support information-sharing and networks that promote the work (e.g., Coalition of Urban Serving Universities).
> - Develop a funders' group that can support long-term, comprehensive, multi-modal initiatives at leading campuses.
> - Create incentives to encourage structural changes, including policy amendments and internal collaboration, that support an anchor institution mission.
> - Provide pre-development and capital support for community job creation strategies linked to anchor institutions, as in Cleveland.

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

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

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

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

Policy Support for the Anchor Institution Mission

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

> ### Figure 32: Policy Measures to Support the Anchor Institution Mission
>
> - Support comprehensive programs through collaboration with new government policy initiatives (e.g. Promise Neighborhoods), expansion of current Office of University Partnership programs and creation of an "Urban Grant" program.
> - Fund specialized programs that match anchor resources to critical public objectives in specific areas (e.g., affordable housing, business development, K-12 education, etc.).
> - Create anchor-based community development programs that leverage universities' economic power (e.g., purchasing, investment, hiring, etc.) for community benefit.
> - Convene a multi-stakeholder group that can support cross-anchor institution collaborative efforts through a competitive grant program.
> - Utilize local government to incentivize universities to invest in comprehensive community development efforts, as well as provide matching grants.
> - Award prizes like NSF does to provide recognition for exemplary university efforts and help legitimize the work.
> - Develop a national consultation team of faculty and staff from institutions that have been successful in their work with the community to aid in training and technical assistance.

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

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

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

Thinking Forward

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendices

Appendix A: Budget Documents from Anchor Institutions Task Force

Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies: Recommendations for HUD Action

HUD Anchor Institutions Task Force Recommendations

The Anchor Institutions Task Force was guided in its budgeting by the following factors and principles:

1) HUD needs to make a bold commitment to leveraging anchor institutions to succeed in its community development mission.[418]

2) Resources are required to move faculty and administrations and lead higher education to make the kinds of changes needed to embed and sustain civic engagement across all components of the institution. Universities are not starving for funds, but the funds received direct universities to lab research, not community development. For instance, in FY 2005, universities received $4.4 billion from the National Science Foundation, $16.8 billion from the National Institutes of Health, and roughly $33 million from the HUD Office of University Partnerships (OUP).

3) Although the total amount of money proposed ($1.21 billion) may seem large, it is almost exactly identical to the current level of USDA funding to support university work in (primarily) rural development through the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). Of course, the majority of anchor institution capital is based in urban, not rural, areas.

4) The Task Force was also guided in its efforts by the groundbreaking work of the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, a group of three dozen university presidents which has proposed an Urban University Renaissance Act with a $700 million set of programs in HUD, as well as related programs in other federal departments.

5) The Task Force also wanted to expand the focus of OUP from an exclusively university-based focus to also encompass medical centers and hospitals and other anchor institutions. This effort to expand beyond typical partnership programs to leverage anchor economic assets also added to the cost figures.

6) **The Task Force recommends a first-year budget of $290 million, which would be ramped up over 5 years to the $1.21 billion amount in the full budget, as presented above.**

Year One and Full Budget Scenarios are provided below to demonstrate the potential impact of federal investment.

Budget Scenarios

Year 1 Budget Scenario

a. **Office of University Partnerships: $105 million**
  - "Phase 1" Community Outreach Partnership Center programs ($20 million)
  - "Phase 2" Community Outreach Partnership Center programs ($30 million)
  - Expanding OUP's other component programs ($50 million)
  - Awards, training, and program evaluation ($5 million)

b. **Program Division of Anchor Institutions: $60 million**
  - Integrated Community Anchor Network (I-CAN) program of cross-anchor partnerships ($35 million)
  - Seed grants for individual anchors, state/local matching grants ($15 million)
  - Anchor best practices website, awards, training, and program evaluation ($10 million)

c. **White House Summit/Regional OUP HUD staff: $5 million**

d. **Community economic development programs: $120 million**
  - Anchor institution-supported housing ($20 million)
  - Green housing workforce development ($25 million)
  - University-assisted community schools and school-centered community development ($20 million)
  - Community development staff continuing education and urban studies curriculum grants ($5 million)
  - Urban Revitalization Corps ($35 million)
  - Health Partnership Centers ($5 million)
  - Cultural economic development grants ($2 million)
  - Research grants ($8 million)

TOTAL: $290 million

Anticipated Impacts
  - 100 campuses dedicating a minimum of $1 million each to partnership work (half from anchor match)
  - Integrated Community Anchor Network modeled on successful HUD-supported Living Cities model, which has achieved a leverage of 29:1 per federal dollar invested
  - 125 workforce development sites for greening of affordable housing
  - Anchor institution employer-assisted housing programs in approximately 60 sites
  - Anchor-subsidized housing for up to 10,000 AmeriCorps/VISTA employees

- 2,000 new Urban Revitalization Crops AmeriCorps/VISTA workers nationwide
- Health partnership centers at 25 anchor institutions
- Funding for urban research and urban studies curriculum development
- Cultural economic pilot initiatives at four anchor institutions
- 10 training and workforce centers for community development continuing education
- Dedicated funding for 40 campuses with K-12 partnership programs, particularly university-assisted community schools: based on conservative graduation figures above, federal investment of $20 million would have an economic return of $52 million ($260,000 increase in lifetime earnings per high school graduate)

Full Budget Scenario

Total "ask" contained in the Task Force's report comes to **$1.21 billion in year 5.**
- Comprehensive "partnership" type programs ($455 million)
- Programs focused on leveraging anchor institution's economic power ($310 million)
- Anchor institution programs related to housing, workforce development, health, K-12 partnerships, culture-based development, and community-based research ($445 million)

Year 5 budget would add the following specific programs, in addition to those listed in Year 1 budget above:
- Urban Grant program: extension-like outreach to urban communities
- HUD Urban Research Grants
- Community Economic Development Centers network to boost CED productivity
- Project-based Community Health Anchor Partnership Grants
- Civic engagement metropolitan planning grants to boost anchor partnership results
- Workforce training program to train new community development leaders

TOTAL: $1.21 billion

Anticipated Impacts

- Transformation of the role of anchor institutions in local community and economic development.
- Many programs listed above are on a 5-year grant cycle, meaning the full impact (and full cost) of the programs as "steady state" only occurs after year 5.
- With the schooling example above, the dedicated $100 million funding for university-assisted community schools could be expected to reach 200,000 K-12 students. A very conservative projection (1,000 more students graduating a year) would mean a return of $260 million for the federal government's $100 million investment.
- If 75 anchor institutions by year 5 had duplicated the results of Penn's purchasing program, it is reasonable to assume that these efforts would have generated 12,000 local jobs, $375 million in local wages, and nearly a $1 billion in additional local economic activity. It is also reasonable to assume similar gains in the other anchor economic and community development efforts, partnership initiatives, and supporting programs.

- Significant potential for tremendous gains. For instance, in 2008, 1.23 million Americans failed to graduate from high school. The cost to the nation of this failure at $260,000 per student comes to a total of $320 billion. If a concerted effort by anchor institutions can reduce this number even by one percent, the program has more than paid for itself.
- Budget outlined by the Anchor Institutions Task Force provides a mechanism for HUD to begin to think and act comprehensively and holistically in its role as facilitator and catalyst for leveraging anchor institutions for community and economic development in the 21st century.

Regarding the particular budget items in the report, a chart outlining the report recommendations, followed by brief explanation of each line item, follows:

Summary of Recommended Investment Amounts

Strategy 1—Partnership Programs: Enhance the Current Office of University Partnerships	Direct HUD Investment	Anticipated Anchor Match	Total Investment
1. Revised Community Outreach Partnership Centers—Phase 1 grants	60,000,000	60,000,000	120,000,000
2. Revised Community Outreach Partnership Centers—Phase 2 grants	90,000,000	90,000,000	180,000,000
3. Increase funding and support for OUP's other component programs (for HBCUs, tribal colleges, community dev. work study, etc.)	50,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000
4. Urban Grant University program	200,000,000	200,000,000	400,000,000
5. HUD Urban Research Assistance Grants	50,000,000		50,000,000
6. Awards, training, and evaluation	5,000,000		5,000,000
Strategy 2—Anchor Institutions: Joining Forces with HUD to Meet the Housing Need	**Direct HUD Investment**	**Anticipated Anchor Match**	**Total Investment**
1. Nonprofits House America	50,000,000	100,000,000	150,000,000
2. Universities Serving America	25,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000
3. Housing Information System community housing data program	25,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000
Strategy 3—Anchor Institutions: Promoting Community & Economic Development	**Direct HUD Investment**	**Anticipated Anchor Match**	**Total Investment**
1. Anchors Build Community	15,000,000	15,000,000	30,000,000
2. Integrated Community Anchor Network	35,000,000	35,000,000	70,000,000
3. Grant pool to supply loans or matching capital for state/local efforts	50,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000
4. Community Economic Development (CED) Centers	50,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000
5. Grant pool for CED Center projects	150,000,000	150,000,000	300,000,000
6. Awards, training, and evaluation for items 1–5 above	10,000,000		10,000,000
7. Youth Green America	25,000,000	25,000,000	50,000,000
8. Youth Rebuilding Communities	25,000,000	25,000,000	50,000,000
9. Health Partnership Capacity Grants—Phase 1 grants	25,000,000	25,000,000	50,000,000
10. Community Health Anchor Partnerships—Phase 2 grants	20,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000
11. Awards, training, and evaluation for items 9 and 10 above	5,000,000		5,000,000
12. Continuing education for community development organization staff	25,000,000	25,000,000	50,000,000
13. Urban Revitalization Corps (2,000 AmeriCorps/ VISTA positions)	35,000,000		35,000,000
14. High school urban planning curriculum development grants	10,000,000		10,000,000
15. University-Assisted Community Schools and School-Centered Community Development Center grants	100,000,000	100,000,000	200,000,000
16. Cultural-based anchor development grants	10,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000
17. Action research metro/regional grants	40,000,000		40,000,000
18. Civic engagement anchor metro planning grants	25,000,000		25,000,000
TOTALS	**1,210,000,000**	**1,130,000,000**	**2,340,000,000**

Line-Item-by-Line-Item Budget Rationale

Strategy 1—Office of University Partnerships

Items 1 and 2: Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC)

In 1998, David Cox, then Director of the Office of University Partnerships at HUD, proposed increasing funding for this program from $7.5 million to $75 million, raising the level of funding per site to $1,500,000 ($500,000 a year for 3 years) and increasing the number of COPC sites per funding cycle to 50. The Urban University Renaissance Act [a version of which was subsequently introduced in Congress by Representative David Wu (D-OR) in June 2010 as HR 5567] would raise COPC funding to $100 million and also funding Capacity Engagement grants at $150 million. The Task Force proposes **$60 million for start-up or "Phase I" COPC grants** (which would fund 40 sites at $500,000 a year for 3 years) and **$90 million for longer-term "Phase II" COPC grants** (which would provide grants for up to 36 sites at $500,000 a year for 5 years to support institutions that are poised to take on or advance their role as "fully engaged" anchor institutions.). Armand Carriére, Director of the Office of University Partnerships from 2002 to 2004, noted that regularly 120 schools would apply for 16 grants, even though the program at the time would not allow past recipients to reapply (i.e., there were at least 120 *new* applicants each year). And Carriére noted that the program had barely begun to "scratch the surface" at community colleges, which were increasingly becoming applicants. Program funding at the level proposed would begin to meet the actual demand at community colleges and universities for this kind of work.

Item 3: Additional OUP component programs

This includes the Community Development Work Study Program (CDWSP); Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants (DDRG); Early Doctoral Student Research Grants (EDSRG); and minority-focused initiatives including Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian and Hispanic-Serving Institutions Assisting Communities, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Tribal Colleges and Universities. **$50 million** represents roughly a doubling of current funding levels.

Item 4: Urban Grant Universities

The **$200 million** figure comes from the Urban University Renaissance Act. The idea of an "Urban Grant" institution is modeled on existing programs such as the original Land-Grant system, but also more recent Sea Grant (started in the 1960s to fund coastal and environmental research), Space Grant (started in the late 1980s), and Sun Grant (energy research program initiated under the Bush administration). The focus here is on providing a supporting infrastructure for qualifying universities, colleges, and community colleges that show excellence in fields related to the mission of HUD and demonstrate a record of long term and institution-wide commitment to urban and metropolitan research, teaching, and/or service. There are nearly 2,000 urban universities, colleges, and community colleges in the United States. $200 million is sufficient to provide support funding of $500,000 a year to 400 of these institutions for this purpose.

Item 5: HUD Urban Research Assistance Grants

The **$50 million** figure comes from the Urban University Renaissance Act. Modeled after the National Science Foundation's successful early career research grant program, this program would provide grants between $50,000 and $100,000 to individuals that received a doctorate degree within the last decade and are employed in a tenure track position. $50 million would fund 1,000 grants at $50,000 each, which effectively would result in a small army of graduate student researchers who could apply their skills to helping to solve the many community development problems impacting metropolitan America.

Item 6: Awards, Training & Evaluation

The Task Force put in **$5 million** in this category because (1) as NSF and other agencies have demonstrated, small national awards have a big leveraging impact; and (2) because the Task Force believes that if funding is increased in the ways it advises, rigorous study and analysis are required to monitor and track results. In short, the Task Force has taken the Brookings Institution focus on data-driven policy to heart.

Strategy 2 — Housing

Item 1: Employer-Assisted Housing (Nonprofits House America)

The **$50 million** number is meant to be a modest amount, which must be matched by $100 million in anchor contribution. The Mayo Clinic in Rochester alone spent $7 million on its EAH program (matched by another $7 million). The Task Force very roughly estimates that $150 million (one third from government, two thirds from anchors) might support EAH efforts in about 60 cities (assume $5 million per effort, 2-year period).

Item 2: VISTA Housing (Universities Serve America)

The amount leveraged, $75 million (**$25 million** from government, $50 million from anchors), would be adequate to provide a $7,500 annual housing stipend to 10,000 volunteers nationwide, thereby markedly improving the quality of VISTA workers that universities are able to generate to undertake community development work.

Item 3: Housing Information Systems

The **$25 million** figure is a bit of an educated guess based on what such centers generally cost. This would allow for 100 centers with budgets of $500K ($250,000 from government and $250,000 match from anchor institution).

Strategy 3 — Anchor Institutions

A. Items 1 through 6 — Anchor Institution Program Division

Item 1: Anchors Build Community

The **$15 million** for this item would fund seed grants at $200,000-a-year for 5 years that would focus on leveraging anchors' economic assets (purchasing, investment, hiring, business incubator, etc.) for community development. This figure is based on research examining what it actually takes in terms of staffing to implement these systems: in other words, it typically takes

2–3 full-time employees to do the outreach necessary to get a local purchasing program to be effective and it typically takes 3–5 years before that effort is consolidated.

Item 2: Integrated Community Anchor Network (I-CAN)
Patterned directly after Living Cities, the **$35 million** funding level for I-CAN is based on actual HUD contribution similar to Living Cities ($34 million in FY 2008), which has leveraged foundation and government funding at an estimated ratio of 29-to-1. A request-for-proposals (RFP) that selected an initial slate of I-CAN cities might include the following criteria: a) Clear objectives in terms of local investment, local purchasing, hiring in low-income communities, business incubation, green job development, and wealth creation; b) Clear delineation of how economic development objectives will connect with core institutional programs — e.g., education for universities and health care for hospitals; c) Indication of institutional support at the CEO/Presidential level and of a commitment of internal funds and in-kind support; d) Evidence of state and local government support; e) Inclusion of community development corporations and other local community groups in the development of goals and objectives; and f) Clear metrics to track the impact anchor institution investments in community building have over time.

Item 3: Grant pool to supply loans or matching capital for state/local efforts
There is no formula as to the "correct" amount in this category. The Task Force chose **$50 million** for state and local grants to ensure that seeking state and local matching funding would be a key charge of the Anchor Institution Program Division, as well as to encourage Brookings-type regional development initiatives. The potential in this area is huge: for instance, Michael Swack, Founding Dean of the School of Community Economic Development at Southern New Hampshire University, has long argued that states should provide credit enhancements that leverage hospitals and university endowment funds for community investment. This line item could help finance such initiatives.

Items 4 and 5: Community Economic Development Centers and program grants
The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities proposed $200 million for housing assistance grants to fund universities to provide nonprofits with technical assistance. This report basically adapted that proposal by dividing it into two components: the **$50 million** (with match funding required) for Community Economic Development Centers and the **$150 million** for project grants.

Item 6: Awards, Training & Evaluation
The Task Force put **$10 million** in this category (rather than $5 million, as in Strategy 1, Item 6 above or health partnerships below) because the Task Force believes that the Anchor Institution Program Division work is particularly complicated and, as a result, requires particularly careful and rigorous evaluation and monitoring. Additionally, as the Brookings Institution has noted, for federal policy to be effective, innovation needs to be backed up by "a robust, national system for identifying and diffusing the best innovations to speed adoption and adaptation of successful best practices."

B. Items 7 & 8—Workforce Development (partnerships with DOL)
Item 7: Greening Affordable Housing (Youth Green America)
The figure of **$25 million** (which, with a rough estimate of $200,000 funding per site matched by $200,000 anchor funding, might fund 125 locations nationwide) is surely inadequate to meet the need, but it can serve as an innovative pilot initiative that leverages anchor institution assets to train youth for a pressing workforce need.

Item 8: Youth Rebuilding Community workforce development program
The Task Force set a budget figure of **$25 million**, which could support a national network of approximately 50 centers. This figure is generated by looking at the budget of Community Development Technology Center (CDTC), the model for this proposed HUD initiative. According to CDTC's 990 filing for 2007, the organization currently has a budget of slightly over $1.5 million budget, with roughly 30 percent of funding ($467,000) coming from government sources. For more information on the CDTC, see www.cdtech.org/index.php.

C. Items 9 through 11 — Health Partnerships (partnerships with HHS)
Items 9 and 10: Health Partnership Capacity Grants and Community Health Anchor Partnerships programs
The Task Force set a budget of **$25 million for the "Phase 1" capacity grants**. This is adequate to fund 25 new centers a year (125 by year 5) nationally at the rate of $200,000 per center (matched by $200,000 anchor funding). The Task Force also set a budget **of $20 million for the "Phase 2" partnership grants**, which is adequate to fund 20 new centers a year or 100 by year 5. The $400,000 figure per center is based on an educated guess as to what community health programs cost. SAMHSA — Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (HHS) provides $250,000 for its community health programs for instance.

Item 11: Awards, Training & Evaluation
The Task Force put in **$5 million** in this category for the reasons indicated under Strategy 1, Item 6; health is another area where monitoring and evaluation is key.

D. Items 12 through 15 — Education Partnerships (partnerships with DOE)
Item 12: Continuing education for community development organization staff
The Task Force proposes an annual expenditure level of **$25 million**, which, with matching funds, could support a national network of 50 training and workforce centers. The Task Force used the same formula as that used for the Youth Rebuilding Communities program (item 8 above), but in this case the program focuses on training existing community development staff (just as Labor Centers at a number of universities provide extension-type training for union staff).

Item 13: Urban Revitalization Corps program
For this item, the Task Force proposes an annual allocation of **$35 million** a year, which would fund up to 2,000 "service years" worth of VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America) and AmeriCorps participants for this purpose (calculated by dividing the VISTA budget line in the FY

2008 Corporation for National and Community Service Budget by the number of annual service hours).

Item 14: High school urban planning curriculum development grants
For this item, which involves developing urban planning educational materials for high schools, the Task Force proposes an annual allocation of **$10 million** a year, which would provide curriculum development grants for 10 faculty each at 50 institutions (i.e., average grant amount of $20,000 per faculty member for course development work).

Item 15: University-Assisted Community Schools & School-Centered Community Development Centers
A demonstration community schools project sponsored by the federal government in 2008 received over 450 applications, only ten of which could be funded. Cost of the pilot was $5 million (i.e., about $500,000 per school). The Task Force proposes **$100 million** a year, which could fund up to 200 university-school-community partnerships (matched by anchor funding), including university-assisted community schools and school-centered community development centers across the country.

E. Item 16 — Cultural Development (partnerships with NEA and NEH)
Item 16: National Network of Cultural Development Centers
For this program, the Task Force proposes an annual expenditure level of **$10 million**, which, with matching funds, could support a national network of 20 cultural development centers. This is based on the cost of the "connective corridor" at Syracuse University, which links the university and the city's arts and cultural institutions and is a model of this kind of anchor-assisted cultural community and economic development work.

F. Items 17 and 18 — Regional Grants
Item 17: Action research grant program
The Task Force proposes **$40 million** with $25 million designated for regional planning (including housing, homelessness, transportation, land use, and economic development) and $15 million for issues that have not typically been addressed regionally, but would benefit from such an approach. If the average research grant award were approximately $250,000 (a reasonable amount in the social sciences), HUD could fund 160 research grants nationally with this allocation.

Item 18: Civic engagement anchor metro planning grants
The Task Force proposes **$25 million** to fund grants to encourage broad regional civic engagement initiatives. Unlike I-CAN, the focus here is much broader and could include service, research, or other non-economic functions that nonetheless have an indirect community economic development effect. If the average regional initiative grant were $500,000, HUD could fund 50 metro planning grants with this allocation.

Appendix B: Interview Subjects and Contributors

Section 1: Site Visit Interviews

Emory University/Atlanta, GA

- Frank Alexander, Professor of Law, Emory
- Rob Brawner, Program Director, Beltline Partnership
- Madge Donnellan, Associate Professor of Nursing, Emory
- Sam Marie Engle, Senior Associate Director, Office of University-Community Partnerships, Emory
- John Ford, Senior Vice President and Dean of Campus Life, Emory
- Alicia Franck, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Strategic Partnerships, Emory
- Kate Grace, Director of the Community Building and Social Change Fellows Program, Office of University-Community Partnerships, Emory
- David Hanson, Associate Vice President of Finance and Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration, Emory
- Ozzie Harris, Senior Vice President for Community and Diversity, Emory
- Moshe Haspel, Director of Research and Evaluation and Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Emory
- Ciannat Howett, Director of Sustainability Initiatives, Emory
- Young Hughley, Executive Director, Reynoldstown Revitalization Corporation
- David Jenkins, Director, Faith and the City and Assistant Professor of Church and Community Ministries, Candler School of Theology, Emory
- Kathy Kite, Senior Associate Director, Lillian Carter Center for International Nursing and Administrative Director of Service Learning, Emory
- Bob Lee, Associate Dean, Multicultural Medical Student Affairs, School of Medicine, Emory
- Earl Lewis, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Emory
- Kate Little, President and CEO, Georgia State Association of Neighborhood Developers
- Carlton Mackey, Assistant Director, Ethics and Servant Leadership, and Assistant Coordinator, Undergraduate Studies, Center for Ethics, Emory
- Crystal McLaughlin, Director of Student Development, Oxford College, Emory
- Emily Penprase, Coordinator of Community Service, Oxford College, Emory
- Alicia Philipp, CEO, Community Foundation of Greater Atlanta
- Edward Queen, Director, Ethics and Servant Leadership, and Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies, Center for Ethics, Emory
- Michael J. Rich, Associate Professor of Political Science and Environmental Studies and Director, Office of University-Community Partnerships, Emory
- Andy Schneggenburger, Executive Director, AHAND (Atlanta Housing Association of Neighborhood Developers)
- Nathaniel Smith, Director of Partnerships and Research for Equitable Development, Office of University-Community Partnerships, Emory
- Patti-Owen Smith, Director, Theory-Practice-Service Learning Program, Emory
- Denise Walker, Assistant Director of Community Affairs, Office of Governmental and Community Affairs, Emory
- Betty Willis, Senior Associate Vice President, Governmental and Community Affairs, Emory
- J. Lynn Zimmerman, Senior Vice Provost for External Academic Initiatives and Special Assistant to the Provost, Emory

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)/Indianapolis, IN

- Diane Arnold, Executive Director, Hawthorne Community Center
- Jennifer Boehm, Director, Government and Community Relations, External Affairs, IUPUI
- Richard Bray, Assistant Director, Office of Multicultural Outreach, IUPUI
- Robert Bringle, Executive Director, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI
- Lorrie Brown, Associate Director of Civic Engagement, IUPUI
- Claudette Canzian, Associate Director, Office of Purchasing Services, IUPUI
- Lana Coleman, Near Westside Resident
- Patrice Duckett, Near West Coordinator, Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative
- Richard Gordon, Event Consultant for NonProfit Solutions, Solution Center, IUPUI
- Jim Grim, Director of School/Community Engagement, George Washington Community High School
- Robert Halter, Director, Office of Purchasing Services, IUPUI
- Krista Hoffman-Longtin, Associate Director, Solution Center, IUPUI
- Ann Kreicker, Coordinator, George Washington Community High School
- Aaron Laramore, Program Officer, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Indianapolis
- Libby Laux, Assistant Director, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI
- Laura Littlepage, Clinical Lecturer, Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, IUPUI
- Darrell Nickolson, Community Faculty Fellow, Engineering and Technology, IUPUI
- Starla Officer, Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI
- Morgan Studer, Coordinator, Office of Community Work-Study, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI
- Anne-Marie Predovich Taylor, Executive Director, Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center

LeMoyne-Owen College (LOC)/Memphis, TN

- Femi Ajanaku, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, LOC
- Mairi Albertson, Division Administrator, Department of Planning and Development, City of Memphis
- Tk Buchanan, Senior Research Associate, Center for Community-Building and Neighborhood Action, University of Memphis
- Damita Dandridge, Instructor, Political Science and Program Director, American Humanics, LOC
- Austin Emeagwai, Assistant Professor of Accounting, LOC and Chief Financial Officer, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation
- Bob Fockler, President, Community Foundation of Greater Memphis
- Cheryl Golden, Professor and Division Chair, Sociology and Behavioral Sciences, LOC
- Laura Harris, Assistant Professor, Division of Public and Nonprofit Administration, University of Memphis
- Jeffrey Higgs, Executive Director, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation
- Robert Lipscomb, Director, City of Memphis Division of Housing and Community Development and Executive Director, Memphis Housing Authority
- Eric Robertson, Chief Administrative Officer, Center City Commission and President, Soulsville Neighborhood Association
- Emily Trenholm, Executive Director, Community Development Council of Greater Memphis
- Johnnie B. Watson, President, LOC
- Melissa Wolowicz, Director of Grants and Initiatives, Community Foundation of Greater Memphis
- Suhkara A. Yahweh, Community Activist

Miami Dade College (MDC)/Miami, FL

- Alex Alvarez, Director, Take Stock in Children, Miami
- Phil Bacon, Vice President for Neighborhood and Regional Initiatives, Collins Center for Public Policy
- Marilyn Brummitt, Director of Community Development, Miami Rescue Mission/Broward Outreach Centers
- Crystal Dunn, Program Manager, Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center, MDC
- Sheldon Edwards, Coordinator, Minority and Small Enterprise Office, MDC
- Geoffrey Gathercole, Director, School of Community Education, MDC
- Annette Gibson, Faculty, School of Nursing, Medical Center Campus, MDC
- Norma Martin Goonen, former Provost for Academic and Student Affairs and President of the Hialeah Campus, MDC
- Ossie Hanauer, Kendall Campus Director, Center for Community Involvement, MDC
- Daniella Levine, Executive Director, Human Services Coalition of Dade County
- Theodore Levitt, Director, Division of College Communications, MDC
- Michael Mason, Program Manager, Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center, MDC
- Elizabeth Mejia, Executive Director, Communities In Schools of Miami
- Eduardo Padrón, President, MDC
- Barbara Pryor, Staff, Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center, MDC
- Vivian Rodriguez, Vice Provost for Cultural Affairs and Resource Development, MDC
- Denis Russ, Director of Community Development, Miami Beach Community Development Corporation
- Linda Scharf, Program Manager, Working Solutions Program, MDC
- H. Leigh Toney, Director, Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center, MDC
- Joshua Young, Campus-Wide Director, Center for Community Involvement, MDC

Portland State University (PSU)/Portland, OR

- Lisa Abuaf, Senior Project Coordinator, Portland Development Commission
- Bob Alexander, Special Projects Manager, Portland Development Commission
- Lew Bowers, Central City Division Manager, Portland Development Commission
- Lara Damon, Director, Business Outreach Program, PSU
- Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, PSU
- Stephanie Farquhar, Associate Professor, School of Community Health, PSU
- Jill Fuglister, Co-Director, Coalition for a Livable Future
- Mark Gregory, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, PSU
- Diana Hall, Program Supervisor, School and Community Partnerships, Multnomah County Department of County Human Services
- Brian Hoop, Manager, Neighborhood Resource Center, Office of Neighborhood Involvement, City of Portland
- Kevin Kecskes, Associate Vice Provost for Engagement and Director, Community-University Partnerships, PSU
- Lynn Knox, Program Manager, Economic Opportunity Initiative, Bureau of Housing and Community Development
- Roy Koch, Provost, PSU
- Paul Leistner, Neighborhood Program Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Involvement, City of Portland
- Julie Massa, Portland Policy Coordinator, Oregon Opportunity Network
- Genny Nelson, Co-Founder, Sisters of the Road
- Laurie Powers, Director, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, PSU
- Karen Preston, Manager, Purchasing and Contracting Services, PSU
- Ethan Seltzer, Director and Professor, School of Urban Studies and Planning, College of Urban and Public Affairs, PSU

- Steve Trujillo, President, Downtown Neighborhood Association
- Robert Voica, Contracts Officer, Facilities and Planning, PSU
- Dee Walsh, Executive Director, Reach CDC
- Wim Wiewel, President, PSU
- Mark Wubbold, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Finance and Administration, PSU
- Diane Yatchmenoff, Director of Research, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, PSU

Syracuse University (SU)/Syracuse, NY
- Eric Beattie, Director, Campus Planning, Design, and Construction, SU
- Ed Bogucz, Director and Associate Professor, Syracuse Center of Excellence in Environmental and Energy Systems, SU
- Inmaculada Lara Bonilla, Assistant Professor and Faculty Associate, Latino-Latin American Studies, SU
- Allan Breese, Director, Business and Facilities Maintenance Services, SU
- Frank Caliva, Director of Talent Initiatives, Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York
- Nancy Cantor, Chancellor and President, SU
- Tim Carroll, Director of Operations, City of Syracuse
- Jan Cohen-Cruz, Director, Imagining America
- Dionisio Cruz, Community Consultant
- Ana Fernandez, Project Manager, Syracuse Center of Excellence in Environmental and Energy Systems, SU
- Douglas Freeman, Director, Purchasing and Real Estate, SU
- Rachael Gazdick, Executive Director, Say Yes to Education Syracuse
- Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director, Rosamond Gifford Charitable Corporation, Syracuse
- Marilyn Higgins, Vice President of Community Engagement and Economic Development, SU

- David Holder, President, Syracuse Convention and Visitors Bureau
- Linda Littlejohn, Associate Vice President, SU
- Stephen Mahan, Visiting Instructor, College of Visual and Performing Arts, SU
- Alys Mann, Senior Neighborhood Planner, Home HeadQuarters
- Louis Marcoccia, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, SU
- Chris McCray, Assistant Professor and Executive Director, COLAB, College of Visual and Performing Arts, SU
- Daniela Mosko-Wozniak, Director of Community Engagement and Economic Development, SU
- Rita Paniagua, Executive Director, Spanish Action League of Onondaga County, Inc.
- Eric Persons, Director, Engagement Initiatives, SU
- Daniel Queri, Real Estate Consultant
- Kevin Schwab, Director of Communications and Air Service Development, Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York
- Benjamin Sio, Economic Development Specialist, Syracuse Chamber of Commerce
- Steve Susman, Executive Director, Westcott Community Center
- Marion Wilson, Professor and Director of Community Initiatives in the Visual Arts, SU
- Jeff Woodward, Managing Director, Syracuse Stage

University of Cincinnati (UC)/Cincinnati, OH
- Jennifer Blatz, Director of Operations, Strive
- Matt Bourgeois, Director, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
- Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium
- Myrita Craig, former Executive Director, Agenda 360, Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber
- Thomas Croft, Chief Investment Officer, UC

- Kathy Dick, Director, Center for Community Engagement, UC
- Jeff Edmondson, Executive Director, Strive
- Bill Fischer, Business Development Manager, Department of Community Development, City of Cincinnati
- Tom Guerin, Associate Vice President, Purchasing and Material Management Services, UC
- Brooke Hill, District Director of Southwest Ohio, U.S. Senator Sherrod Brown's Office
- Larry Johnson, Dean, College of Education, Criminal Justice and Human Services, UC
- Kathy Merchant, President, Greater Cincinnati Foundation
- Rob Neel, President, CUF (Clifton Heights, University Heights, Fairview) Community Council
- Eric Rademacher, Co-Director, Institute for Policy Research, UC
- Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration and Interim President, UC
- Michael Romanos, Professor, School of Planning and Director, Center for Research in Urban Development, UC
- Michael Sharp, Director for Community-Engaged Learning, UC
- Gerry Siegert, Associate Vice President for Community Development, UC
- Cheryl Smith, Interim Director, Office of Contract Compliance, UC
- Mary Stagaman, former Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement and Associate Vice President, External Relations, UC
- Scott Stiles, Assistant City Manager, City of Cincinnati

University of Minnesota (UMN)/Minneapolis, MN
- Martin Adams, Project Coordinator, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, UMN

- Sara Axtell, Community-Campus Health Liaison and Assistant Professor, UMN
- Harry Boyte, Senior Fellow, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, UMN and Founder and Co-Director, Center for Democracy and Citizenship, Augsburg College
- Jay Clark, Program Director, Minnesota Center for Neighborhood Organizing, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, UMN
- Raymond Dehn, Community Resident Co-Chair of Community Affairs Committee, University Northside Partnership
- Mary Fitzpatrick, Executive Director, Seeds of Change
- Felecia Franklin, Principal Officer and Administrative Specialist, Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, UMN
- Andrew Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, UMN
- Ed Goetz, Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, UMN
- Erik Hensen, Principal Project Coordinator, City Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
- Reynolds-Anthony Harris, Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center, Strategic Plan Consultant, Lyceum Group, Minneapolis
- Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration, UMN
- Margaret Kaplan, Operations Director, Minnesota Center for Neighborhood Organizing, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, UMN
- Helen Kivnick, Professor, School of Social Work, UMN
- Lauren Martin, Research Associate, Center for Early Education and Development, UMN
- Geoff Maruyama, Associate Vice President for System Academic Administration and Professor, College of Education and Human Development, UMN
- Irma McClaurin, Associate Vice President and Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center, UMN

- Scott McConnell, Professor, College of Education and Human Development and Director of Community Engagement, Center for Early Education and Development, UMN
- Jan Morlock, Director, Community Relations for the Twin Cities Campus, UMN
- Kris Nelson, Director of Neighborhood Partnerships for Community Research, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, UMN
- Makeda Norris, Program Coordinator, Minneapolis Urban League
- Beverly Propes, Community Resident
- Sherrie Pugh, Director, Northside Resident Redevelopment Council
- Craig Taylor, Director, Office of Business and Community Economic Development, UMN
- Makeda Zulu-Gillespie, Community Liaison, Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center and University Northside Partnership, UMN

University of Pennsylvania (Penn)/Philadelphia, PA
- Randy Belin, Senior Program Officer, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Philadelphia
- Cory Bowman, Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Penn
- Glenn Bryan, Assistant Vice President of Community Relations, Office of Government and Community Affairs, Penn
- Tom Burns, Managing Director, Urban Ventures Group
- Jamie Gauthier, Program Officer, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Philadelphia
- David Grossman, Director, Civic House, Penn
- Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Penn
- Hillary Kane, Director, Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development
- Lucy Kerman, Vice President, Policy and Planning, Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Council

- Ann Kreidle, Project Coordinator of Penn Partnership Schools, Graduate School of Education, Penn
- James Lytle, Director of Penn Partnership Schools, Graduate School of Education, Penn
- Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing (Chief Procurement Officer), Penn
- Rick Redding, Director of Community Planning, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
- Gretchen Seuss, Director of Evaluation, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Penn
- Eleanor Sharpe, former Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Penn
- Tony Sorrentino, Executive Director, Public Affairs, Penn
- Joann Weeks, Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Penn
- Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University City District
- Steven Williams, Executive Director, Partnership CDC
- D. L. Wormley, Deputy Director, NeighborhoodsNow

Yale University/New Haven, CT
- Michael Ceraso, Principal, Hill Regional Career High School
- Rose Evans, Librarian, Christopher Columbus Family Academy
- Florita Gonzales, Chair, Dwight Community Management Team
- David Heiser, Head of Education and Outreach, Yale Peabody Museum
- Suzannah Holsenbeck, Yale Partnership Coordinator, Co-op High School
- Jeannette Ickovics, Deputy Director for Community Outreach, Yale Center for Clinical Investigation
- Sheila Masterson, Executive Director, Whalley Avenue Special Service District
- William Placke, Chief Executive Officer, First Community Bank of New Haven

- Claudia Merson, Director of Partnerships, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale
- Frank Mitchell, Chair, Board of Directors, Common Ground
- Michael Morand, Associate Vice President, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale
- Colleen Murphy-Dunning, Director, Urban Resources Initiative, Yale
- Holly Parker, Director, Sustainable Transportation Systems, Yale
- Joanna Price, Coordinator of Community Programs in Science, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale

- Abigail Rider, Associate Vice President, Director of University Properties, Yale
- Shana Schneider, Deputy Director, Yale Entrepreneurship Institute
- Sheila E. Shanklin, Director of Cooperative Management, Home, Inc.
- Jon Soderstrom, Director, Office of Cooperative Research, Yale
- T. Reginald Solomon, Program Director, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale
- Deborah Stanley-McAulay, Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Yale
- Linda Townsend-Maier, Executive Director, Greater Dwight Development Corporation

Section 2: Additional Background Interviews and Quoted Individuals

- John C. Burkhardt, Professor and Director, National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, University of Michigan
- David Cox, Executive Assistant to the President and Professor, University of Memphis
- Amy Driscoll, Consulting Scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Senior Scholar, Portland State University
- Rosalind Greenstein, Urban Policy Analyst and former Senior Fellow and Chair, Department of Economics and Community Development, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
- Nick Harris, Assistant Vice President for Community and Economic Development and Executive Director, Dillard University Community Development Corporation
- Elizabeth Hollander, Senior Fellow, Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University and former Executive Director, Campus Compact

- David Maurrasse, President and Founder, Marga Incorporated
- Ruth Meyers, Director, Demonstration Projects for Community Revitalization, United Way for the Greater New Orleans Area
- David Perry, Associate Chancellor, Great Cities Commitment and Director of the Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink
- Amber Seeley, Finance Program Director, Renaissance Neighborhood Development Corporation, a subsidiary of Volunteers of America, New Orleans
- Karl Seidman, Senior Lecturer in Economic Development, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Henry Louis Taylor, Professor and Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo

Appendix C: Additional Resources

Section 1: Profiled Organizations

Many of the colleges and universities in this report have multiple offices, centers, and departments that oversee community partnership efforts. For simplicity's sake, we've listed only one principal organization at each institution.

BARBARA AND EDWARD NETTER CENTER FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS
University of Pennsylvania
133 South 36th Street, Suite 519
Philadelphia, PA 19104
T 215-898-5351
F 215-573-2799
www.upenn.edu/ccp

Founded in 1992, the Netter Center for Community Partnerships is the University of Pennsylvania's primary vehicle for community-oriented, real-world problem solving. The Center enlists the broad range of knowledge available at a research university in its efforts to help solve the complex, comprehensive, and interconnected problems of the American city. The Netter Center's programs focus on local public schools, urban nutrition, and a range of community development initiatives. Academically based community service is at the core of the Netter Center's work, linking theory to practice, to create mutually beneficial partnerships between the University and its West Philadelphia community.

CENTER FOR ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
Portland State University
1721 SW Broadway
Cramer Hall 349
Portland, OR 97201
T 503-725-5642
caestaff@pdx.edu
www.pdx.edu/cae

The Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) is dedicated to excellence in teaching, learning, assessment, research, and community-university partnerships at Portland State University. Through curricular innovation and civic engagement activities, CAE works to realize the University's motto, "Let Knowledge Serve the City." To this end, the Center consults faculty in the development of community-based learning courses, which address specific and compelling issues locally, regionally and worldwide. It also collaborates with the Senior Capstone program, which provides every student the opportunity to apply their learning, in a team context, to real challenges emanating from the metropolitan community.

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
Miami Dade College
300 NE 2nd Avenue, Room 3410
Miami, FL 33132
T 305-237-7477
F 305-237-7580
www.mdc.edu/cci

Housed within the Academic Division of Miami Dade College, the Center for Community Involvement (CCI) strives to enhance student learning, meet community needs, and foster civic responsibility and a sense of caring for others. CCI is responsible for all service-learning activities and the America Reads program across the College's eight campuses, as well as serves as a volunteer clearinghouse for students, faculty, and staff who want to engage in community service. The Center provides individual faculty consultation on integrating service-learning into their courses, student handbooks, a comprehensive list of approved service-learning sites appropriate for each course, service-learning certificates, a campus-wide "Forum on Civic Responsibility," and other assistance to support relevant and meaningful service to the community.

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
801 West Michigan Street
Business/SPEA Building Room BS2010
Indianapolis, IN 46202
T 317-278-2662
F 317-278-7683
http://csl.iupui.edu

The Center for Service and Learning's (CSL) mission is to involve IUPUI students, faculty, and staff in service activities that mutually benefit the campus and community. CSL is comprised of four offices — The Office of Service Learning, The Office of Community Service, The Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, and the Office of Community Work-Study. Through these offices, CSL collaborates with other campus units, develops community partnerships, coordinates and evaluates programs, and promotes service, service learning, and civic engagement to further the academic and public purposes of the university.

LEMOYNE-OWEN COLLEGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
915 East McLemore Avenue, Suite 201
Memphis, TN 38126
T 901-672-8420
www.loccdc.org
www.loc.edu/administration/loccdc.htm

In 1989, LeMoyne-Owen College renewed its commitment to the city and the community by forming the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation. The LeMoyne-Owen CDC's mission is aimed at raising the economic and education levels of those people who live and work in the community surrounding the College. Since hiring its first executive director in 1999, the CDC has served as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization and economic development in the LeMoyne-Owen community known as Soulsville. Activities include implementing a revolving loan fund; job creation, training and placement; residential and commercial development; homeownership training; and business incubation.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVLEOPMENT
Syracuse University
350 West Fayette Street
Warehouse, Suite 405
Syracuse, NY 13202
T 315-443-0320
www.syr.edu/suanchorinstitution
http://connectivecorridor.syr.edu

The Office of Community Engagement and Economic Development oversees several of Syracuse's large partnership efforts, such as its involvement in the Connective Corridor and the Near West Side Initiative. The Connective Corridor is emerging as a signature strip of cutting-edge cultural development connecting University Hill to the city below, which Syracuse University is developing with local, state, and federal partners. The University is also a key partner in the Near West Side Initiative, a collaborative effort to rehabilitate and revitalize the Near West Side neighborhood through arts, culture, and technology. Chancellor Nancy Cantor has dedicated $13.8 million in forgiven loans from the state to the Initiative, which has helped to acquire and renovate property as well as improve the energy and environmental performance of homes in an 11-block area.

OFFICE OF NEW HAVEN AND STATE AFFAIRS
Yale University
433 Temple Street
New Haven, CT 06511
T 203-432-8613
F 203-432-8622
www.yale.edu/onhsa

Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs (ONHSA) provides a front door to the University and its resources for Greater New Haven residents and organizations. ONHSA works with other Yale departments and community partners to foster economic development, revitalize neighborhoods, support public school and youth programs, and create a vital downtown. The Office oversees, for example, Yale's Homebuyer Program, which has helped more than 920 employees purchase homes

since 1994, including $7.5 million of housing purchases in Dixwell, a low-income neighborhood near campus that is a focus area of Yale's current outreach efforts.

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS
Emory University
1256 Briarcliff Road NE
Suite 418 West
Atlanta, GA 30322
T 404-712-9893
F 404-712-9892
oucp@emory.edu
http://oucp.emory.edu

The Office of University-Community Partnerships (OUCP) was created by the Provost's Office in 2000, to integrate teaching and research at Emory with service to benefit the Greater Atlanta community and beyond. OUCP is working to create a continuum of engaged scholarship, research and learning opportunities through four key strategies: building the capacity of faculty, staff and students to develop mutually beneficial partnerships; connecting academic coursework with community-based service; focusing faculty and student research on pressing local concerns; and building the capacity of local organizations to respond effectively to community needs.

UPTOWN CONSORTIUM
629 Oak Street, Suite 306
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
T 513-861-8726
F 513-861-1902
www.uptownconsortium.org

The Uptown Consortium is a non-profit community development corporation dedicated to the human, social, economic and physical improvement of Uptown Cincinnati. The organization was formed in 2003 by leaders of Uptown's five largest employers: Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati Zoo & Botanical Garden, The Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati, TriHealth, Inc., and University of Cincinnati. In addition to the Consortium, the University has helped create seven Community Urban Redevelopment

Corporations in the neighborhoods of Uptown. The University alone has invested nearly $150 million of its $833 million endowment in real estate development efforts.

URBAN RESEARCH OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT CENTER
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
2001 Plymouth Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55411
T 612-626-8762
uroc@umn.edu
www.uroc.umn.edu

In 2006, the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities formed the University Northside Partnership in collaboration with community organizations and city and county representatives, as well as elected to establish its first Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center (UROC). UROC aims to serve as the University's anchor in North Minneapolis to coordinate the delivery of community-driven research, outreach, and engagement activities and programs. The UROC building opened its doors in October 2009 and houses programs in early childhood education, health disparities, youth and family development, nutrition education, youth entrepreneurship, and business incubation. UROC's vision is to transform the University of Minnesota's land-grant mission to encompass and support a collaborative and sustainable model of community-university partnerships by leveraging its resources to address the complex challenges and improve the quality of life in urban communities.

Section 2: Selected Additional Models and Resources

Many more schools and resources could be listed but below is a sampling of additional leading university-community partnership programs and efforts.

ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS TASK FORCE
c/o Marga, Inc.
245 Park Avenue
39th Floor, Suite 46
New York, NY 10167
T 212-979-9770
F 917-591-1547
taskforce@margainc.com
www.margainc.com/html/anchor_task_force.html

The Anchor Institutions Task Force, initially convened to advise incoming U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Shaun Donovan in 2009, has become a permanent organization that aims to develop and disseminate knowledge to help create and advance democratic, mutually beneficial anchor institution-community partnerships. Bringing together scholars, university presidents, and others, the Task Force aims to increase cooperation and alignment among government, anchor institutions, businesses, schools, community organizations and philanthropy in order to improve communities.

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Michigan State University
1801 W. Main St
Lansing, MI 48915
T 517-353-9555
F 517-484-0068
cedp@msu.edu
www.cedp.msu.edu

Founded in 1969, the Center for Community and Economic Development at Michigan State University is located in the state capital city of Lansing and operates as a unit within MSU University Outreach and Engagement, with the express purpose of developing and applying knowledge to address the needs of society across the state of Michigan — primarily in distressed urban communities.

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
University of Texas, El Paso
Benedict Hall, Room 101
El Paso, TX 79968
T 915-747-7969
F 91-5747-891
cce@utep.edu
www.utep.edu/cce

The Center for Community Engagement at the University of Texas, El Paso engages faculty and students through service learning to enhance student learning, promote civic engagement, and actively improve the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez Region. Each semester, 500 students and 30 classes work with the Center. The Center has cultivated partnerships with over a dozen nonprofit groups, placing UTEP students in service learning placements relevant to their individual academic pursuits while helping the organizations increase their capacity to carry out their social missions.

COALITION OF URBAN SERVING UNIVERSITIES
101 Constitution Ave., N.W. Suite 650E
Washington, DC 20001
T 202-638-1950
F 202-639-0713
info@usucoalition.org
www.usucoalition.org

The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) is a national network of public research universities. Formed by university presidents, USU advocates for federal policy that supports public urban universities in partnership with their cities and metropolitan areas; collects and analyzes data to help create a foundation for these universities' work; and provides leadership by forming a common urban agenda and highlighting innovative models of university-community partnerships. USU's initiatives focus on three areas: supporting partnerships with K-12 schools; revitalizing neighborhoods and

increasing economic development; and improving community health.

DUKE-DURHAM NEIGHOBRHOOD PARTNERSHIP
Duke University
Office of Community Affairs
110 Swift Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
T 919-668-6300
www.community.duke.edu/duke

The Duke-Durham Neighborhood Partnership began in 1996 as a way to engage Duke University in a structured partnership with the surrounding community. Since that time, Duke has helped to raise more than $12 million to invest in its partner neighborhoods. The Partnership directs the University's resources — particularly student volunteers — to improve the quality of life within these neighborhoods. The Partnership's efforts have focused primarily on improving the quality of education through in-school and after-school programs, providing health care at neighborhood clinics and wellness centers, and helping to build affordable housing for lower income residents.

EAST ST. LOUIS ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Campus mail code: MC-549, 326 Noble Hall
1209 South Fourth St.
Champaign, IL 61820
T 217-265-0202
F 217-244-9320
eslarp@uiuc.edu
www.eslarp.uiuc.edu

Since 1990, this program of mutual learning and assistance has been an important part of the growing neighborhood revitalization movement in East St. Louis, Illinois and more recently four adjacent communities: Alorton, Brooklyn, Centreville, and Washington Park. Areas of concentration have included youth skill development, neighborhood organization capacity building, and affordable housing.

EDWARD GINSBERG CENTER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND LEARNING
University of Michigan
1024 Hill Street
The Madelon Pond Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
T 734-647-7402
F 734-647-7464
www.ginsberg.umich.edu

The Ginsberg Center at the University of Michigan strives to engage students, faculty members, university staff, and community partners in a process that combines community service and academic learning in order to promote civic participation, build community capacity, and enhance the educational process. The Center is home to several community partnership and service-learning programs that engage undergraduate and graduate students in serving meals in soup kitchens, tutoring children in schools, rehabilitating abandoned houses, and revitalizing urban neighborhoods. These students also explore the connections between the service they perform and opportunities to create change through social and political action.

PARTNERSHIP FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 37
11 Payne Street
Hamilton, NY 13346
T 315-825-3537
info@partnersatwork.org
www.partnersatwork.org

Founded in 1998 as a partnership between Colgate University and the Town and Village of Hamilton, New York, the Partnership for Community Development has fostered small business development; provided design help and funding to improve building facades and streetscapes in the five-block business district of downtown Hamilton; helped restore the Village Green; and established retail and marketing support for local arts and crafts. To date, Colgate has provided $630,000 in funding, which has leveraged over $1.5 million from private sector, foundation, and government sources.

SOUTHSIDE INSTITUTIONS NEIGHBORHOOD ALLIANCE
207 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106
T 860-493-1618
F 860-520-1359
www.sinainc.org

Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance (SINA) is a partnership between Connecticut Children's Medical Center, Hartford Hospital and Trinity College that works cooperatively with the community to develop leadership and improve the economic, physical and social characteristics of Hartford's Frog Hollow, Barry Square and South Green neighborhoods. The partnership has promoted homeownership, jobs for neighborhood residents, and community commercial development.

JONATHAN M. TISCH COLLEGE OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC SERVICE
Tufts University
Lincoln Filene Hall
Medford, MA 02155
T 617-627-3453
F 617-627-3401
http://activecitizen.tufts.edu

Founded in 2000, Tisch College was established to support the core Tufts mission of promoting civic engagement by: 1) facilitating and supporting a wide range of student programs that enable them to develop their potential to contribute meaningfully to the greater world; 2) working directly with the communities in which Tufts has a presence; 2) engaging and supporting faculty in research and teaching; and 4) engaging Tufts alumni interested in building stronger communities and societies.

UCLA CENTER FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS
University of California, Los Angeles
PO Box 951405, 2333 Murphy Hall
405 Hilgard Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1405
T 310-267-5257
F 310-267-5443
http://la.ucla.edu

Founded in 2002, the Center has advanced over 180 collaborations between UCLA and community organizations, working on economic development; children, youth and families; and arts and cultural programs. CCP has awarded over $4.8 million dollars to Los Angeles non-profit community based organizations and UCLA partners to carry out their collaborative work. In 2007, CCP launched a second office in South Los Angeles that offers a steady, physical presence within the community to help cultivate a network of relationships integral to successful partnership building. The South Los Angeles initiative provides support to non-profit organizations, UCLA faculty, students and staff for meetings, classes, and community projects. UCLA sustains the South Los Angeles office with a commitment of nearly $300,000 annually.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, CHICAGO—NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE
University of Illinois, Chicago
412 South Peoria Street
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60607
T 312-996-8700
F 312-996-8933
www.uicni.org

Founded in 1993, the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative (UICNI) contributes to neighborhood revitalization through teaching, research, and services that are focused on measurable improvements in educational outcomes, health status, economic conditions, physical environment and safety among other important issues. To date, UICNI has received more than 35 grants totaling more than $13.8 million from federal, state and foundation sources. UICNI projects as of 2010 include its Latino leadership development program (Latino Urban

Leaders), a community health initiative program (Chicago Partnership for Health Promotion) and Illinois ResourceNet, a nonprofit capacity building program.

USC COMMUNITY INITIATIVES
University of Southern California
Office of Government and Community Relations
2801 S. Hoover Street
Los Angeles, CA 90089-7740
T 213-821-2549
F 213-740-7459
http://communities.usc.edu

In 1992, USC President Steven B. Sample launched five university-community initiatives that focused the University's outreach and public-service programs on improving the surrounding neighborhoods. These five initiatives include providing special educational, cultural and developmental opportunities for local children; working with the community to provide safer streets; attracting more entrepreneurs, especially minority entrepreneurs, to the immediate vicinity; encouraging USC employees to live in the immediate area; and increasing the hiring of persons who have lived in the surrounding community for the previous five years. USC's Office of Government and Community Relations oversees the overall implementation, and academic units across the university, as well as several administrative offices, are involved in carrying out the five initiatives.

Endnotes

1. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul Brophy and Rachel Godsil, eds., *Retooling HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Penn Institute for Urban Research, Feb. 2009, pp. 147-168, quote on p. 148.

2. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," p. 159. U.S. Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 2008,* Washington, DC: NCES, 2009, Chapter 3, http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98 (accessed July 26, 2010).

3. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," see especially pp. 148–149; Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), personal correspondence, May 4, 2010.

4. Henry S. Webber and Mikael Karlstrom, *Why Community Investment is Good for Nonprofit Anchor Institutions: Understanding Costs, Benefits, and the Range of Strategic Options*, Chicago: Chapin Hill at the University of Chicago, 2009, see especially pp. 4–6.

5. Ira Harkavy and Harmon Zuckerman, *Eds and Meds: Cities' Hidden Assets*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999, p. 1.

6. Arloc Sherman and Chad Stone, *Income Gaps between Very Rich and Everyone Else More than Tripled in Last Three Decades New Data Show,* Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, June 25, 2010, p. 3.

7. We had initially sought to assess the quantifiable impact university partnerships are having on poor and low-income residents, as a fourth purpose; however, we quickly realized that such data was not readily available and creating appropriate quantitative measures on our own was beyond the scope of this study. We continue to believe this is an important issue for the field, however, and include it in our discussion of recommendations of areas for future research.

8. Derek Bok, *Universities and the Future of America*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990, quotes on p. 21 and inside book flap.

9. John Saltmarsh, Matt Hartley, and Patti Clayton, *Democratic Education White Paper*, Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Feb. 2009, p. 3.

10. James Collier, "Scripting the radical critique of science: the Morrill Act and the American Land-Grant University," *Futures*, volume 34, no. 2, 2002, pp. 182–191, see especially p. 183. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development*, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland, Aug. 2007, pp. 11–13.

11. Although university-community partnership work has deep historical roots, there are important differences between today's movement and the land-grant and settlement house movements of a century ago. In particular, today's movement puts less emphasis on provision of university expertise for communities and places greater emphasis on building mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships. (See, for example: Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, p. 57.)

12. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, p. 106. Mary Jo Deegan, *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils*, Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002. William Rainey Harper, "The University and Democracy," 1899, in Harper, *The Trend in Higher Education*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905, pp. 1–34, quoted in Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett, *Dewey's Dream, Universities in an Age of Education Reform: Civil Society, Public Schools, and Democratic Citizenship*, Philadelphia: Temple University, 2007, p. 13. David Hildebrand, "The Chicago School," The Pragmatism Cybrary, Amherst, NY: Center for Inquiry Transnational, 2010, www.pragmatism.org/genealogy/chicago.htm (accessed Feb. 3, 2010).

13. Dwight E. Giles and Janet Eyler, "The Theoretical Roots of Service-Learning in John Dewey: Toward a Theory of Service-Learning," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 1, 1994, pp 77–85.

14. Michael Lounsbury and Seth Pollack, *Institutionalizing Civic Engagement: Shifting Logics and the Cultural Repackaging of Service-Learning in Higher Education*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 2001, quote on p. 17, www.ilr.cornell.edu/lounsbury/papers/pollack.pdf (accessed Oct. 13, 2005).

15. Michael Lounsbury and Seth Pollack, *Institutionalizing Civic Engagement,* quote on p. 20. Definition of service-learning is taken from Hollie Lund, Director of Service-learning at Cal Poly Pomona; see Hollie Lund, "The Many Shapes of Service-Learning," Pomona, CA: California State University Pomona, no date, www.calstate.edu/cce/resource_center/engaged_departments.shtml (accessed Oct. 14, 2005). Campus Compact, *5-Year Impact Summary*, Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2004, www.compact.org/aboutcc/5yrimpact.html (accessed Oct. 13, 2005); Campus Compact, *2004 Service Statistics: The Engaged Campus—Highlights and Trends of Campus Compact's Annual Membership Survey*, Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2005.

16. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, pp. 21–23.

17. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges,* pp. 30, 108 (endnote 77). Corporation for National Service, *Corporation Budget Chart for FY 2011*, Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service, Feb. 1, 2010, www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/2011_budget_chart.pdf (accessed Feb. 5, 2010).

18. Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Crime—Large Local Agencies: Trends in One Variable, Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter*, Washington, DC: DOJ, Aug. 27, 2009, http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/dataonline/Search/Crime/Local/TrendsInOneVarStepTwoLarge.cfm?NoCrimeCrossId=Yes&CFID=1380684&CFTOKEN=24221505 (accessed Jan. 7, 2010). Pennsylvania Firearms Owners Association, *Philly Murder Rates before 1996?*, Philadelphia, PA: PFOA, no date, http://forum.pafoa.org/pennsylvania-10/8238-philly-murder-rates-before-1996-a.html (accessed Jan. 7, 2010). Alfred Bloumstein, Frederick P. Rivara, and Richard Rosenfeld, "The Rise and Decline of Homicide—And Why," *Annual Review of Public Health*, 2000, vol. 21, pp. 505–541, see especially p. 529.

19. Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett. *Dewey's Dream*, p. 79. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, pp. 56–61, 116.

20. Carol Morello and Tim Craig, "In sign of rebound, D.C. population set to surpass 600,000," *Washington Post,* December 31, 2009, p. A-1, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/30/AR2009123003262_pf.html (accessed Feb. 5, 2010).

21. Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and CEOs for Cities, *Leveraging Colleges and Universities for Urban Economic Revitalization: An Action Agenda*, Boston, MA: ICIC and CEOs for Cities, 2002, pp. 2 and 9. David Perry and David Cox, Internal Submission to Anchor Institutions Task Force, Dec. 2008. David Maurrasse, *City Anchors: Leveraging Anchor Institutions for Urban Success,* Chicago, IL: CEOs for Cities, Sept. 2007, p. 2.

22. Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, *A Vital Partnership: Great Cities, Great Universities*, Washington, DC: USU, 2008. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," pp. 147–168, see especially pp. 150 and 209.

23. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Muriel Howard*, Washington, DC: AASCU, no date, www.aascu.org/association/president/howardbio.htm (accessed May 31, 2010). Justin Wellner, Manager, Government Relations, Van Scoyoc Associates, personal correspondence, May 2010. Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, "Shari O. Garmise, Ph.D. Appointed Vice President, APLU/USU Office of Urban Initiatives," *A Public Voice: A•P•L•U's Online Newsletter*, Washington, DC: APLU, June 25, 2010, www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=1660 (accessed July 8, 2010).

24. Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Profiles of the Professoriate*, Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

25. Derek Bok, *Universities and the Future of America*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990, p. 120.

26. John Saltmarsh, Matt Hartley, and Patti Clayton, *Democratic Education White Paper*, Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Feb. 2009, p. 6.

27. David Cox, Executive Assistant to the President, University of Memphis, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009.

28. Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009.

29. Elizabeth Hollander, Senior Fellow, Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University and former Campus Compact Director, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 23, 2009.

30. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide to neighborhood revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania, March 2008, pp. 15–24.

31. Henry S. Webber and Mikael Karlstrom, "Why Community Investment is Good for Nonprofit Anchor Institutions: Understanding Costs, Benefits, and the Range of Strategic Options," Chicago: Chapin Hill at the University of Chicago, 2009, p. 6.

32. Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and CEOs for Cities, *Leveraging Colleges and Universities for Urban Economic Revitalization: An Action Agenda*, Boston, MA: ICIC and CEOs for Cities, 2002, pp. 21–22.

33. Ted Howard, Executive Director, The Democracy Collaborative, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 10, 2009.

34. David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, London: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and ME Sharpe, 2005, pp. 304–314.

35. Allegra Calder, Gabriel Grant, and Holly Hart Muson, "No Such Thing as Vacant Land: Northeastern University and Davenport Commons," in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer,* pp.256–7.

36. Ziona Austrian and Jill S. Norton, "An Overview of University Real Estate Investment Practices," in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer,* pp. 202–3.

37. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit*, p. 67.

38. The Rensselaerville Institute, *Duke Durham Neighborhood Partnership: Results from the First Decade*, Durham, NC: The Rensselaerville Institute, March 2008, pp. 5 and 11.

39. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges,* pp. 65–66. Laura Dueñes, Michelle Ciurrea, Eliza Edelsberg, and Rhae Parkes, *Building Partnerships for Neighborhood Change: Promising Practices of the University-Community Partnership Initiative*, Washington, D.C.: Fannie Mae Foundation, December 2001.

40. Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009. On support of community development financial institutions, for Yale, see section on Yale in this report. On Duke, see The Rensselaerville Institute, *Duke Durham Neighborhood Partnership: Results from the First Decade*, Durham, NC: The Rensselaerville Institute, March 2008, p. 11. As of March 2008, Duke had a commitment to deposit $5 million in Latino Community Credit Union and also had $5.5 million already on deposit at various area minority-owned banks.

41. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnership with Their Communities,* London: Routledge, 2001, p. 55.

42. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul Brophy and Rachel Godsil, eds., *Retooling HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, Feb. 2009, pp. 147–168, see especially p. 163. Alliance for Excellent Education, "The Nation's Path to Economic Growth: The Economic Benefits of Reducing the Dropout Rate," Nov. 2009.

43. Coalition for Community Schools, *Community Schools Research Brief 09*, Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 2009, www.communityschools.org (accessed March 17, 2009).

44. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," p. 162.

45. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: Transforming Communities and Higher Education*, Seattle, WA: CCPH, no date, www.ccph.info (accessed July 2, 2010).

46. Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009.

47. For further discussion of scholarly engagement, as well as institutionalization of the work, see Lorilee R. Sandmann, Courtney H. Thornton, Audrey J. Jaeger, eds., "Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: the first wave of Carnegie classified institutions," *New directions for higher education* 147, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 2009.

48. David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, London, UK: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and ME Sharpe, 2005, pp. 309–15.

49. Michael Morand, Associate Vice President, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale University, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

50. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit*, p. 104.

51. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Carnegie Selects Colleges and Universities for New Elective Community Engagement Classification,* Stanford, CA: Carnegie, www.carnegiefoundation.org/news/sub.asp?key=51&subkey=2126 (accessed June 15, 2010).

52. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, p. 84.

53. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnership with Their Communities,* London: Routledge, 2001, p. 7.

54. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges,* see especially pp. 80–82.

55. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, pp. 30–31, 51–56, 116. The now-defunct Campus Outreach Partnership Center program most commonly gave 3-year, $400,000-grants. The Office of University Partnerships, however, continues to provide minority-serving institution grants, which have averaged $700,000. (Armand Carriére, personal correspondence, April 30, 2010.)

56. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus,* pp. 5–7.

57. David Dixon and Peter J. Roche, "Campus Partners and The Ohio State University: A Case Study in Enlightened Self-Interest," in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, London: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and ME Sharpe, 2005, pp. 272–3.

58. Stephen Viederman, "Can Universities Contribute to Sustainable Development," in Robert Forrant and Linda Silka, eds., *Inside and Out: Universities and Education for Sustainable Development,* Amityville, New York: Baywood, 2006, p. 26.

59. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, pp. 98–99.

60. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus,* pp. 11–13.

61. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus,* p. 184.

62. Rachel Weber, Nik Theodore, and Charles Hoch, "Private Choices and Public Obligations: The Ethics of University Real Estate Development," in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis.* London: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and ME Sharpe, 2005, p. 288.

63. Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009.

64. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit*, p. 108.

65. Ziona Austrian and Jill S. Norton, "An Overview of University Real Estate Investment Practices," in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., *The University as Urban Developer*, p. 212.

66. Rosalind Greenstein, Urban Policy Analyst, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 14, 2009.

67. Elizabeth Hollander, Senior Fellow, Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, Tufts University and former Campus Compact Director, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 23, 2009.

68. David Maurrasse, *Beyond the Campus,* p. 186. For further discussion on asset-based community development, see Gord Cunningham and Alison Mathie, "Asset-Based Community Development—An Overview," 2002, www.synergos.org/knowledge/02/abcdoverview.htm (accessed June 7, 2010). See also The Asset-Based Community Development Institute at the School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University, www.abcdinstitute.org/ (accessed June 7, 2010).

69. Harry C. Boyte, "Repairing the Breech: Cultural Organizing and the Politics of Knowledge," *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-learning & Civic Engagement*, Vol.1 (1), Summer 2009, p. 1.

70. Victor Rubin, personal correspondence, June 9, 2010.

71. Ziona Austrian and Jill S. Norton, "An Overview of University Real Estate Investment Practices," p. 205.

72. Richard Bray, Assistant Director, Office of Multicultural Outreach, IUPUI and former GINI Coordinator for the Near Westside, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

73. Robert Bringle, Director, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009. Starla Officer, Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

74. *Quality of Life Plan: Creating our Future Near Westside Neighborhood*, 2007. Downloaded from www.greatindyneighborhoods.org/index.php (accessed July 22, 2009). Diane Arnold, Executive Director, Hawthorne Community Center, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

75. Robert Bringle, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009. Patrice Duckett, Coordinator for Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative in Near Westside, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

76. Anne-Marie Predovich Taylor, Executive Director of the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 4, 2009. Diane Arnold, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009.

77. Coalition for Community Schools, www.communityschools.org (accessed February 17, 2010).

78. Starla Officer, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009. George Washington Community High School, www.421. ips.k12.in.us/index.php?id=8107 (accessed April 1, 2010). Starla Officer, personal correspondence, April 29, 2010. Robert Bringle, personal correspondence, April 11, 2010.

79. Libby Laux, Assistant Director of Development, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

80. Robert Bringle, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009. Krista Hoffman-Longtin, Associate Director for Internships and Experiential Learning, Solution Center, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

81. Laura Littlepage, Clinical Lecturer and Policy Analyst, Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 4, 2009.

82. Wim Wiewel, President, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

83. Kevin Kecskes, Associate Vice Provost for Engagement and Director, Community-University Partnerships, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth Portland, OR, July 14, 2009.

84. Wim Wiewel, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

85. Roy Koch, Provost, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 15, 2009. Kevin Kecskes, interview by Rita Axelroth, July 14, 2009. Lynn Knox, Program Manager, Economic Opportunity Initiative, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR: July 16, 2009.

86. For more information on this topic, see: Andrew Mott, *University Education for Community Change: A Vital Strategy for Progress on Poverty, Race and Community-Building*, Washington, DC: Community Learning Project, May 2005. Portland State's effort is discussed briefly on p. 20 of the report.

87. Stephanie Farquhar, Portland, OR, Associate Professor of Community Health, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 16, 2009.

88. Genny Nelson, Co-founder, Sisters of the Road, Inc., interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 15, 2009.

89. Laurie Powers, Director, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 22, 2009.

90. Lara Damon, Director, Business Outreach Program, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

91. Lynn Knox, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 16, 2009. Kevin Kecskes, interview by Rita Axelroth Portland, OR, July 14, 2009. Wim Wiewel, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

92. Mark Gregory, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

93. Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

94. Lew Bowers, Central City Division Manager, Urban Development Department, Portland Development Commission, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 15, 2009. Roy Koch, interview by Rita Axelroth, July 15, 2009.

95. Eduardo Padrón, President, Miami Dade College, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009.

96. *Miami Dade College Highlights and Facts, 2009.* Daniella Levine, Executive Director, Human Services Coalition of Dade County, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

97. H. Leigh Toney, Executive Director, Carrie P. Meek Entrepreneurial Education Center, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009.

98. Josh Young, Campuswide Director, Center for Community Involvement, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

99. Overtown Collaborative, *Chronology of Overtown History: University of Miami Oral History Project*, Miami, FL: Overtown Collaborative, no date, www.floridacdc.org/members/overtown/hist-his3.htm (accessed Dec. 14, 2009).

100. Phil Bacon, Vice President for Neighborhood and Regional Initiatives, Collins Center for Public Policy, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

101. Florida Campus Compact recognized this effort as the state's most outstanding campus-community partnership for 2009.

102. Marilyn Brummitt, Director of Community Development, Miami Rescue Mission, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

103. Daniella Levine, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 11, 2009.

104. Vivian Rodriguez, Vice Provost for Cultural Affairs and Resource Development, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009. Wim Wiewel, Internal Submission to Anchor Institutions Task Force, Dec. 2008.

105. Sheldon Edwards, Coordinator, Minority and Small Enterprise Office, Office of Equal Opportunity Programs, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL May 12, 2009.

106. Linda Scharf, Program Manager, Working Solutions, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009. Theodore Levitt, Director, Division of College Communications, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

107. Starla Officer, Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

108. Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

109. Alex Alvarez, Director, Take Stock in Children, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

110. Dilafruz Williams, Partnership Institute Featured Session: "Sites of Knowledge, Service, and Research: How to Grow Long-Term Partnerships among Schools, Universities, and Communities," May 19, 2009.

111. Robert Bringle, Julie Hatcher, Barbara Holland, "Conceptualizing civic engagement: Orchestrating change at a metropolitan university," *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(3), 2007, pp. 57–74.

112. Robert Bringle, Director, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009. Darrell Nickolson, Engineering and Technology Department, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

113. Phil Bacon, Vice President for Neighborhood and Regional Initiatives, Collins Center for Public Policy, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

114. Eduardo Padrón, President, Miami Dade College, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009. Geoffrey Gathercole, Director, School of Community Education, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009.

115. Wim Wiewel, President, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

116. Miami Dade College, "Saviors of our Cities: Survey of Best College and University Civic Partnerships," Draft Submission May 22, 2009.

117. Richard Bray, Assistant Director, Office of Multicultural Outreach, IUPUI and former GINI Coordinator for the Near Westside, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

118. Anne-Marie Predovich Taylor, Executive Director of the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 4, 2009. Diane Arnold, Executive Director, Hawthorne Community Center, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

119. Ethan Seltzer, Professor and Director, School of Urban Studies and Planning, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

120. Eduardo Padrón, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009.

121. Norma Goonen, Provost for Student and Academic Affairs, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009. H. Leigh Toney, Executive Director, Meek Entrepreneurial Center, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009. Eduardo Padrón, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009.

122. Sheldon Edwards, Coordinator, Minority and Small Enterprise Office, Office of Equal Opportunity Programs, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009.

123. Robert Halter, Director, Purchasing Department, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 4, 2009.

124. Karen Preston, Manager, Purchasing and Contracting Services, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 14, 2009.

125. Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

126. Theodore Levitt, Director, Division of College Communications, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 11, 2009.

127. Robert Bringle, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009. Patrice Duckett, Coordinator for Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative in Near Westside, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

128. Kevin Kecskes, "Beyond the Rhetoric: Applying a Cultural Theory Lens to Community-Campus Partnership Development," *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, Spring 2006,* pp. 5–14. Kevin Kecskes, Director, Associate Vice Provost for Engagement and Director, Community-University Partnerships, Portland State University, Portland, OR, interview by Rita Axelroth, July 14, 2009.

129. Lisa Abuaf, Senior Project Coordinator, Portland Development Commission, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, Aug. 15, 2009.

130. Brian Hoop, Manager, Neighborhood Resource Center, Office of Neighborhood Involvement, City of Portland and Steve Trujillo, President, Downtown Neighborhood Association, interviews by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 14, 2009.

131. Stephanie Farquhar, Portland, OR, Associate Professor of Community Health, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 16, 2009. Lynn Knox, Program Manager, Economic Opportunity Initiative, Portland, OR, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 16, 2009.

132. Elizabeth Mejia, Executive Director, Communities IN Schools of Miami, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009.

133. Aaron Laramore, Program Officer, LISC Indianapolis, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis IN, Aug. 20, 2009.

134. Theodore Levitt, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 11, 2009.

135. Wim Wiewel, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

136. National Association of College and University Business Officers, *All Institutions Listed by Fiscal Year 2008 Market Value of Endowment Assets with Percentage Change Between 2007 and 2008 Endowment Assets,* Washington, DC: NACUBO, 2009. National Association of College and University Business Officers and Commonfund, *U.S. and Canadian Institutions Listed by Fiscal Year 2009 Endowment Market Value and Percentage Change in Endowment Market Value from FY 2008 to FY 2009,* Washington, DC: NACUBO and Commonfund, 2010.

137. University of Pennsylvania, *Penn Facts and Figures,* Philadelphia, PA: Penn, 2009, www.upenn.edu/about/facts.php; University of Pennsylvania, *2008–2009 Financial Report,* Philadelphia, PA: Penn, 2009, p. 20; Yale University, *About Yale: Facts,* New Haven, CT: Yale, no date, http://yale.edu/about/facts.html; University of Cincinnati, *About UC,* Cincinnati, OH: UC, no date, www.uc.edu/about/ucfactsheet.html (websites accessed May 23, 2010). Penn Fiscal Year 2009, Penn hospital revenues and expenses were roughly 56 percent of Penn's total budget; the $2.5 billion figure of Penn's budget without the Health System assumes a similar percentage in FY 2010 (since the FY 2010 financial report is not published as of press time). Since Yale New Haven Hospital, unlike Penn Health Systems, is a separate corporation and thus does not appear on the books of its parent university, the Penn Health numbers need to be subtracted out to arrive at comparable numbers.

138. Judith Rodin, quoted in: John Kromer and Lucy Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004, p. 8.

139. Although beyond the scope of this study, "town and gown" have interacted ever since the university was founded. An interesting parallel to the West Philadelphia Initiatives in Penn's history is the University's 1959 creation of the West Philadelphia Corporation, formed in response to a murder of a Penn graduate student the previous year. Generally, this early effort is seen as much more "top down" than Penn's current efforts. The "top down" nature of the 1959 effort can be seen in the language of the partnership effort, which, according to Sharpe, was focused on the "need for elbow room and a more healthy campus environment." For more information, see Judith Rodin, *The University and Urban Revival Out of the Ivory Tower and Into the Streets,* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007, see especially Chapter 3 and Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, March 2008, see especially pp. 29–30 and 46. Eleanor Sharpe, former Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, personal correspondence, April 30, 2010.

140. Tom Burns, Managing Director, Urban Ventures, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 13, 2009. Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Founding Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships,

University of Pennsylvania, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 15, 2005. See also: Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, March 2008, pp. 35–38. Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009.

141. Tom Burns, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, May 13, 2009. Tony Sorrentino, Executive Director, Public Affairs, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009.

142. John Kromer and Lucy Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Redevelopment. Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania, 2004, pp. 36, 38, and 52.

143. Diane-Louise Wormley, Deputy Director, Neighborhoods Now, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Richard Redding, Director of Community Planning, City of Philadelphia, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009.

144. Richard Redding, interview by Steve Dubb, May 4, 2009. Ira Harkavy, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Ira Harkavy, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 15, 2005. Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, Annual Report 2008–2009, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, p. 18.

145. Ralph Maier, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009.

146. Tony Sorrentino, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009. Glenn Bryan, Associate Vice President, Office of Community Relations, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009.

147. Tony Sorrentino, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009. Kromer and Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives,* pp. 28 and 52.

148. Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University City District, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009. Tony Sorrentino, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009. University Center District, University City Report Card 2009, Philadelphia, PA: UCD, 2009, pp. 50 and 58. Kromer and Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives*, p. 22. Additional University Center District programs include marketing, street cleaning, recycling promotion, summer jobs for community youth, a farmer's market, maintenance of two local parks, homeless outreach, and graffiti removal. (Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University City District, personal correspondence, April 2010; Tom Burns, Managing Director, Urban Ventures Group, personal correspondence, May 2010. Tom Burns, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, May 13, 2009.)

149. James Lytle, Professor, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. School District of Philadelphia, *School Profile, Penn Alexander School: Ethnicity*, Philadelphia, PA: School District of Philadelphia, 2010, https://webapps.philasd.org/school_profile/view/1280 (accessed May 31, 2010). For historical data, see: Stephen Seplow, "Penn neighborhood blooms around a top school," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 5, 2010, www.philly.com/philly/education/89894467.html?cmpid=15585797 (accessed May 31, 2010).

150. Ann Kreidle, Manager, K12 Partnerships, Penn Partnerships Planning Office Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. James Lytle, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009. Cory Bowman, Associate Director and Gretchen Seuss, Director of Evaluation, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Rita Axelroth, *The Netter Center for Community Partnerships' University-Assisted Community School Programs*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, June 4, 2008, p. 6.

151. David Grossman, Director, Civic House, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Hillary Kane, Director, Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Eleanor Sharpe, former Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, personal correspondence, April 30, 2010.

152. Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration and Interim President, University of Cincinnati, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009.

153. Michael Romanos, David Edelman, and Mahyar Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations: Study of Peer Institutions—Main Report*, Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, Office of the President, November 2006, see especially pp. 13–14. Gerald Siegert, Associate Vice President for Community Development, University of Cincinnati, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010.

154. Michael Romanos, *The University of Cincinnati's Community Involvement*, Curitiba, Brazil: Seminario Internacional de Curitiba, Aug.-Sept. 2007, p. 20. Gerald Siegert, Associate Vice President for Community Development, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009. Interview with Tony Brown, former

President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, Sept. 2007, p. 2. Mary Stagaman, former Associate Vice President for External Relations and Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009. In June 2010, Stagaman left her position at the University of Cincinnati to serve as Executive Director of Agenda 360, a regional economic action plan that includes the University.

155. Romanos, Edelman, and Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations,* see especially pp. 16–24, 53, 102–103, 123. Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, presentation at CEOs for Cities, *Leveraging Anchor Institutions for Urban Success*, San Jose, CA: CEOs for Cities, May 1–2, 2007.

156. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

157. Kathy Dick, Director, Center for Community Engagement, and Michael Sharp, Director for Community-Engaged Learning, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

158. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009. Gerald Siegert, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010.

159. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

160. Some of these redevelopment corporations are not currently active. Gerald Siegert, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

161. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

162. Olivetree Research and UC Marketing Students, "Uptown Market Landscape," May 2009.

163. Romanos, Edelman, and Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations*, pp. 20–21. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009.

164. Jeff Edmonson, Director and Jennifer Blatz, Director of Operations, Strive, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009. Mary Stagaman, personal correspondence, May 6, 2010. Strive's 2010 annual report indicates improvement on 40 of 54 key measures of success, including a 10 percent increase in Cincinnati Public School graduates enrolling in college since 2004, the majority of whom attend the University of Cincinnati. (Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, *Urban Universities: Anchors Generating Prosperity for America's Cities,* Washington, DC: USU, July 2010, page 13.)

165. Larry Johnson, Dean, College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009. Jeff Edmonson, Director and Jennifer Blatz, Director of Operations, Strive, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009.

166. Larry Johnson, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 11, 2009.

167. Scott Stiles, Assistant City Manager and Bill Fischer, Business Development Manager, City of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009.

168. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009. Myrita Craig, former Executive Director, Agenda 360, Chamber of Commerce, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009.

169. Gregory Williams, Address by President Gregory H. Williams to All-University Faculty Meeting, Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, November 18, 2009, www.uc.edu/president/messages/11_18_09_presidentaddress.html (accessed Dec. 29, 2009); Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 27, 2009; Cliff Peale, "Health Alliance Future Clouded," Cincinnati Enquirer, July 12, 2009, http://news.cincinnati.com/article/20090712/COL/907120347/Health-Alliance-future-clouded (accessed Dec. 29, 2009). In June 2010, the Uptown Consortium Board of Trustees selected Beth Robinson as its new President and CEO; Robinson formerly served as the University of Cincinnati's director of real estate development.

170. Mark Alden Branch, "Then . . . and now: How a city came back from the brink," *Yale Alumni Magazine*, May/June 2009, pp. 35–61, quote on p. 43. Note Branch's article says there were 37 homicides, but, as cited in the executive summary above, official crime statistics count 34 homicides, not 37.

171. Although not a focus of this report, Yale's involvement with the community evidently did not begin in 1991. For example, Michael Morand, Associate Vice President of Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs, notes that in 1987, Yale committed to invest $50 million over 5 years in housing, commercial and industrial development in New Haven. (Michael Morand, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.)

172. Sheila Masterson, Executive Director, Whalley Special Services, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009. Linda Thompson-Maier, Executive Director, Greater Dwight Development Corporation, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009.

173. Yale Office of Public Affairs, "Yale's Office of New Haven and State Affairs," *Yale Bulletin and Calendar*, Special Issue: Spring/Summer 2002, www.yale.edu/opa/arc-ybc/ybc_alumni/story104.html. Yale Office of Public Affairs, *Yale Names Urban Revitalization Leader to Head University's New Haven and State Affairs*, New Haven, CT: Yale University, Aug. 28, 1997, http://opa.yale.edu/news/article.aspx?id=5793 (accessed Dec. 24, 2009). Michael Morand, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

174. US Census Bureau, "New Haven (City) Connecticut," *State and County Quick Facts*, Data derived from Population Estimates, 2000 Census of Population and Housing, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, County Business Patterns, 2002 Economic Census, Minority- and Women-Owned Business, Building Permits, Consolidated Federal Funds Report, Census of Governments, Washington, DC: Dept. of Commerce, Nov. 17, 2009, http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/09/0952000.html (accessed Dec. 24, 2009). Sheila Shanklin, Director of Cooperative Management, HOME, Inc., interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009.

175. Richard C. Levin, *Universities and Cities: The View from New Haven*, Cleveland, OH: inaugural colloquium, Case Western Reserve University, Inaugural Colloquium, Jan. 30, 2003, http://opa.yale.edu/president/message.aspx?id=36 (accessed Dec. 24, 2009).

176. Jon Soderstrom, Director, Office of Cooperative Research, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009. Shana Schneider, Deputy Director, Youth Entrepreneurial Institute, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009. Michael Morand, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

177. Reggie Solomon, *New Haven Investments—Summary 1990–2009*, New Haven, CT: Yale University, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, November 23, 2009. Sheila Masterson, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 6, 2009. Linda Thompson-Maier, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 6, 2009.

178. Reggie Solomon, Program Director, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009. Michael Morand, Associate Vice President, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009. Reggie Solomon, *New Haven Investments—Summary 1990–2009*. Michael Morand, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

179. Reggie Solomon, *New Haven Investments—Summary 1990–2009*.

180. Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009. Suzannah Holsenbeck, Yale Partnership Coordinator, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009.

181. Colleen Murphy-Dunning, Director, Urban Resources Initiative, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009.

182. Reggie Solomon, *New Haven Investments—Summary 1990–2009*.

183. Reggie Solomon, *New Haven Investments—Summary 1990–2009*.

184. Abigail Rider, Associate Vice President and Director for University Properties, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009. Michael Morand, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

185. Abigail Rider, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 8, 2009.

186. University of Pennsylvania, *West Philadelphia Data & Information Resources*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, no date, http://westphillydata.library.upenn.edu (accessed Dec. 29, 2009). Richard Redding, Director of Community Planning, City of Philadelphia, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009.

187. Olivetree Research and UC Marketing Students, *Uptown Market Landscape*, Cincinnati, OH: UC, May 2009.

188. Nelson Bregon, General Deputy Assistant Secretary, Community Planning and Development, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the House Committee on Ways and Means*, Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, Oct. 7, 2009, Attachment #1, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/hearings.asp?formmode=view&id=8080 (accessed Dec. 29, 2009).

189. Stephen Seplow, "Penn neighborhood blooms around a top school," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 5, 2010, www.philly.com/philly/education/89894467.html?cmpid=15585797 (accessed May 31, 2010). Lucy Kerman, Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009. Diane-Louise Wormley, Deputy Director, Neighborhoods Now, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009.

190. Michael Morand, Associate Vice President, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale, personal correspondence, April 28, 2010.

191. Ira Harkavy, Carol de Fries, Joann Weeks, Cory Bowman, Glenn Bryan, and Dawn Maglicco, *Strategy for Taking Penn's Local Engagement Effort from Excellence to Eminence*, Submitted to Van McMurtry, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Affairs, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Jan. 9, 2006.

192. Cory Bowman, Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009.

193. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization*, Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, March 2008, pp. 93–94. Randy Belin, Senior Program Officer and Jamie Gauthier, Assistant Program Officer, Philadelphia LISC, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009. Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University Center District, personal correspondence, April 2010.

194. Michael Sharp, Director for Community-Engaged Learning, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009.

195. Mary Stagaman, former Associate Vice President for External Relations and Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009.

196. Reginald Solomon, Program Director, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009

197. Jeanette Ickovics, Deputy Director of Community Outreach, Yale Center for Clinical Investigation, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009. Bill Placke, CEO, First Community Bank, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009.

198. Anonymous, "University Trustees' November Meeting Coverage*," University of Pennsylvania Almanac*, Volume 56, No. 11, November 10, 2009, www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v56/n11/trustees.html (accessed Dec. 30, 2009). Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges*, pp. 63–64. Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Founding Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, personal correspondence, April 27, 2010.

199. Kathy Merchant, President, Greater Cincinnati Foundation, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 14, 2009. Gerald Siegert, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010. Michael Sharp, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 11, 2009. Michael Romanos, Professor, School of Planning and Director of the Center for Research in Urban Development, University of Cincinnati, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth Oct. 1, 2009.

200. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009. University of Cincinnati, Office of the President, *Biography*, Cincinnati, OH: UC, no date, www.uc.edu/president/biography.html (accessed July 2, 2010).

201. Jon Soderstrom, Director, Office of Cooperative Research, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009.

202. Michael Morand, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009.

203. University of Nevada, Reno, "Case Study #4: University of Pennsylvania-Philadelphia, Pennsylvania," *University and College Community Partnerships: University of Nevada, Reno Comprehensive Master Plan*, Reno, NV: University of Nevada, Reno, March 11, 2004, p. 2, www.unr.edu/masterplan/worktodate.html (accessed Dec. 30, 2009). Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, *Annual Report 2007–2008*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, p. 39.

204. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009. Gerald Siegert, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009. Gerald Siegert, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010. Thomas Croft, Chief Investment Officer, University of Cincinnati, personal correspondence, May 17, 2010.

205. Kathy Merchant, President, Greater Cincinnati Foundation, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 14, 2009.

206. Reginald Solomon, *New Haven Investments — Summary 1990–2009,* New Haven, CT: Yale University, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, November 23, 2009. Note: the Office of New Haven and State Affairs includes "uncompensated medical care" among its community partnership expenditures. We have elected to exclude this category, in part because this is not strictly a "voluntary contribution" and recalculated Yale's contribution totals accordingly (i.e., nonprofit hospitals are legally obliged to provide charity care and, moreover, the amount a nonprofit hospital "contributes" for charity care depends on how many uninsured patients need medical care, a factor that is largely beyond the nonprofit hospital's control).

207. Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. Natalie Kostelni, "UCD adds new jobs initiative," *Philadelphia Business Journal,* June 25, 2010, http:// philadelphia.bizjournals.com/philadelphia/stories/2010/06/28/story1.html (accessed July 12, 2010).

208. Tom Guerin, Associate Vice President, Purchasing and Cheryl Smith, Interim Director of Contract Compliance, University of Cincinnati, interviews by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009.

209. Scott Stiles, Assistant City Manager and Bill Fischer, Business Development Manager, City of Cincinnati, S interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009.

210. Michael Morand, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 6, 2009.

211. John Kromer and Lucy Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004, p. 12.

212. Michael Romanos, David Edelman, and Mahyar Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations: Study of Peer Institutions—Main Report,* Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, Office of the President, November 2006, p. 14.

213. Michael Romanos, Professor, School of Planning and Director of the Center for Research in Urban Development, University of Cincinnati, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth Oct. 1, 2009. Romanos, Edelman, and Arefi, *Community Interactions*, see especially pp. 23–25. Mary Stagaman, personal correspondence, May 6, 2010.

214. Matt Bourgeois, Director, Clifton Heights Urban Redevelopment Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009. Rob Neel, President, Clifton Heights, University Heights, and Fairview Community Council, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009.

215. Sheila Masterson, Executive Director, Whalley Special Services, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009. Linda Thompson-Maier, Executive Director, Greater Dwight Development Corporation, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009. Florita Gonzalez, Chair, Dwight Community Management Team, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 6, 2009.

216. Diane-Louise Wormley, Deputy Director, Neighborhoods Now, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Lucy Kerman, Vice President, Policy and Planning, Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009.

217. TCC Group, *Netter Center for Community Partnerships: Strategic Plan*, Philadelphia, PA: TCC Group, Feb. 2008, pp. 5, 18, 29. Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Founding Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009.

218. Tom Burns, Managing Director, Urban Ventures, interview by Steve Dubb, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, May 13, 2009.

219. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

220. Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration and Interim President, University of Cincinnati, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009.

221. Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009. Michael Morand, quoted in: Mark Alden Branch, "Then . . . and now: How a city came back from the brink," *Yale Alumni Magazine*, May/June 2009, pp. 35–61, quote on p.45.

222. Paul Grogan and Tony Proscio, *Comeback Cities: A Blueprint for Urban Neighborhood Renewal*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 2000, quote on p.13. Mark Alden Branch, "Then . . . and now: How a city came back from the brink," *Yale Alumni Magazine*, May/June 2009, pp. 35–61, see p.46.

223. Ira Harkavy, Carol de Fries, Joann Weeks, Cory Bowman, Glenn Bryan, and Dawn Maglicco, *Strategy for Taking Penn's Local Engagement Effort from Excellence to Eminence*, Submitted to Van McMurtry, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Affairs, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Jan. 9, 2006. Tony Sorrentino, Executive Director, Public Affairs, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. Tom Burns, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, May 13, 2009.

224. Olivetree Research and UC Marketing Students, "Uptown Market Landscape," May 2009.

225. Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 27, 2009.

226. On Cincinnati's formal commitment to poverty reduction: see Nancy Zimpher, *State of the University Address*, 2007: Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, 2007, www.uc.edu/president/2007_State_of__the_University_Address.html (accessed July 8, 2010), where Zimpher says, "These are a set of neighborhoods that face some very

daunting challenges — high poverty, high unemployment, low literacy, low home ownership, and safety and transportation issues. And that's why the Uptown Consortium is committed to a five-pronged strategy focused on housing, retail, safety, transportation and neighborhood amenities." On Penn's formal commitment, see Ira Harkavy et al., *Strategy for Taking Penn's Local Engagement Effort from Excellence to Eminence*, Jan. 9, 2006. See especially p.6 where the authors write, "Penn is not, nor should it be, a social service agency. However, the University can make a significant difference by harnessing and marshalling our academic and institutional resources to solve universal problems (such as poverty, unequal healthcare, substandard housing, and inadequate, unequal education) that are manifested locally in West Philadelphia."

227. Yale Office of Public Affairs, "Yale Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions by 17%," New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2008, http://environment.yale.edu/news/5565 (accessed Dec. 28, 2009). Holly Parker, Director, Sustainable Transportation Systems, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009. Rafi Taherian, Executive Director, Yale Dining, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, November 23, 2009.

228. Nancy Cantor, President and Chancellor, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

229. Nancy Cantor, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 29, 2009.

230. Marilyn Higgins, Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009. Kevin Morrow, "State approves Syracuse University investing $13.8 million loan repayment in Near Westside Initiative," Sept. 21, 2007, www.syr.edu/news/archives/story.php?id=4341 (accessed May 30, 2009).

231. Marilyn Higgins, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 28, 2009. Marilyn Higgins, personal correspondence, March 23, 2010. Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director, Rosamond Gifford Charitable Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

232. Ed Bogucz, Director of the Center for Excellence in Environmental & Energy Systems, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009. Marilyn Higgins, personal correspondence, March 31, 2010.

233. Linda Littlejohn, Associate Vice President, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009.

234. Eric Persons, Director of Engagement Initiatives, Office of Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Benjamin Sio, Economic Development Specialist, Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

235. Douglas Freeman, Director of Purchasing and Real Estate, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. "Guaranteed Mortgage Program," http://realestate.syr.edu/RealEstate/display.cfm?content_ID=%23%23288I-%0A; "Home Ownership Grant Program," http://realestate.syr.edu/RealEstate/display.cfm?content_ID=%23%28%28-%28%0A (accessed May 25, 2009).

236. Louis Marcoccia, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Douglas Freeman, Director of Purchasing and Real Estate, Eric Beattie, Director of Campus Planning, Design, and Construction, and Allan Breese, Director of Business and Facilities Maintenance, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Louis Marcoccia, personal correspondence, June 22, 2009.

237. Nancy Cantor, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 29, 2009.

238. Marilyn Higgins, personal correspondence, March 31, 2010.

239. Robert H. Bruininks, *Inaugural Address: Advancing Knowledge: A Partner for the Public Good,* Minneapolis, MN: Office of the President, University of Minnesota, February 28, 2003, www1.umn.edu/pres/00_images/pdf/inaugural_address.pdf (accessed July 2, 2010).

240. Harry Boyte, Senior Fellow, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 9, 2005. For details, see Edwin Fogelman, "Civic Engagement at the University of Minnesota," *The Journal of Public Affairs*, Volume 6, Supplemental Issue 1: Civic Engagement and Higher Education, 2002, pp. 103–117.

241. W.K. Kellogg Foundation, *Engaged Institutions Cluster Evaluation–Case Study: The University of Minnesota*, draft report in possession of author, 2009.

242. Craig Taylor, Director, Office for Business and Community Economic Development, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009. Office for Business and Community Economic Development Website, www.ced.umn.edu/About_Us.html (accessed June 4, 2010).

243. "UROC development surpasses contracting and hiring goals," *InsightNews.com,* Jan. 22, 2010, www.insightnews.com/news/5487-uroc-development-surpasses-contracting-and-hiring-goals (accessed June 4, 2010).

244. Craig Taylor, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 24, 2009. Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

245. Sherrie Pugh, Executive Director, Northside Resident Redevelopment Council, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

246. "University Northside Partnership," www.unpmn.org (accessed May 22, 2010).

247. Martha Coventry, "McClaurin Helps Forge New Partnerships: Engaging with the Northside," UMN News, July 22, 2008, http://www1.umn.edu/news/features/2008f/UR_192846_REGION1.html (accessed June 4, 2010).

248. Robert Jones, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 24, 2009. Reynolds-Anthony Harris, Lyceum Group, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 24, 2009. Erik Hansen, Principal Project Coordinator, City of Minneapolis Department of Community Planning and Economic Development, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, August 25, 2009.

249. Erline Belton and Reynolds-Anthony Harris, The Lyceum Group. "Strategic Planning Process Phase One: Report on Interviews, Findings, & Preparation for the Futures Conference," 2008. Sara Axtell, Community-Campus Health Outreach Liaison, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

250. Minister Suhkara A. Yahweh, Community Activist, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009.

251. Eric Robertson, Chief Administrative Officer, Center City Commission and President, Soulsville Neighborhood Association, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009.

252. Jeffrey Higgs, Executive Director, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009.

253. For a detailed history of the LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, including its internal organizational structure, external oversight, relationship to the College, specific program initiatives, and the College's participation in the HUD HBCU grant program, see: Nina Liou, Laurel Davis, and Sheila Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies of Experiences in Community Development: Volume II—Case Study Reports*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development & Research, Baltimore, MD: Optimal Solutions Group LLC, Oct. 2007, pp. 37–72.

254. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies*, pp. 37–72, see especially p. 64.

255. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies*, pp. 37–72, see especially p. 68.

256. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Austin Emeagwai, Assistant Professor of Accounting, LeMoyne-Owen College and Chief Financial Officer, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies*, pp. 37–72, see especially p. 55.

257. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. "Students Prepare to Graduate from Recovery Act Funded Highway Worker Training Program," http://news.tennesseeanytime.org/node/5227 (accessed June 14, 2010).

258. Michael Powell, "Blacks in Memphis lose Decades of Economic Gains," *NY Times,* May 30, 2010, www.nytimes.com/2010/05/31/business/economy/31memphis.html (accessed June 14, 2010). Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies*, pp. 37–72, see especially pp. 43–44 and 68–69.

259. Femu Ajanaku, Department of Sociology, LeMoyne-Owen College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009.

260. LeMoyne-Owen College, *Transformation Plan*, 2008.

261. Earl Lewis, Provost, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

262. National Association of College and University Business Officers and Commonfund, *All Institutions Listed by Fiscal Year 2009 Market Value of Endowment Assets with Percentage Change Between 2008 and 2009 Endowment Assets*, Washington, DC: NACUBO and Commonfund, 2010. Jane Roberts, "Alumna leaves LeMoyne-Owen College gift of San Francisco real estate," *The Commercial Appeal* [Memphis, TN], May 7, 2010, www.commercialappeal.com/news/2010/may/07/alumna-leaves-lemoyne-owen-college-gift-san-franci, accessed August 3, 2010. David Cox, Executive Assistant

to the President, University of Memphis, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009. Alicia Philip, President, Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 18, 2009.

263. Craig Schneider and Andy Miller, "Emory Cuts Grady Debt $20 million," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution,* December 19, 2008, www.ajc.com/hotjobs/content/printedition/2008/12/19/grady.html (accessed Nov. 20, 2009). Robert Lee, Associate Dean, Multicultural Medical Student Affairs, School of Medicine, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 18, 2009; Emory University, *Emory/Grady At a Glance*, Atlanta, GA: Emory, 2008, www.emory.edu/grady/ataglance.htm (accessed Nov. 20, 2009).

264. David Jenkins, Director, Faith in the City, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 18, 2009.

265. Madge Donnellan, Associate Professor of Nursing, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Crystal McLaughlin, Director of Student Development, Oxford College, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Emory University, *Transformations: A Blueprint for Engaging Emory in Scholarship and Learning in Science and Community*, Report of the Emory: Engaging Community Advisory Board, Atlanta, GA: Emory, June 7, 2007, p.6.

266. Alicia Franck, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Partnerships, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

267. David Hanson, Associate Vice President of Finance and Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Betty Willis, Senior Associate Vice President, Governmental and Community Affairs, and Denise Walker, Assistant Director of Community Affairs, Office of Governmental and Community Affairs, Emory University, interviews by Steve Dubb, Atlanta: GA: June 17, 2009. J. Lynn Zimmerman, Senior Vice Provost for External Academic Initiatives and Special Assistant to the Provost, Emory University, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Emory University, *About the Clifton Community Partnership*, 2008, Atlanta, GA: Emory, http://cliftoncommunitypartnership.org/about/index.html (accessed Nov. 20, 2009). "Emory's Clifton Partnership Aids Business, Community, and the Environment," *Knowledge @Emory*, Oct. 9, 2008. http://knowledge.emory.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1188 (accessed Nov. 20, 2009).

268. Of course, if one factors in the housing allowance and tuition waiver, the effective wage rate is much higher than $9 an hour. Kate Grace, Director, Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

269. Kate Grace, interview by Steve Dubb, June 17, 2009. Nathaniel Smith, Director, Partnerships & Research for Equitable Development, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Alicia Philip, interview by Steve Dubb, June 18, 2009.

270. Sam Marie Engle, Senior Associate Director, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Beverly Clark, "Community partnership programs boosted by university investment," *Emory Report*, November 13, 2006, volume 59, number 11.

271. Nathaniel Smith, interview by Steve Dubb, June 17, 2009. Moshe Haspel, Director, Research & Evaluation, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

272. Michael J. Rich, Director, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

273. "V" as in the letter V– not the Roman numeral for "5." For planning purposes, the City of Atlanta has chosen to group neighborhoods into "neighborhood planning units," each designated by a separate alphabet letter.

274. Michael J. Rich, interview by Steve Dubb, June 17, 2009. David Hanson, interview by Steve Dubb, June 17, 2009. Michael Rich and Sam Emory, *Connecting Campus to Community: A Place-Based Strategy for Preparing Engaged Scholars*, Atlanta, GA: Emory, 2009, mimeo.

275. Andrew Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, University of Minnesota, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 8, 2009.

276. Douglas Freeman, Director of Purchasing and Real Estate, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Jan Morlock, Director, Community Relations for the Twin Cities Campus, University of Minnesota, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 16, 2009. Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, and Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, personal correspondence, June 4, 2010.

277. Bob Fockler, President, Community Foundation of Greater Memphis, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, October 13, 2009.

278. Marilyn Higgins, Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009. Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director, Rosamond Gifford Charitable Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

279. Rachel Gazdick, Executive Director, Say Yes to Education Syracuse, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. "Syracuse Say Yes to Education and Economic Development," www.sayyestoeducation.org/syte/content/view/83/32/ (accessed May 25, 2009).

280. Thomas Scott and Kris Nelson, "Engaging the Northside Community: CURA and the Northside Partnership," *CURA Reporter,* Spring 2007.

281. Erline Belton and Reynolds-Anthony Harris, The Lyceum Group, "Strategic Planning Process Phase One: Report on Interviews, Findings, & Preparation for the Futures Conference," 2008.

282. For example, the Minnesota Youth Community Learning Initiative (MYCL) is a university-community partnership that has been associated directly with the Konopka Institute rather than the overall University. The Konopka Institute has a long history and deep ties in North Minneapolis but has not been directly involved with the Northside Partnership. (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, *Engaged Institutions Cluster Evaluation–Case Study: The University of Minnesota,* draft report in possession of author, 2009, pp. 9–10.)

283. Andy Schneggenburger, Executive Director, Atlanta Housing Association of Nonprofit Developers (AHAND), interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

284. Cheryl Golden, Professor and Division Chair, Sociology and Behavioral Sciences, Femu Ajanaku, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, and Damita Dandridge, Instructor and Program Director for American Humanics, LeMoyne-Owen College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009. "Hollis F. Price Middle College," www.loc.edu/hollis%20f%20price/about.htm (accessed Dec. 18, 2009).

285. Louis Marcoccia, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Marilyn Higgins, personal correspondence, March 31, 2010.

286. Craig Taylor, Director, Office for Business and Community Economic Development, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009. Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 24, 2009. *University of Minnesota, Promotion and tenure: key changes to the faculty tenure policy,* Minneapolis, MN: UM, 2007, www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/changes.html (accessed June 4, 2010).

287. Jeffrey Higgs, Executive Director, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009. Johnnie B. Watson, President, LeMoyne-Owen College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009. Nina Liou, Laurel Davis, and Sheila Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies of Experiences in Community Development: Volume II — Case Study Reports*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development & Research, Baltimore, MD: Optimal Solutions Group LLC, Oct. 2007, pp. 37–72, see especially pp. 40–42.

288. Nancy Cantor, President and Chancellor, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Rachel Gazdick, Executive Director, Say Yes to Education Syracuse, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

289. "Urban Research and Outreach/Engagement Center: Broadband Access Project," www.uroc.umn.edu/programs/bap.html (accessed June 24, 2010). Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, and Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, personal correspondence, June 4, 2010. Minnesota's Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, Andy Furco, notes that the University also continues to make substantial investments in non-urban-focused public engagement initiatives, supporting more than 200 units, centers, and programs that conduct community-engaged work across the state, nationally, and internationally. (Andy Furco, personal correspondence, June 30, 2010.)

290. Austin Emeagwai, Assistant Professor of Accounting, LeMoyne-Owen College and Chief Financial Officer, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009. Robert Lipscomb, Director of City of Memphis Division of Housing and Community Development, Executive Director of the Memphis Housing Authority, and Chair of LeMoyne-Owen College Board of Trustees, interview by

Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies,* see especially pp. 40–42.

291. Louis Marcoccia, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

292. Ciannat Howett, Director of Sustainability, Emory, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 19, 2009. Ozzie Harris, Senior Vice Provost for Community and Diversity, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, Nov. 3, 2009.

293. Jeffrey Higgs, Executive Director, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009. Minister Suhkara A. Yahweh, Community Activist, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 13, 2009.

294. Ed Bogucz, Director of the Center for Excellence in Environmental & Energy Systems, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009.

295. Frank Caliva, Director of Talent Initiatives, and Kevin Schwab, Director of Communications and Air Service Development, Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 10, 2009.

296. Irma McClaurin, personal correspondence, June 4, 2010.

297. Minister Suhkara A. Yahweh, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 13, 2009.

298. Nicci Brown, "Downtown warehouse to be a focal point for Syracuse University and community programs," March 24, 2005, www.syr.edu/news/archives/story.php?id=1643 (accessed June 2, 2009). Marilyn Higgins, Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, personal correspondence, March 31, 2010.

299. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Tk Buchanan, Senior Research Associate, Center for Community Building and Neighborhood Action, University of Memphis, personal correspondence, June 14, 2010. (Sources include IRS income data, 2000–2007, and Geolytics Population estimates from 2009). Minister Suhkara A. interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 13, 2009.

300. Frank Caliva and Kevin Schwab, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, July 10, 2009. Tim Carroll, Director of Operations, City of Syracuse, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009. Daniel Queri, Real Estate Consultant, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

301. Earl Lewis, Provost, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

302. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide to neighborhood revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania, March 2008, p. 24.

303. Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Founding Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, personal correspondence, April 27, 2010.

304. Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett, *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007, p. 84. Cory Bowman, Associate Director, The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009.

305. Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University City District, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 4, 2009. Tony Sorrentino, Executive Director, Public Affairs, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. University Center District, University City Report Card 2009, Philadelphia, PA: UCD, 2009, pp. 50 and 58. John Kromer and Lucy Kerman, *West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004, p. 22. Eleanor Sharpe, *Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide to neighborhood revitalization,* Philadelphia, PA: The Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania, March 2008, see especially pp. 54, 69–72, and 91; Nicole Contosta, "Lewis Wendell, UCD's third Executive Director, to leave in June," *UC Review,* November 26, 2008, www.ucreview.com/default.asp?sourceid=&smenu=1&twindow= &mad=&sdetail=1114&wpage=&skeyword=&sidate=&ccat=&ccatm=&restate=&restatus=&reoption=&retype=& repmin=&repmax=&rebed=&rebath=&subname=&pform=&sc=2320&hn=ucreview&he=.com (accessed May 31, 2010;) Lewis Wendell, former Executive Director, University Center District, personal correspondence, April 2010.

306. Nancy Cantor, "A New Morrill Act: Higher Education Anchors the 'Remaking of America,'" *The Presidency,* Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Fall 2009, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3839/is_200910/ ai_n39234189 (accessed Jan. 11, 2010).

307. Kathy Goldfarb-Findling, Executive Director, Rosamond Gifford Charitable Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009

308. Marilyn Higgins, Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009.

309. "The Connective Corridor: Project Overview," http://connectivecorridor.syr.edu/project-overview/ (accessed Feb. 8, 2010).

310. Jan Cohen-Cruz, Director, Imagining America, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Eric Persons, Director of Engagement Initiatives, Office of Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

311. Craig Taylor, Director, Office for Business and Community Economic Development, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009. OBCED also runs a Community Workers Mentoring Initiative designed to match entry-level construction workers with experienced craftsman who will guide them to success on the job (Office for Business & Community Economic Development Website, www.bced.umn.edu/Community_Program.html, accessed Jan. 11, 2010).

312. Craig Taylor, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 24, 2009. Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, and Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010.

313. Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. Purchasing Services, *Economic Inclusion Statistics by Fiscal Year*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2009, www.purchasing.upenn.edu/supply-chain/sup_diversity.php (accessed Feb. 25, 2010). In fiscal year 2008 alone, Penn purchased approximately $89.6 million (approximately 11 percent of its total purchase order spending) from West Philadelphia suppliers; when Penn began its effort in 1986, its local spending was only $1.3 million. Determining economic impact is an inexact science, but given that Penn has shifted more than $85 million of its spending to West Philadelphia, a rough estimate would suggest that Penn's effort has generated 160 additional local jobs and $5 million more in local wages than if old spending patterns had stayed in place. This estimate for local purchasing effect is extrapolated from a study of Grand Rapids and surrounding Kent County in 2008, which found that if residents shifted 10 percent of their retail purchases to local stores ($840 million), this would generate 1,614 new jobs, $53.3 million in wages, and $137.3 million in economic activity. Penn's shift of $85 million is one-tenth of this amount; see: Civic Economics, *Local Works: Examining the Impact of Local Business on the West Michigan Economy*, Austin, TX and Grand Rapids, MI: Civic Economics and Local First, September 2008. For further information on the Penn model, see research of Professor John Kromer, cited in: Radhika K. Fox and Sarah Treuhaft, with Regan Douglass *Shared Prosperity, Stronger Regions: An Agenda for Rebuilding America's Older Core Cities*, Oakland, CA and Denver, CO: PolicyLink and Community Development Practitioners' Network, 2006, pp. 70–72. (This estimate was originally configured by Steve Dubb in Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul C. Brophy and Rachel D. Godsil, eds., *Rethinking HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, University of Pennsylvania, Feb. 2009, pp. 147–168, see especially p. 159.)

314. Ralph Maier, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009.

315. Ralph Maier, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009.

316. Diane-Louise Wormley, Deputy Director, Neighborhoods Now, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009. Ralph Maier, interview by Steve Dubb, May 5, 2009.

317. Ralph Maier, Director of Purchasing, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009. Speaking to Penn's continued commitment to economic inclusion through three presidencies, Assistant Vice President of Community Relations, Glenn Bryan, notes, "Resources aren't the answer to success as much as it's the commitment to think outside the box. You need strong senior management support for the initiative. This work is part of the Penn Compact, coming out of the Office of the President." (Glenn Bryan, Associate Vice President, Office of Community Relations, University of Pennsylvania, interview by Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 5, 2009).

318. Michael J. Rich, Director, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Kate Grace, Director, Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009. Young Hughley, Executive Director of RRC, a community development corporation in Reynoldstown, hosted Emory fellows during the program's first year and vouches for its impact: "We had five-to-six kids, really bright kids. They worked with my

CDC and three other community-based organizations to do an assessment of our services, our service area and our capacity. . . What really came out of that was a matrix that talked about duplication of services, strengths of our organization, and what we could leverage." (Young Hughley, Executive Director, RRC, interview by Steve Dubb, Atlanta, GA, June 18, 2009.)

319. Steve Dubb, Emory Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program meeting notes: Discussion led by Michael J. Rich, Associate Professor of Political Science and Director, Office of University and Community Partnerships and Kate Grace, Director, Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program, Office of University and Community Partnerships, Emory, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

320. Steve Dubb, Emory Community Building & Social Change Fellows Program meeting notes, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 2009.

321. Emory University, Office of University-Community Partnerships, *OUCP Staff*, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, no date, http://oucp.emory.edu/pages/oucp/staff.html (accessed June 9, 2010).

322. Richard Bray, Darrell Nickolson, and Starla Officer, "CHANGE—Campuses Helping to Address Neighborhood & Grassroots Efforts," presented at the 22nd Annual National Conference on Race & Ethnicity in American Higher Education (NCORE), San Diego, California, 2009. Jim Grim, Monica Medina, Starla Officer, "GWCHS and IUPUI—Partners in the Community," presented at the National Conference on University-Assisted Community Schools as an Effective Strategy for Education Reform K-16+, University of Pennsylvania, June 3, 2009.

323. Diane Arnold, Executive Director, Hawthorne Community Center, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Community Outreach Partnership Center New Directions: Grant Agreement #COPC-IN-03-045, Final Report, July 2007—June 2008. Another public health initiative led by the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships resulted from a five-year community health plan developed in partnership with Near Westside leadership as part of a COPC grant. This plan was used by Clarian Health to secure a $720,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to address health disparities in the Westside, which is now being coordinated through a local community center. (Starla Officer, Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, IUPUI, personal correspondence, April 29, 2010).

324. Lana Coleman, Near Westside Resident, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009. Starla Officer, personal correspondence, April 29, 2010. Starla Officer, Coordinator, Office of Neighborhood Partnerships, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

325. Jim Grim, Director of School/Community Engagement, George Washington Community High School, personal correspondence, May 18, 2009.

326. Ceraso also notes that, "Some on the university side thought we were going to think that the university was going to provide all kinds of financial back-up. We worked out this mutual agreement—we were really more interested in the university's educational and human resources." (Michael Ceraso, Principal, Hill Regional High School, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009).

327. Michael Ceraso, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 8, 2009.

328. Merson also emphasizes building sustainable partnerships: "Twice a month the high school students come to the university to work with first-year medical students and do dissections at the Medical School. That uses university resources in a way that is completely sustainable and is not grant dependent." Claudia Merson, Director of Public School Partnerships, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009. Abby Benitez, Principal, Christopher Columbus Family Academy, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009.

329. Yale also aims to design its interventions to minimize the potentially disruptive impact of principal turnover. According to Merson, "Usually you don't go from a great principal to a terrible one, but it happens from time to time. Schools are not known for managing their boundaries. We'll leave if necessary. It has not happened often. Most of the things that we provide in the schools are so well managed that [they're seen as] bringing an asset to the school. We aim for user-friendly resources." Claudia Merson, interview by Steve Dubb, Oct. 7, 2009. Joanna Price, Coordinator of Community Programs in Science, Office of New Haven and State Affairs, Yale University, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 8, 2009. David Heiser, Head of Education and Outreach, Yale Peabody Museum, interview by Steve Dubb, New Haven, CT, Oct. 7, 2009.

330. *Quality of Life Plan: Creating our Future Near Westside Neighborhood*, 2007, www.greatindyneighborhoods.org/index.php (accessed July 22, 2009). Robert Bringle, Director, Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

331. "Faculty Community Fellows," Office of Neighborhood Partnerships website, http://csl.iupui.edu/onp/1b3.asp (accessed Aug. 30, 2009).

332. Robert Bringle, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 3, 2009. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), Community Outreach Partnership Center New Directions: Grant Agreement #COPC-IN-03-045, Final Report, July 2007 — June 2008.

333. Darrell Nickolson, Engineering and Technology Department, IUPUI, interview by Rita Axelroth, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 3, 2009.

334. Portland State University, *Economic Development Strategy: a 10 year plan for strengthening PSU's contribution to regional economic growth*, 2009. University relationships with the City have not always been this strong, according to Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration at Portland State: "Since the1960s, it's been a gradual progression: relationships waxed and waned with intensity of involvement, but we've always been on the positive side of the ledger. . . In the early1990s, Portland State did not have as much connection to the City. But we [also] didn't have much state money, so we *had* to partner with the City to get our development done. . . And in today's recession, we are really the only ones providing construction jobs in Portland." (Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.)

335. Bowers adds, "Their plan is good; we pushed them as far as we could. Of course, it's not as audacious as we'd like. I would like to see them have a little more focused, targeted partnership. . . But again, they are grossly under funded; they have done a lot with very little." Lew Bowers, Central City Division Manager, Urban Development Department, Portland Development Commission, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR July 15, 2009. Lisa Abuaf, Senior Project Manager, Portland Development Commission, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 15, 2009.

336. Mark Gregory, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, Portland State University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Portland, OR, July 13, 2009.

337. Wim Wiewel, President, Portland State University, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 13, 2009.

338. Portland State University, *Economic Development Strategy.*

339. It should be noted that a fifth founding organization, the Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati, is now defunct. According to the Uptown Cincinnati website (an identity created by the Consortium), Consortium members alone employ nearly 52,000 people and have a payroll of $1.4 billion, http://uptowncincinnati.com/ (accessed Dec. 10, 2009).

340. Michael Romanos, David Edelman, and Mahyar Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations: Study of Peer Institutions—Main Report,* Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, Office of the President, November 2006, p. 17.

341. Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland, September 2007. Mary Stagaman, former Associate Vice President for External Relations and Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement, University of Cincinnati, personal correspondence, May 6, 2010. Of course collaboration between the Consortium and the City of Cincinnati does not always go smoothly. "In a public-private partnership, what comes first—the plan, the subsidy, or site control?," asks Brown in a 2009 interview. "If you start with the plan, from a community development finance standpoint, any project requires 20–30 percent subsidy. So we would acquire a block and have it assembled, and often times the City wasn't ready with the subsidy. We tried to get a commitment for the subsidy while we were planning the project, but the City pushed back and said, 'No. Create the project first.' So how do you balance the financial risk before you get public commitment?" Perhaps just as important, this deliberation can cause unmet expectations, particularly among neighborhood organizations involved in the planning phases. (Tony Brown, former President and CEO, Uptown Consortium, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Oct. 27, 2009.)

342. Gerald Siegert, Associate Vice President for Community Development, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009. Gerald Siegert, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010. The Consortium initially held three community planning "Uptown Summits" that were held in 2004 and 2005. The consultant who helped the CEOs initially collaborate also conducted a general study of the community, which led to the development of a preliminary plan focused on public safety, transportation, housing, economic development and integrated social services. As a result of resident input during the first Summit, education became an additional focus areas for the Consortium. Although many of these areas have yet to be fully addressed, in 2009–2010, the Consortium Board

reaffirmed its broader socioeconomic mission. (Romanos, Edelman, and Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations*; Mary Stagaman, personal correspondence, May 6, 2010.)

343. Scott Stiles, Assistant City Manager and Bill Fischer, Business Development Manager, City of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. Sept. 11, 2009. Mary Stagaman, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 10, 2009.

344. Syracuse University, "Our Vision," www.syr.edu/about/vision.html (accessed Feb. 1, 2010).

345. Ed Bogucz, Director of the Center for Excellence in Environmental & Energy Systems, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009.

346. Marion Wilson, Director of Community Initiatives, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009

347. Marilyn Higgins, Vice President for Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 28, 2009. Higgins also brings with her experience as a former economic development executive for the regional utility company National Grid, a corporate partner of Syracuse University.

348. Nancy Cantor, President and Chancellor, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009. Douglas Freeman, Director of Purchasing and Real Estate, Syracuse University, interview by Rita Axelroth, Syracuse, NY, May 29, 2009.

349. Nancy Cantor, interview by Rita Axelroth, May 29, 2009.

350. Monica Rimai, former Senior Vice President of Finance and Administration and Interim President, University of Cincinnati, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Oct. 5, 2009.

351. Gerald Siegert and William L. Doering, "Implementing Community Development at the University of Cincinnati," presented at the Treasury Symposium, Jan. 26, 2009. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009. In addition, the University established reserves of approximately 20 percent of principal and a portion of accrued interest "because of the extended periods over which we expect to be able to recover those investments," adds Siegert. (Gerald Siegert, personal correspondence, April 26, 2010.)

352. Bourgeois also comments that with the University's name on the planning document, and a very open planning process through CHCURC, property owners realized that "UC's checkbook" was behind the efforts. "Basically, we paid a huge premium [for property] because of our transparency." Matt Bourgeois, Director, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 11, 2009.

353. Matt Bourgeois, interview by Rita Axelroth, Sept. 11, 2009. Matt Bourgeois, "Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corp.," Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 14, 2009, document in possession of author. Mary Stagaman, former Associate Vice President for External Relations and Presidential Deputy for Community Engagement, University of Cincinnati, interview by Rita Axelroth, Cincinnati, OH, Sept. 10, 2009.

354. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009. Dan Monk and Lucy May, "Tax credits could catalyze Cincinnati projects," *Business Courier of Cincinnati*, Aug. 28, 2009, http://cincinnati.bizjournals.com/cincinnati/stories/2009/08/31/story1.html (accessed Oct. 20, 2009); *CDFI Awards for Uptown Consortium, Inc. NMTC (2009)—$45,000,000*, www.topgovernmentgrants.com/cdfi.php?State=OH&cdfi_id=1634 (accessed July 7, 2010).

355. Monica Rimai, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 5, 2009.

356. For more information on LeMoyne-Owen College's and the LeMoyne-Owen CDC's participation in the HUD HBCU grant program, see Nina Liou, Laurel Davis, and Sheila Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies of Experiences in Community Development: Volume II — Case Study Reports*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development & Research, Baltimore, MD: Optimal Solutions Group LLC, Oct. 2007, pp. 37–72 and 111–124.

357. This Senator also had previous relationships with Soulsville's STAX museum and had secured $2 million for its reconstruction a few years earlier. (Jeffrey Higgs, Executive Director, LeMoyne-Owen College Community Development Corporation, interview by Rita Axelroth, Memphis, TN, Oct. 12, 2009.)

358. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Liou, Davis, and Ards, *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Three Case Studies*, see especially pp. 69–70.

359. Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the US Department of the Treasury, "New Markets Tax Credit Program Overview," www.cdfifund.gov/what_we_do/programs_id.asp?programID=5 (accessed Jan. 18,

2009). Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009. Romanos, Edelman, and Arefi, *Community Interactions and Collaborations,* November 2006, see especially pp. 125–7.

360. Jeffrey Higgs, interview by Rita Axelroth, Oct. 12, 2009.

361. Miami Dade College, *Miami Dade College Highlights and Facts*, Miami, FL: MDC, 2009.

362. "MDC's Hospitality Institute to Offer Customer Service Training and Job Opportunities to Inner City Residents," *Miami Dade College News and Events,* April 27, 2009, www.mdc.edu/main/news/articles/2009/05/h_i_job_opportunities.asp (accessed May 12, 2009). Geoffrey Gathercole, Director, School of Community Education, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009. "The Hospitality Institute," egov.ci.miami.fl.us/Legistarweb/Attachments/57266.pdf (accessed June 14, 2010).

363. H. Leigh Toney, Executive Director, Meek Entrepreneurial Center, Miami Dade College, interview by Rita Axelroth, Miami, FL, May 12, 2009. Eduardo Padrón, President, Miami Dade College, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009.

364. Eduardo Padrón, e-mail interview by Rita Axelroth, June 5, 2009. *Miami Dade College Highlights and Facts, 2009.* Miami Dade College, "Saviors of our Cities: Survey of Best College and University Civic Partnerships," Draft Revised May 22, 2009

365. Sherrie Pugh, Executive Director, Northside Resident Redevelopment Council, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

366. Tom Moran, "Some north side residents wary of U partnership," *Minnesota Daily,* May 1, 2008.

367. University Northside Partnership Community Affairs Committee, www.unpmn.org/cac/index.html (accessed Aug. 30, 2009).

368. Makeda-Zulu Gillespie, Community Liaison for UNP and UROC, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 25, 2009. CAC members consist of resident, community and faith-based organizations, local businesses, and city representatives, as well as University faculty, staff and students.

369. Geoff Maruyama, Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009. Mary Fitzpatrick, Executive Director, Seeds of Change, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

370. Makeda-Zulu Gillespie, interview by Rita Axelroth, Aug. 25, 2009. UROC's consultants have also recommended that they develop guiding principles — such as community participation in planning and implementation phases — for all University research projects proposed for the Northside community. (Erline Belton and Reynolds-Anthony Harris, The Lyceum Group, "Strategic Planning Process Phase One: Report on Interviews, Findings, & Preparation for the Futures Conference," 2008.)

371. The building, which was named a finalist for the Best in Real Estate Award, has space that is available for community and organizational meetings. Since opening its doors in October 2009 up until its official Grand Opening and Ribbon Cutting, on May 12, 2010, almost 9,000 people visited the Center. (Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, and Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, personal correspondence, June 4, 2010.)

372. Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, and Associate Vice President, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009. Raymond Dehn, Community Affairs Committee Co-Chair and Resident, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 25, 2009.

373. Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009.

374. Nancy Cantor, "A New Morrill Act: Higher Education Anchors the 'Remaking of America,'" *The Presidency*, Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Fall 2009, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3839/is_200910/ai_n39234189 (accessed Jan. 11, 2010).

375. Nancy Cantor, "A New Morrill Act."

376. Nancy Cantor, "A New Morrill Act."

377. Rosalind Greenstein, Urban Policy Analyst, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 14, 2009.

378. Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett, *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform,* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007, p. xiii.

379. Harry Boyte, "Lessons of Civic Mission Work at the University of Minnesota 1997–2005," *Report to Kettering Foundation,* Oct. 23, 2005, p. 8.

380. Harry Boyte, "Lessons of Civic Mission Work," p. 126.

381. Maggie Astor and Betsy Morais, "Court rejects eminent domain in Manhattanville," *Columbia Spectator,* December 4, 2009, www.columbiaspectator.com/2009/12/04/court-rejects-eminent-domain-manhattanville; Kate Tighe, "Allston Residents Feel 'Steamrolled' by Harvard Development," *The Citizen: The Student Newspaper of the Kennedy School*, November 14, 2007, http://harvardcitizen.com/2007/11/14/allston-residents-feel-%E2%80%9Csteamrolled%E2%80%9D-by-harvard-development (accessed Feb. 10, 2010).

382. Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink, personal correspondence, June 9, 2010.

383. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul C. Brophy and Rachel D. Godsil, eds., *Rethinking HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, University of Pennsylvania, Feb. 2009, pp. 147–168, see especially p. 153.

384. David Perry, Wim Wiewel, and Carrie Menendez, *The city, communities, and universities: 360 degrees of planning and development,* Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2009, p. 4.

385. Andrew Hahn with Casey Coonerty and Lili Peaslee, *Colleges and Universities as Economic Anchors: Profiles of Promising Practices,* Waltham, MA: Heller Graduate School of Social Policy and Management and Institute for Sustainable Development/Center for Youth and Communities, Brandeis University, Oakland, CA: PolicyLink, 2002.

386. Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, *Annual Report 2007–2008*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, p. 39.

387. Cory Bowman, Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, interview with Steve Dubb, Philadelphia, PA, May 8, 2009.

388. Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development*, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, Aug. 2007, pp. 91–94, see especially p. 92.

389. Elizabeth Hollander, Former Executive Director (1994–2004), Campus Compact, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 2, 2005.

390. Harry Boyte, Senior Fellow, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 9, 2005.

391. John Burkhardt, Executive Director, National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, telephone interview by Steve Dubb, Sept. 12, 2005.

392. Justin Wellner, Manager, Government Relations, Van Scoyoc Associates, personal correspondence, May 2010. Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, *Initiatives: Annie E. Casey Foundation*, Washington, DC: USU, 2010, www.usucoalition.org/initiatives/annieecasey.html (accessed May 31, 2010). Strive—Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky, *Strive Model Spreading to Other Cities*, Cincinnati, OH: Strive, April 29, 2009.

393. On the Social Innovation Fund, see: Corporation for National and Community Service, *Social Innovation Fund*, Washington, DC: March 2, 2010, www.nationalservice.gov/about/serveamerica/innovation.asp (accessed March 2, 2010).

394. The Foundation Center's Statistical Information Service, *Distribution of Foundation Grants by Subject Categories, circa 2007*, New York, NY: The Foundation Center, 2009, http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/gs_subject.html (accessed Feb. 21, 2010).

395. "Engaged Institutions: Enriching Communities & Strengthening Families," www.engagedinstitutions.org/ (accessed Jan. 25, 2010).

396. John Burkhardt, Director, National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good and Special Assistant to the Provost for University Engagement, University of Michigan, and former program director at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 14, 2009.

397. Ted Howard, Executive Director, The Democracy Collaborative, personal correspondence, Sept. 28, 2009. These ideas are also developed in Gar Alperovitz, Ted Howard, and Thad Williamson, "The Cleveland Model," *The Nation*, March 1, 2010.

398. Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009.

399. In Fiscal Year 2010, NIH's total budget was $31.246 billion. (National Institutes of Health, *Enacted Appropriations for FY 2008–FY 2010*, Bethesda, MD: NIH, 2010.) On its website, the NIH notes that, 'More than 80% of the NIH's funding is awarded through almost 50,000 competitive grants to more than 325,000 researchers at over 3,000 universities.' (NIH, *NIH Budget: Research for the People*, Bethesda, MD: NIH, May 18, 2010, www.nih.gov/about/budget.htm, accessed June 16, 2010.) For NSF grants to universities in FY 2010, see: National Science Foundation, NSF FY 2011 Budget Request to Congress, Arlington, VA: NSF, 2010, p. 12. On funding of the land-grant program, see: The Cornerstone Team, "NIFA Programs Spared Cuts in President's FY 2011 Budget Request; AFRI Funding Proposed at $429M," *The Cornerstone Report*, vol. 8, no. 1, February 1, 2010, www.land-grant.org/reports/2010/02-01.htm (accessed June 16, 2010). Figure for the Office of University Partnerships from Gar Alperovitz, Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Rebuilding America's Communities: A Comprehensive Community Wealth Building Federal Policy Proposal*, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland, April 2010, p. 28.

400. United Neighborhood Centers of America, *$65 Million for Choice Neighborhoods,* Washington, DC: UNCA, December 10, 2009, http://unca-acf.org/?p=643 (accessed March 3, 2010). Hayling Price, *Promise Neighborhoods: A Planning How-To Guide*, Washington, DC: Alliance for Children and Families and United Neighborhood Centers of America, September 30, 2009. American Planning Association, *APA's Overview of Federal Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities Programs in the FY 2011 Budget Proposal*, Washington, DC: APA, February 2, 2010. US Department of Health and Human Services, *Obama Administration Details Healthy Food Financing Initiative*, Philadelphia, PA: HHS, February 19, 2010, www.hhs.gov/news/press/2010pres/02/20100219a.html (accessed March 3, 2010). Radhika Fox, Federal Policy Director and Sarah Treuhaft, *The President's 2011 Budget: Creating Communities of Opportunity*, Oakland, CA: PolicyLink, 2010. Robin Shulman, "Harlem Program Singled Out as Model," *Washington Post*, August 2, 2009, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/08/01/AR2009080102297.html (accessed June 17, 2010).

401. Office of University Partnerships, *Grantee Database*, Washington, DC: HUD, June 6, 2009, http://oup.org/grantee/map_search.asp (accessed Feb. 21, 2010).

402. Avis Vidal, Nancy Nye, Christopher Walker, Carlos Manjarrez, Clare Romanik, *Lessons from the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program*, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2002, prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research, chapter 1, p. 11.

403. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul C. Brophy and Rachel D. Godsil, eds., *Rethinking HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, University of Pennsylvania, Feb. 2009, pp. 147–168; Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies: Recommendations for HUD Action: Budget Documents," Jan. 2009, unpublished addendum in possession of authors. For more policy recommendations from the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, see: "Summary of the Urban University Renaissance Act of the 21st Century," Washington, DC: USU, July 2010, www.usucoalition.org/advocacy/uura.html (accessed July 26, 2010).

404. On the federal government sustainability office (established in 2009) and its developing program, see: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities*, Washington DC: EPA, May 7, 2010, www.epa.gov/dced/partnership/index.html (accessed May 31, 2010).

405. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," see especially pp. 154 and 159–161.

406. Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009. Note that Rubin's comment does not directly apply to HUD funding provided for Minority-Serving Institutions, which has served as substantially more than "seed funding." (Armand Carriére, Visiting Fellow, New England Resource Center for Higher Education, personal correspondence, April 27, 2010.)

407. "Equitable Development Toolkit," PolicyLink, http://policylink.com/ (accessed Jan. 25, 2010).

408. David Cox, Executive Assistant to the President, University of Memphis, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009.

409. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," see especially pp. 154 and 156.

410. Rosalind Greenstein, Urban Policy Analyst, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 14, 2009.

411. Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo (State University of New York), telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009. Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners," see especially p. 160.

412. David Cox, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 8, 2009. Henry Taylor, telephone interview by Rita Axelroth, April 16, 2009. Irma McClaurin, Founding Executive Director and Associate Vice President, Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center, University of Minnesota, interview by Rita Axelroth, Minneapolis, MN, Aug. 24, 2009.

413. Steve Dubb, Personal Notes, Anchor Institutions Task Force Meeting, Philadelphia, PA: June 10, 2010. Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, *Urban Universities as Anchor Institutions: A Report of National Data and Survey Findings,* Washington, DC: USU, July 2010. For more detailed data from this survey by school, see: Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, *Urban Universities: Anchors Generating Prosperity for America's Cities,* Washington, DC: USU, July 2010. Armand Carriére, Visiting Fellow at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education, notes that there is also a need for the field to collect more outcome measurements in addition to process measurements — e.g., what percentage of local residents secured a job after participating in a workforce training program, not merely how many completed the training. (Armand Carriére, personal correspondence, April 27, 2010.) A few promising examples of outcomes measurements were presented in this report.

414. Steve Dubb, Personal Notes, Anchor Institutions Task Force Meeting, Philadelphia, PA: June 10, 2010.

415. The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, led by Amy Driscoll and Lorilee Sandmann, represents one significant effort to ensure that the same level of strong peer review exists for anchor institution mission or engagement work as exists for research and teaching. For more on this topic, see Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development,* College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, Aug. 2007, pp. 80–82.

416. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *2008 Community Engagement Classification*, Stanford, CA: Carnegie, 2008, http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/ce_2008.php (accessed June 17, 2010).

417. Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett, *Dewey's Dream,* p. 84.

418. For further detail of the rationale behind the various items included in the budget, we refer readers to the published report: Ira Harkavy et al., "Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies," in Paul C. Brophy and Rachel D. Godsil, eds., *Retooling HUD for a Catalytic Federal Government: A Report to Secretary Shaun Donovan*, Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, 2009, pp. 147–168.

Partnerships between universities and communities generate local investment by helping entrepreneurs turn academic ideas into commercial inventions, pushing city planners to map green spaces, and encouraging businesses to promote sustainable building practices. Yet, challenges remain to ensure underserved communities benefit from truly inclusive local economic development. The Road Half Traveled outlines how to serve those needs and spur universities to address the challenges of the low-income communities surrounding them.

> —U.S. Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH)

Because universities rarely relocate, their fortunes are closely tied to the cities and neighborhoods where they are based. By focusing their economic power locally—particularly their procurement, hiring, and investment practices—institutions of higher education can help move the needle on such vital urban issues as job creation, poverty reduction, and providing economic opportunity for low-income residents. For those committed to the revitalization of our nation's great urban places, The Road Half Traveled will prove an invaluable resource.

> —Ben Hecht, CEO, Living Cities

In an "evidence-based world" where policy makers want information before they act, this study will be influential—offering a careful, comprehensive and deeply realized assessment of the place-based, institutional importance of universities to urban change and development. For university leaders and urbanists, as well as policy makers, this study is essential reading.

> —David Perry, Professor and Associate Chancellor, Great Cities Commitment, University of Illinois, Chicago

Complete with illustrative best practices, principles and guidelines for implementation, and keys for assessing progress, this report is a one-of-a-kind compendium of what works and how to move the dial toward comprehensive community revitalization. For more than a decade, I feel like I've lived this comprehensive report on university engagement. From Columbus to Milwaukee to Cincinnati, I have had the privilege of serving at campuses that truly embrace the reciprocal benefits of engagement and the responsibilities of anchor institutions to facilitate, lead, or convene key stakeholders in community revitalization. Now in New York, I see no higher calling than to steadily deepen the anchor of the State University of New York in communities across the state. The Road Half Traveled will be our roadmap.

> —Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor, State University of New York (SUNY)