

ChapinHall at the University of Chicago
Policy research that benefits children, families, and their communities

**Why Community
Investment Is Good
for Nonprofit Anchor
Institutions**
Understanding Costs,
Benefits, and the Range
of Strategic Options

Henry S. Webber
Mikael Karlström

2009

community
change

**Why Community Investment
Is Good for Nonprofit
Anchor Institutions:
Understanding Costs,
Benefits, and the Range
of Strategic Options**

Henry S. Webber
Mikael Karlström

ISSN: 1097-3125

© 2009 Chapin Hall
at the University of Chicago

Chapin Hall
at the University of Chicago
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

773-753-5900 (phone)
773-753-5940 (fax)

www.chapinhall.org

Acknowledgments

The writing of this report was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We would like to acknowledge the helpful comments on earlier versions of this report by Wim Wiewel, Paul Brophy, Michael Morand, Rosalind Greenstein, and Prue Brown. We have also benefitted greatly from an ongoing dialogue with Salin Geevarghese at the Casey Foundation. Above all, we want to acknowledge the contributions of Harold Richman, who was centrally involved in developing the argument of the report.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction.....	6
Anchors and Communities: Defining Areas of Potential Impact.....	9
Costs and Benefits: Deciding Whether to Invest.....	12
Toward Guidelines for Action	21
Routes and Strategies: A Guide to Anchor Options.....	27
Conclusion and Next Steps	46
References.....	48

Preface

This report was written out of a recognition that there has been no serious effort to systematically examine the value to anchor institutions of engaging in significant community investment. Many have considered the benefits of anchor investments to cities and communities. Others have studied the conditions under which productive interactions between cities, communities, and anchor institutions are most likely. Little work, however, has been done with regard to considerations of institutional self-interest that motivate anchors to engage and invest locally, or to look broadly at which strategies of community or regional change are most effective.

In the absence of any serious efforts to examine the value of local investment to these institutions, we believe that such institutions tend to overestimate the costs and risks and underappreciate the potential benefits. In this report, we attempt an analysis of the costs and benefits of various potential anchor strategies

for institutional action and present a compendium of strategic options. We hope this analysis will facilitate decision making by anchor institutions contemplating major investments in their local city or community and help decision-makers see that such initiatives are, on balance, often of greater potential utility to them than a more impressionistic assessment might indicate. Please note that this report is concerned with the self-interest of institutions. It does not deal with what many believe is the moral imperative for large anchor institutions to invest in their host communities or with the impact of anchor strategies on local communities. These are critical issues, but they are beyond the scope of this report.

We hope this report will prove helpful to decision-makers within anchor institutions as well as those trying to induce anchor institutions to become more active in local communities.

Executive Summary

In the past two decades, considerable attention has been focused on the role of nonprofit anchor institutions as a force for positive redevelopment in challenging urban communities. Anchor institutions are defined as those institutions that, by reason of mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers or employees, are tied to a certain location. This report concentrates on the role of universities and academic medical centers, which are usually the largest anchor institutions in metropolitan areas.

Much of the attention that is focused on the role of anchor institutions comes from governments and civic and community leaders. This attention is attributable both to the size and resources of universities and medical centers and to the recognition that, unlike many private businesses, they are unlikely to relocate. There is, moreover, a clear potential for—as well as many successful examples of—anchor institutions contributing to regional growth, improved human and educational services, and job creation. This report explores the ways in which investing locally is in the

self-interest of anchor institutions, irrespective of moral imperatives or societal benefits.

The decision as to whether an anchor should develop a program of sustained local impact is a cost-benefit determination. Among the potential benefits of an active program of anchor involvement in community and local development are the creation of a local environment that can attract staff and customers; strengthening the local economy; generating support from community and political leaders; contributing to institutional missions; and building support among internal constituencies. Among the potential costs are the financial and human capital required; the opportunity cost for senior management; and the difficulty of achieving substantive goals. While the results of this cost-benefit analysis will differ for different institutions at different times, we argue that anchor institutions tend to overstate the costs and understate the benefits, leading to less investment than would be optimal. In particular, institutions tend to overestimate the financial costs and political risks of local action, underrecognize the potential of partnering, and underappreciate the

progress made in the past decade in developing proven strategies of community development.

Success at community and urban redevelopment is greatly facilitated by efforts that build on organizations' existing strengths; partnering and building relationships with community actors, government entities, and civic organizations; incremental approaches; and careful attention to implementation issues and processes. In general, institutions are most successful when they move carefully and in concert with others, building programs and strategies over time and learning from experience.

The use of particular strategies for urban and community development must reflect local needs and circumstances. Among the most common, most successful, and most promising strategies are a set of infrastructural strategies

that include urban renewal; infrastructure growth oriented toward community improvement aims; involvement in urban planning; and investing in local infrastructure and commercial development. Promising non-infrastructural strategies include employee assisted housing; local purchasing, contracting, and hiring; investments targeted to specific local challenges (i.e. crime or education); holistic neighborhood revitalization efforts; job creation through knowledge transfer; and research and policy analysis around key local issues. Key relational strategies include project-based relationships; convening and visioning; establishing or joining a community development partnership; supporting community organizations; multi-anchoring; and institutional reorientation toward an urban mission.

Introduction

Across the country, nonprofit anchor institutions are increasingly regarded as major contributors to urban and community development. Anchor institutions are those nonprofit or corporate entities that, by reason of mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers or employees, are geographically tied to a certain location. Classic examples of traditional anchors are large local banks that invested money in a city or metropolitan area, hired employees from the local area, and contributed widely toward the success of the city. In the past few decades, many traditional anchors, such as banks and utilities, have become absorbed into larger organizations that are not bound to any single community or even country, and corporate headquarters have become increasingly mobile. Attention has thus shifted to nonprofit anchors, such as hospitals and universities. Reflecting the increased attention to education and health in our society, hospitals and universities have emerged as very large businesses and in many cities are now the largest nonpublic employers. The University of Pennsylvania, for example, is the largest private employer in the city of Philadelphia and Johns Hopkins Medical

Center is the largest private employer in the state of Maryland. Moreover, history indicates that nonprofit anchors, although susceptible to some of the same outsourcing of back-office operations as other businesses, are much less likely to relocate than traditional corporate anchors.

The intersection of economic size and the difficulty of relocating has led many in recent years to a greater focus on nonprofit anchors as promising engines for city and neighborhood redevelopment in cities faced with widespread disinvestment and poverty. Consider the following case: It is no longer realistic to base an economic development strategy in Pittsburgh around the steel industry. That industry is no longer predominantly located in the United States, let alone in Pittsburgh. Mellon Bank, the leading financial institution in the Pittsburgh area, has merged with a New York bank. Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Pittsburgh, and Allegheny County Health Department, however, are all growing and together now employ tens of thousands of workers. Is it possible to craft an economic development strategy for Pittsburgh

around these three nonprofit entities and those profit-making firms linked to their human and intellectual capital? Might not increasing the economic well-being of Pittsburgh benefit Carnegie Mellon and the University of Pittsburgh as well as the citizens of the Pittsburgh region?

We focus here on the potential of anchor institutions, predominantly nonprofit anchors, to be leaders in economic and social renewal in economically challenged cities or neighborhoods. Our analysis focuses particularly on universities and academic medical centers as anchor institutions. These institutions are the largest non-profit anchors in most cities and the focus of most the literature in the field. The available literature on the role of universities and academic medical centers in urban redevelopment suggests that such leadership is usually, although not always, in the interest of cities, neighbors, and the institutions themselves. The evidence suggests, however, that relatively few anchor institutions are significantly involved in large-scale efforts to improve their cities or neighborhoods, even when such efforts would be in their interest. Why? We believe this phenomenon can be explained in good part by institutional misperceptions of both the benefits of potential actions and the risks of engagement. We hypothesize that although institutions have a clear sense of the potential

costs of local involvement, the benefits often seem amorphous. In particular, anchor institutions often (1) undervalue the range of potential positive impacts that could follow from their involvement; (2) overestimate the risks and costs of civic intervention; (3) do not conduct careful assessments of the costs and benefits of possible community involvement; and (4) fail to appreciate the full range of proven and promising strategies for promoting neighborhood and city change.

This misperception is not the result of errors in formal cost-benefit analysis. In our research for this report, we found no examples of anchor institutions that had done a formal cost-benefit analysis before engaging in or significantly expanding their community activities. It is even unclear, as we will discuss later, whether formal cost-benefit tools would be helpful. What is the monetary benefit to an academic medical center of one less doctor being robbed? Is it really possible to link increased contributions to a museum to neighborhood improvement, apart from other factors? But the lack of a formal cost-benefit structure does not mean that anchor institutions do not try to think seriously about the benefits of a proposed path, what it will take to achieve success, what resources are required, and the risks involved. It is in this looser, more managerial sense—characterized by listing benefits and costs and developing qualitative

assessments rather than by formal discount-rate models—that we believe institutions make assessment errors.

The goals of this report are to:

1. Explore the potential benefits to anchor institutions of concentrated action to improve cities and communities.
2. Identify the potential costs and risks of such actions to anchor institutions.
3. Specify the range of positive community impacts that can result from institutional action by anchors.
4. Suggest some general guidelines for assessing costs and benefits that anchor institutions could use when contemplating institutional action to improve cities or neighborhoods.
5. Identify proven, promising strategies for community improvement by anchor institutions and suggest how anchors can offset or minimize potential costs.
6. Help anchors to weigh the various strategies of community involvement available to them.

The focus of this report is on institutional self-interest. We recognize that self-interest is not the only motive that might influence an institution's decision to take action to improve their host cities and communities. Many argue that such efforts are an ethical responsibility of nonprofit anchors, because of their tax status or history as public charities. Others suggest that colleges and universities in particular have ethical responsibilities because of their stated commitment to civic and democratic values and to the practical utility of systematic knowledge. It may also be argued that a larger sense of mission or purpose has been a critical factor in the most successful cases of large-scale or transformative anchoring. Motives beyond institutional self-interest may be necessary to generate the requisite traction to launch such efforts and the sustained will to maintain them over time. Initiatives driven primarily by self-interest may not be adequately responsive to the needs of the outside community. However, regardless of their nonutilitarian motives, institutional leaders arguing for this sort of initiative will have an uphill struggle in the face of perceptions that the costs of such action outweigh the potential benefits. Our task is, therefore, to shed better light on the institutional self-interest that inevitably is part of making such decisions.

Anchors and Communities: Defining Areas of Potential Impact

What do anchor institutions do for their local communities? Nonprofit anchors can have major community impacts in at least the following thirteen areas:

Neighborhood identity. Some anchor institutions are such prominent presences in their neighborhoods or towns that the latter become identified with the institution. Princeton, New Jersey; Berkeley, California; and the Hyde Park neighborhood of Chicago are all known by residents and nonresidents primarily as home to an anchor institution. To live in one of these places is to choose a university neighborhood.

Employment. Anchors are often the largest employers in their host communities or cities. Although some of this employment is highly specialized and positions are filled through national recruitment, far more positions are less specialized and recruited locally. Hospitals, for example, hire far more support

staff and nurses than physicians. The largest academic medical centers in the United States have well over 10,000 employees, most from the local area.

New company formation. Ideas generated by universities and medical centers are a major source of innovation and new firms. The relationships of the North Carolina universities to the Research Triangle, Stanford to Silicon Valley, and MIT to the Boston area's Route 128 high-technology zone are well known.

Educational and cultural programs for local citizens. Cultural institutions, colleges, and universities are major sources of educational and cultural programs for local residents. They offer programs that improve the skills of local workers and hence improve local economies. A recent study on per capita income growth in major metropolitan areas in the 1990s concluded that the single largest factor in predicting regional income growth was the

percentage of the population with a four-year college degree (Weissbourd and Berry, 2004). Anchor institutions supply those degrees.

Support for public education. Increasingly, universities have become partners in improving local public education. A number of leading U.S. universities sponsor public charter schools for local residents. Other universities sponsor private schools open to local residents. Many anchor institutions, including cultural institutions, offer extensive afterschool and summer programs for local youth.

Recruitment of high-quality human capital, often from across the country. Selective universities and tertiary care medical centers—the largest nonprofit anchors—recruit students and faculty from across the country and, in some areas, across the globe. A recent study of the impact of Harvard University on the Boston economy noted that the chief executive officers of many leading employers in the region first came to Boston as students or faculty (Appleseed, 2004).

Community safety. Although anchors can, under some circumstances, be a source of disturbances (e.g., fraternity parties), they are also sources of extended-hour activities, providing important eyes on the street. The private security forces of large anchors in a number of cases provide extensive

neighborhood coverage, as well as service to the institution's staff and customers.

Healthcare. Nonprofit medical centers are the nation's leading sources of tertiary care. That medical care is often made available without consideration of ability to pay. Many nonprofit medical centers are also major providers of general care to the local population.

Childcare. Universities, large employers, and medical centers increasingly provide child care for their staff. These centers often also serve local populations.

Demand for market rate housing. Employer-assisted housing programs are becoming common among profit-making and nonprofit anchors. Such programs have the potential to jump start housing markets that have languished for decades. Even without employer housing assistance programs, healthy anchors create demand for local housing, sometimes causing useful improvement and, other times, leading to gentrification.

Real-estate development, including commercial development. Some anchors, usually universities, have concluded that in order to attract students and faculty, they need to provide a vibrant local commercial environment. This has led institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Connecticut to make large

investments in commercial development. This development is designed to meet the needs of members of the university community, but it is often attractive to many others as well.

Local and minority purchasing. Public and private anchor institutions can create and sustain local economies through programs of local and minority purchasing. These programs, which have been developed by many anchor institutions, open the doors to prosperity for traditionally disadvantaged populations. In addition, such programs can ensure that the institution's spending benefits the local community.

Research capacity. Universities and certain nonprofit organizations are well suited to provide research relevant to local and regional problems and evaluate solutions. The specialized staff, culture of free inquiry, and data analysis capacity of these institutions can be particularly helpful in analyzing politically charged and difficult policy issues.

Some of the benefits of large anchor institutions will accrue to local communities and host cities regardless of institutional efforts. But the benefits will be much greater if there is a conscious institutional commitment to local development. The total number of jobs generated by a medical center, for example, is rarely a reflection of neighborhood characteristics. Decisions about where and how to recruit staff, however, can have a great bearing on how many local residents are hired and how institutional growth benefits local communities. 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. All in all, evidence suggests that maximizing the local benefits of the presence of anchor institutions requires a careful, proactive strategy of engagement.

Costs and Benefits: Deciding Whether to Invest

The decision by an anchor institution to invest significant resources in designing and implementing a proactive local agenda is a question of costs and benefits. Such efforts are not inexpensive in time or energy. Developing such efforts inevitably involves the most senior leaders in an institution, diverting attention from other important tasks. Before anchor institutions can be expected to expend the time

and energy to systemically engage in local action, we should expect careful analysis. The following chart provides a summary of the benefits and costs to anchor institutions of intensive involvement in local communities:

Benefits and Costs of Intensive Involvement in Local Communities
Potential Benefits
1. Creates a local environment that can attract staff and customers
2. Builds the local and regional economy
3. Generates support from community and political leaders
4. Contributes to institutional mission
5. Builds supports among internal constituencies
Potential Costs
1. Requires financial and human capital investment
2. Opportunity cost for senior management
3. Difficulty of achieving substantive goals

Benefits of Anchoring

What are the potential benefits to anchors of investing in their host community or city? The list of benefits begins with creating a local environment that can attract staff and customers. Institutions operate in competitive labor markets and must compete for customers. Hospitals have entire departments that recruit physicians and develop and place advertisements designed to attract patients. Cultural institutions spend thousands of dollars advertising in local newspapers and other media outlets. Few would deny that the quality of programs is the most important factor of competition and that pricing and compensation arrangements are always important, but the quality of the local environment is a major factor of competition as well. People make choices based on neighborhoods and cities. The perception of a lack of neighborhood safety makes it less attractive to visit a museum or garden. A set of great restaurants down the street makes it more pleasant to go to a play. The great rise of New York University as an academic institution in the last few decades cannot be separated from the popularity of New York City. Residential universities that need to attract students to live on or near campus are particularly affected by local neighborhood attributes. People will commute to a

neighborhood they might not choose to live in. The importance of neighborhood as a factor of competition varies by business type.

Institutions that offer truly unique and necessary services such as specialized medical care can attract patients regardless of location. The Mayo Clinic and Johns Hopkins Medical Center are both geographically challenged but have succeeded due to the internationally recognized excellence of their specialized medical care. Most anchors offer less unique goods, however, and a stronger neighborhood or a more attractive city is a major asset.

A more successful neighborhood, city, or region creates greater opportunities for local financial support. Institutions that contribute to local wealth creation often benefit from that wealth at a later time. The classic example is Stanford University and the Silicon Valley. Students and faculty at Stanford helped create the companies that built the Silicon Valley high-technology firms. Founders and senior executives at these firms later contributed generously to Stanford.

Regardless of the success of the local economy, anchor institutions also need support from community and political leaders to thrive. This support can take many forms. Some support is modest and usually easily obtained: medical centers need communities to accept the disruption caused by ambulances and helicopters; universities need community

acceptance of a certain amount of student rowdiness and outdoor events. Other types of community and political support are both difficult to obtain and critical to institutional success. Property tax relief is necessary for the economic model of many nonprofit anchors. Many anchor institutions, especially academic medical centers and research universities, must grow in order to fulfill their mission. Research in the physical and biological sciences tends to increase in scale and utilize ever more equipment. Medical technology used in patient care requires ever more room for diagnostic equipment. Patients' expectations for inpatient care now include semi-private or private rooms, a far less space-efficient model than open wards. College students raised with rooms of their own now expect the same at college, requiring larger dorms. Over the past 50 years many leading American universities with academic medical centers have grown at a rate of 2,000,000 square feet per decade. Growth almost always requires expansion onto new land and new construction, which almost always imposes costs on at least some neighbors. The job of adjudicating disputes with neighbors falls to local governmental bodies with the advice of community groups and advocates. These local groups expect anchors to significantly contribute to the local quality of life in exchange for permission to grow.

Anchor institutions also invest in improving the local quality of life for mission-related reasons. Community colleges and other public universities have a mission to serve local constituencies, including providing higher education, an increasingly critical prerequisite for individual employability and factor in regional economic success. Performing arts anchors often include in their mission the development of a greater appreciation of the arts in the general public. Of particular interest are those programs that combine the development of new knowledge, the training of the next generation of professionals, and service to local communities. This model is most developed in the case of teaching hospitals. Teaching hospitals strive to provide excellent patient care; train the next generation of doctors, nurses, and other health care providers; and do research to improve the delivery of health care across the country and world.

Variations on this model are also found in public education, social work, and urban planning and architecture. The University of Chicago's Urban Education Initiative, for example, combines the operation of four lottery-admission public charter schools on the South Side of Chicago that serve 1,200 disadvantaged students and training programs for urban teachers, social workers, and community school leaders, and is among the

nation's most ambitious applied and basic research programs in urban education (Knowles et al., 2007). Research is informed by practice and practice is informed by research. Springfield College in Massachusetts has built upon its roots in religious paternalism and its acquisition of a nearby school of social work to move toward a social-justice orientation and a range of educational, afterschool, and social-service community partnerships (Schramm, 2002).

Engaging in significant local activities to improve the quality of life in local communities is also very popular with internal customers. Employees, alumni, and contributors often place a high value on such activities. This is not to say that an anchor institution would engage in significant local activity purely for this reason, but it is a factor. After beginning a major community development effort in Hartford, Connecticut, Trinity College reported a dramatic increase in endowment contributions by alumni and others who were impressed by their commitment to the surrounding community (Reardon, 2006, p. 103). Other institutions, including Yale University, also report great alumni support for community improvement initiatives.¹

It would be wrong to conclude that there are never mission-related tensions between anchor institutions and their communities. Many hospitals believe they fulfill their obligations by providing charity care to local communities and should not be expected to engage in community development initiatives. Some very large and prestigious university and cultural anchors see their mission as serving the world, often through developing new knowledge, rather than contributing to local communities. Local communities, knowing the resources of these anchors, often take a different view. Although a real issue, this tension between prestigious global anchors and communities can be moderated by recognition of the local impact of the anchor and an institutional commitment to model institutional citizenship for its students or community. President Judith Rodin of the University of Pennsylvania, the architect of the university's well-known program of investment in West Philadelphia, has stressed institutional citizenship as one reason for the university's program (Rodin, 2007, p. 18). Smaller anchors, although perhaps wealthy by the standards of disadvantaged communities, often feel very resource constrained relative to their competitors.

¹ Michael Morand (Yale University), personal communication.

The Costs of Anchoring

Active engagement in local communities is not, however, without costs and risks for anchor institutions. Some of these costs are financial. Many hospitals spend millions of dollars per year providing charity care. Public education programs run by universities can represent an equally large expenditure. Though many local programs are initially funded by foundations or donors, anchors often assume the cost over time. Even programs that have no direct cost can have substantial administrative or managerial cost. Many anchors have programs to promote local or minority purchasing, for example. Although most anchors have clear policies that they will not incur substantially greater costs to hire local or minority vendors, they do expend resources on identifying new local or minority vendors and may provide capacity-building grants to vendors. Neighborhood improvement programs are far from the core mission of most anchors, requiring specialized staff that might not otherwise be on the anchor's payroll and are difficult to identify. Moreover, evidence suggests that an aggressive program of local support requires the personal attention of the anchor's chief executive officer, diverting attention from other important tasks.

Beyond these costs, community engagement also carries risks. Community change is difficult, long-term work, as the history of the

community development movement in the United States makes evident (Halpern, 1995). Engaging significantly in local action requires partnerships with political leaders, public agencies, and community agencies, as well as a willingness to commit to specific programs. Specific partnerships and specific programs are open to criticism. Public criticism is particularly difficult for the many health care and university anchors that are conditioned to overwhelmingly positive press coverage. Universities, for example, most often appear in the press for faculty research or student achievement, a source of public pride. A decision of the same university to develop a charter school, however, involves the institution in the national debate about charter schools and virtually guarantees a negative response from teachers' unions and their supporters.

Besides criticism, there are risks involving a potential loss of control. The success of local initiatives is almost never solely within the control of the anchor institutions. Community development requires the combined efforts of anchors, community groups, funding sources and political leaders, and, often, favorable economic circumstances. Community change efforts by even the wealthiest anchor institutions, such as the University of Southern California's efforts in South Central Los Angeles, the University of Chicago's in Hyde

Park, and Johns Hopkins University Medical Center's in East Baltimore, require partnerships. Anchors with lesser resources have an even greater need for partners.

Another area of risk lies in the implementation of anchor initiatives. No matter how well designed, the success of such efforts depends in great measure on the skill, creativity, flexibility, commitment, and genuinely collaborative spirit with which they are executed. Furthermore, there is no guarantee of success even when partners are assembled, programs are well designed, solid partnerships are formed, and implementation issues are carefully attended to.

Last but not least, anchor institutions often face very limited exit options if community efforts are unsuccessful. To close a program is to admit failure, something anchors are very reluctant to do in their host city or neighborhood. Moreover, to disappoint current program participants can be very painful. No university that has started a charter school in recent years has closed such a school.

Weighing Costs and Benefits

The central task faced by every anchor institution is weighing the potential benefits of an active program of local engagement against the costs and risks. A number of contextual

factors obviously figure into these assessments, such as local economic and political circumstances, the skills and resources of the anchor institution, the specific goals envisioned, and the strategies available. More generally, however, we believe that some common misconceptions tend to distort these assessments. Institutions are prone to overestimate the risks and costs of anchor investment and underappreciate the potential benefits.

First, anchors tend to overestimate the financial resources that are necessary in order to invest effectively in community improvement. This may stem from the fact that very large and wealthy institutions, such as the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, and Ohio State University, are routinely cited as the prime examples of successful community initiatives. Smaller and less richly endowed institutions find these examples irrelevant to their circumstances and can easily conclude that neighborhood change requires the commitment of far greater resources than they possess. The evidence shows, however, that smaller institutions, including Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, and Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, can have a significant local impact through incremental engagement and long-term commitment at a relatively modest institutional cost. Many of the

strategies that have proven successful or appear promising for such an approach are discussed in the final section of this report.

Anchors can also overstate the reputational risk and vulnerability to local politics entailed by active engagement with a community. The public respects anchors for engaging locally and understands that neighborhood decay, failing urban schools, and poor health care are difficult problems that cannot be solved overnight. Moreover, though there is some risk of public criticism, there is far greater likelihood of appreciation from internal constituents, friends, and donors. Attacking the local anchor may be a successful strategy for a few political leaders in the short term, but it is rarely successful over the long term, provided an anchor is willing to work cooperatively. As we discuss at greater length below, these risks can be minimized by an approach to anchoring that emphasizes cooperation with community actors, the formation of community partnerships, and incremental steps toward larger goals. Empirically, we know of few cases where extended and serious institutional involvement has failed to improve local relations between anchors and surrounding communities.

Finally, anchors tend to overestimate the difficulty of achieving substantive community improvement goals. The fund of knowledge about successful community development has

progressed greatly in the past few decades. There is now a set of robust tools of neighborhood engagement, tools that vary depending on the strength of the local economy and resources. The work of the Local Initiative Support Corporations, the Enterprise Foundation, and others has shown that there are proven methods in community development and that at least some positive change is possible in almost all cases. As we know from the rebirth of Bronzeville in Chicago, the South Bronx in New York, and South Central Los Angeles, a coherent strategy of community development can improve even the most challenging community.

Monetization and the Measurability of Costs and Benefits

Our argument about how anchor institutions think about community-investment decisions has been couched in the language of costs and benefits. This raises an obvious question: Can we take the next logical step and apply formal economic cost-benefit analysis? Such analysis would require the quantification or monetization of all pertinent costs and benefits—their reduction to a single measure of value.

Without ruling out the possibility of such analysis, we see a number of difficulties. First,

as briefly discussed earlier, not all of the costs and benefits that we have discussed are amenable to monetization. Although the financial and human-capital costs of local investment by anchor initiatives can obviously be calculated in monetary terms, the monetization of such institutional benefits as improved community and political relations and reinforcement of institutional mission seems problematic. Risks to institutional prestige are equally difficult to quantify and would presumably be more amenable to calculations of probability than to monetization. Community improvement, by contrast, does lend itself to various quantitative measures, such as improved real-estate values and reductions in crime, poverty, and unemployment. Similarly, the institutional benefits presumed to flow from neighborhood revitalization, such as increasing student applications, improved faculty retention, and higher student satisfaction, are regularly measured by colleges and universities. However, although the causal relationship between neighborhood improvement and such benefits may be broadly demonstrable, the *monetization* of such effects—the precise level of gain that they generate for an anchor institution—is difficult even in hindsight, much less predictively, as would be required for a formal cost-benefit analysis. Moreover, most anchor institutions do not seem inclined to convert these sorts of institutional benefits

into monetary values in any areas of decision making. Our research and experience in relevant institutional settings indicate that anchor institutions rarely apply formal cost-benefit analysis to any of their major strategic and budgetary decisions.

What such institutions typically do conduct, however, is a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the potential costs, risks, and benefits of any major strategic initiative. A medical center will decide whether or not to expand into a new area of medical care only after market research, financial analysis, and assessment of internal capacity. Such systematic evaluation is surprisingly rare, however, when it comes to investments in community improvement. In many cases, decisions to engage locally have been made in response to crises. In others, institutional action has been prompted by a funding opportunity or the need for a new institutional direction or mission. It is striking how often institutions otherwise known for careful decision making seem not to have systematically evaluated the full range of considerations pertaining to their urban or community strategies. The main thrust of our argument, therefore, is the need to extend such evaluation processes to decisions about community investments. And we hope that the main contribution of our report will be to provide some useful parameters for doing so.

Despite our reservations about the practicality of full-scale quantitative cost-benefit analysis in this area, we do believe that anchor institutions need to be more intentional in establishing concrete goals for their community work and attempting to measure the outcomes of that work wherever possible. Although such goal-setting and measurement

are beyond the scope of this report, we hope that the systematic approach to anchor investments developed here may also promote greater attention to these issues on the part of anchor institutions. The development of concrete and measurable goals for community initiatives is clearly an important next step in the evolution of this field.

Toward Guidelines for Action

How should institutions decide whether to develop active programs of engagement in their communities? If they decide to act, what specific strategies should they adopt? The next two sections of this report address these issues. In the first section, we set out the major factors that institutions must consider before pursuing a community engagement agenda and how those factors affect strategy selection and the balance between costs and benefits. These factors fall under three categories: (1) the needs, issues, and motives driving community-engagement initiatives; (2) institutional capacities; and (3) external conditioning factors. We also offer several guiding principles that have been shown to improve the prospects for successful engagement and intervention. In the section that follows, we explore the broad range of strategies available to anchor institutions and situate those strategies in relation to the variables and principles explored below.

Needs, Issues, and Motives

Our review of the literature and available documentation on anchor institutions and

community engagement suggests that the following four concerns and motives, singly or in combination, provide the governing rationale for community initiatives of this sort.

Economic and social decline. Far and away the most common environmental scenario motivating community improvement initiatives among anchor institutions has been local economic deterioration and its social costs for local communities. Often the decision to intervene is triggered by a specific crisis, most commonly crime-related. In other cases, the cause is a gradual decline in neighborhood quality that undermines the institution's ability to attract staff or customers.

Expansion needs. Urban universities and hospitals as well as other anchors are often hemmed in by residential neighborhoods that hinder or complicate their physical expansion. In order to overcome this obstacle, anchors require community support or at least acquiescence. They may also require political goodwill at the municipal level, particularly if they face zoning challenges. Such needs constitute a major institutional motivation for

anchors that engage in significant community improvement efforts.

Desire to repair relations with local

communities. Some anchors, particularly institutions of higher learning, have a long history of haughtiness and alienation from the communities in which they operate. In the 1950s and 1960s, such tendencies were exacerbated by the rapid expansion of many urban schools and the urban renewal strategies that they pursued. Today, such tensions often stand in the way of more productive community relations sought by these institutions for a range of reasons. Though the impulse to repair community relations is often motivated by expansion needs and/or concerns about neighborhood decline, there are also situations in which an improved relationship is pursued as an end in itself.

Perceived need for institutional

repositioning and/or renewal. Although this motive is relatively rare, there are a few prominent instances of colleges and universities pursuing a major institutional reorientation toward their surrounding communities or regions as a strategy for institutional renewal and/or in order to improve the institution's standing and profile. Though such motives often have an important moral or civic component, the institutional interest at play—improved attraction capacity in a

competitive academic market—is also important.

Internal Capacity

Any institution contemplating a serious program of local engagement must begin with an assessment of internal capacity. Anchor institutions vary enormously in their ability to successfully engage in this work. Capacity is best evaluated across four dimensions:

Leadership commitment. The most ambitious programs of neighborhood or regional impact require the full and active engagement of the most senior leaders of an anchor institution. Institutions are symbolized by their leaders. Leadership's visible commitment of resources and time to local involvement is a key indicator to both internal and external audiences of serious engagement. The University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee under Nancy Zimpher, Georgia State under Carl Patton, and the University of Pennsylvania under Judith Rodin are prominent examples of this leadership factor. Without such engagement, the anchor institution can be a substantial force but is unlikely to be able to exercise real leadership.

Substantive expertise. The ability of anchor institutions to effectively engage in community improvement strategies is greatly enhanced by particular substantive expertise in relevant

areas such as public education, technology transfer, public health, juvenile justice, and city planning. Many of the most successful university programs to improve communities have derived directly from the pre-existing academic strengths of the institution. The economy of San Diego, for example, has benefited greatly from the growth of a biotechnology industry. This industry has grown, in no small measure, because of the presence and efforts of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD). UCSD could contribute only because it had built great strengths in relevant areas of science over many years. In addition, skilled staff who have general experience in building community partnerships and successfully navigating the difficult terrain of implementing and sustaining community programs are always a great asset to anchors in building community partnerships.

Financial resources. Committing major financial resources to improving local communities is not essential to success. But it does influence the types of strategies that are viable, the breadth of ambition, and the need for partners. Yale University's efforts to both build a biotechnology industry in the New Haven area and rebuild downtown New Haven could only have been pursued successfully by an institution with the capacity and willingness to make a very large commitment of institutional resources. Without these

resources, such work would have required many additional partners and a longer time frame for implementation.

History of community relations. Anchor institutions that have a successful history of working with partners to improve local communities are likely to find future efforts easier than institutions that have a history of failure. Prior success builds confidence and a willingness of partners to engage.

External Factors

Just as internal assessments of capacity are critical, so too is objective analysis of the situation facing the anchor. What is happening in the local economy, who are the likely partners, and what is the civic capacity? Key factors include:

The degree and trajectory of neighborhood or regional change. A highly challenging set of local circumstances always makes anchor strategies far more difficult. It is far easier, for example, to improve a neighborhood in a region of strong economic growth than to improve a neighborhood in a declining region. Correcting a sharply declining regional economy is the most difficult task of all and can likely be achieved only by the largest anchor institutions in partnership with leaders in the private and public sector.

The size of the area where change is proposed. Improving small areas or individual neighborhoods is much easier than improving regional economies or large areas of a city. The success of employee housing assistance programs, for example, is often significant in a targeted neighborhood. They are unlikely to have the same impact on a large area of a city.

The significance of neighborhood improvement to institutional interests. Anchor institutions are likely to invest more institutional resources in communities whose improvement is essential to meeting key institutional goals. This does not mean that anchor institutions cannot be helpful to other neighborhoods, but the ability to utilize core institutional financial resources or the time of the most senior leadership in the institution is likely to be limited.

The local political climate. Most efforts to significantly engage in local neighborhoods or regions require the cooperation of governmental entities. It is impossible to imagine a successful anchor effort to improve public education without the support of the local public school system. Similarly, efforts to reduce crime are very difficult without the assistance of local police departments. The ability to partner with the public sector depends on many factors, including local political relationships and climate.

The capacity of community and public partners. As noted above, local efforts of anchor institutions generally require public sector and community support. Such efforts are greatly facilitated if this support carries with it considerable capacity. Capacity has many dimensions but includes the ability to meet commitments and execute. Strong community development corporations, for example, are by themselves capable of significantly improving local neighborhoods. In combination with strong anchor institutions, they can be an extraordinary force. However, weak community development corporations can detract from anchor efforts.

Local civic commitment to neighborhood improvement and economic redevelopment. Just as community groups and governmental units are important partners for anchor institutions, so too are other major civic organizations, including local foundations and regional planning groups. Such entities can be the conveners of partnerships, financial supporters, and key advisors. The success of the multi-anchor Central Baltimore Project, for example, is attributable in significant part to a local foundation that hosted the early stages of the initiative and facilitated joint work.²

² Wim Wiewel, presentation at “The University as Civic Partner” conference (Phoenix, Arizona, Feb 15, 2008).

General Principles

In addition to these factors, there are a number of general principles that have proven successful across many community engagement efforts by anchor institutions, and whose strategic application can generate a more favorable balance between costs and benefits.

Building on existing strengths. Evolution is easier than revolution. Strengthening and expanding an existing effort is easier than starting an entirely new effort. Success is more likely through targeting the efforts of knowledgeable, respected local experts than in starting brand-new initiatives. Technology-driven job-creation strategies are a particularly good example of the value of underlying research strengths. Likewise, major public education initiatives are far more likely to succeed if they build on internal strengths in relevant research and policy areas.

Partnerships and relationship-building. Real progress cannot be made on important neighborhood or regional issues without partners.³ These partnerships take many forms

³ This factor has been emphasized in several recent studies and overviews, such as Bromley and Kent's (2006) comparative account of four public universities in Ohio, Reardon's (2005, 2006) study of university-community partnerships, Brukardt et al. (2006) on the general lessons of the University

and include efforts with governmental and community agencies, the private sector, foundations, and other anchors. The advantages of partnering include spreading the cost, because most institutions do not have the financial and staff resources to transform a neighborhood; spreading the risk if the initiative experiences setbacks; and bringing together complementary strengths and skills. Such partnerships work best where anchors are willing to share power, decision making, and resources.⁴ Though there are risks, including a loss of control and exposure to complex power dynamics, it is precisely by taking these risks that the most productive partnerships are constructed.

Incrementalism. Evidence suggests that an incremental approach to community engagement work has significant advantages. It minimizes initial costs and risks. It allows for the demonstration of viability and tangible successes to attract potential partners. It allows an institution to build internal expertise, skills, and capacity over time. It enables the

of Wisconsin–Milwaukee's efforts, and Rodin (2007) on those of Penn's revitalization work.
⁴ Ostrander (2004); Reardon (2006).

anchor to adjust for early mistakes and misjudgments. Two prominent examples of large-scale initiatives that were developed gradually are the University of Pennsylvania's work in West Philadelphia and the Urban Education Initiative at the University of Chicago. Both initiatives grew out of prior work in relevant areas, and in both cases changing circumstances and new institutional leadership allowed for an acceleration of effort and new visibility.⁵

Implementation. A successful program of community investment requires effective, deliberate, and flexible implementation. The prospects for effective implementation can be maximized through a range of strategies, including careful attention to optimal staffing, ongoing and institutionalized support from the highest administrative levels, clear and careful implementation planning, and serious attention to the knowledge that is being generated across this emerging field of practice.⁶

⁵ In a study of ten university-community partnerships, Reardon concludes that "successful partnerships develop slowly, and significant time is required to move from the initial relationship-building stage to the program implementation stage, often five to ten years" (2005, p. 10).

⁶ Staffing and executive leadership are emphasized by Reardon (2005), Brukhard et al. (2006), and Bromley and Kent (2006); Rodin stresses the importance of "a clear roadmap toward implementation" (2007, p. 183).

Routes and Strategies: A Guide to Anchor Options

The universe of anchor options is quite extensive. The following discussion does not purport to address every available approach or strategy, but it does attempt to map out the most common, the most successful, and the most promising among them. We have grouped these approaches under three headings: infrastructural strategies; non-infrastructural strategies; and relational strategies. For each approach we provide (1) a brief description; (2) some empirical examples of its application; and (3) a discussion that situates the strategy in relation to the needs and aims that it can serve, its potential costs and benefits, and the relevance of building on strengths, working through partnerships, incrementalism, and optimal implementation.⁷

⁷ Ideally, we would have liked to identify a single institution that has most successfully pursued each of these strategies, but available documentation does not generally support that level of qualitative judgement. Instead, we note what appear to be the most prominent, sustained, or creative examples of each strategy.

These categories are not intended to be mutually exclusive. In particular, relational strategies can overlap significantly with the approaches we classify as infrastructural and non-infrastructural. We treat these as a separate category because of the central role that relationship-building plays within them, and also in order to foreground the range of relationship-building approaches available to prospective anchor institutions.

By exploring the intersections between specific anchoring strategies and the various factors affecting their feasibility, implementation, and chances of success, we hope to raise awareness of the broad range of options and pathways available to anchor institutions. We also aim to provide the beginnings, however rudimentary, of the sort of systematic framework that anchor institutions need in order to make fully informed choices among those options.

Routes and Strategies for Anchor Investment and Engagement	
Infrastructural strategies	
	Urban renewal
	Infrastructural growth oriented toward community improvement aims
	Involvement in urban planning
	Investing in local infrastructure and commercial development
Non-infrastructural strategies	
	Employee assisted housing
	Local purchasing, contracting, and hiring
	Investments targeted to specific local challenges
	Holistic neighborhood revitalization
	Job creation through knowledge transfer
	Research and policy analysis around key local issues
Relational strategies	
	Project-based relationships
	Convening and visioning
	Establishing or joining a community development partnership
	Supporting role vis-à-vis community organizations
	Multi-anchoring
	Institutional reorientation toward urban mission

Infrastructural Strategies

Urban Renewal

From the 1950s through the 1970s, a significant number of major universities in declining urban neighborhoods undertook large-scale urban renewal projects with the

help of favorable federal legislation and often in partnership with city governments. In accordance with the general philosophy of urban renewal, they sought to transform deteriorating neighborhoods by buying up and bulldozing dilapidated properties and replacing them with new construction. In most cases, this strategy was pursued with the dual purpose of neighborhood redevelopment and meeting

institutional expansion needs, although the balance between the two motives varied widely. In some cases, such as Indianapolis and St. Louis, the expansion of institutions located near declining downtown areas was linked with larger efforts to revive the cities themselves. Although their record of success has been mixed, some urban renewal efforts certainly succeeded in their immediate aims. The University of Chicago managed to halt the deterioration of its surrounding neighborhood in the 1960s and 1970s and stabilize it as a viable residential community for staff and students (Webber, 2005). The expansion of Indiana University–Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) was a central component in a broader municipal urban renewal program that succeeded in revitalizing downtown Indianapolis (Cummings et al., 2005). In both Denver, Colorado, and Tacoma, Washington, major new university campuses were built from scratch with similar intent—Denver’s Auroria Higher Education Center and the University of Washington–Tacoma—and both were reportedly instrumental in turning around adjacent downtown districts (Coffey & Dierwechter, 2005; Kronewitter, 2005).

If the benefits of such initiatives have, in many instances, been considerable, so have the costs. Such financial investments are of course quite major and can be made only by large and/or wealthy institutions. Even then, co-financing

with municipal or state authorities has generally been indispensable. More importantly for our purposes, such initiatives have often been anything *but* partnership-oriented, making local communities feel threatened and bullied, generating opposition and resentment, and in some instances doing serious harm to the residents of the neighborhoods in question. Indiana University–Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI), for instance, obliterated an entire African American neighborhood in central Indianapolis (Cummings, 2005, p. 151). Such harms and conflicts are not quickly forgotten, and many of these institutions were left with a legacy of suspicion that could be overcome only through decades of community outreach. The University of Pennsylvania’s community improvement efforts in the 1990s, for instance, were still hampered by local hostility stemming from the university’s urban renewal period in the 1950s and 1960s (Rodin, 2007, p. 42).

Infrastructural Growth Oriented Toward Community Improvement Aims

Since the demise of urban renewal, a more modest approach to using infrastructural expansion in the service of surrounding communities has often been to reshape the physical relationship between an institution and its neighbors. Such efforts have served a remarkably wide range of institutional needs

and intentions. For both Ohio State and Youngstown State, new campus construction designed to create a more attractive and inviting interface with surrounding communities grew out of ongoing neighborhood revitalization efforts, serving both as extensions and symbolic affirmations of those commitments (Bromley & Kent, 2006). In the 1990s, Portland State University planned and developed a newly constituted “University District” as a way of redefining the university as an integral part of the city, while also helping the university to overcome zoning constraints on its expansion options (Bunnell & Lawson, 2006). The University of Pennsylvania, having already invested in a wide range of redevelopment projects in directly adjacent neighborhoods since the mid-1990s, is now orienting a major campus expansion toward reconnecting the university with downtown Philadelphia (Rodin, 2007, pp. 170-172). San Jose State University recently pooled resources with the city of San Jose to build a new joint library, both in order to help overcome a long-standing rift with its surrounding community and to leverage its limited resources with city dollars (Jordan, 2005).

Although this anchoring strategy can be expensive in monetary terms, it has the advantage of killing two birds with one stone by simultaneously fulfilling a core institutional

need and promoting community development and/or improved community relations. Because of the cost involved, such demonstrations of neighborly commitment can also be particularly persuasive to surrounding communities. Involving the community in campus planning processes, as UNC–Chapel Hill has recently done (Thorsten, 2005), can amplify this positive effect. Such projects can help leverage outside resources, as with the joint municipal/university library in San Jose. Similarly, Georgia State’s efforts to orient its campus expansion toward the revitalization of downtown Atlanta helped it to leverage much-needed private and philanthropic co-financing (Kelley & Patton, 2005). And Arizona State is building a new campus for a number of its professional programs in derelict downtown Phoenix with the help of \$232 million in bond funds approved by Phoenix voters in 2006 (Chesnick, 2007). On the side of costs and risks, this strategy involves a variable degree of effort in determining and adapting to community priorities. Any campus expansion plan carries some risk of community resistance, and the reorientation of core institutional facilities to involve community needs and stakeholders may also arouse internal resistance, as when San Jose State faculty and students mounted a campaign against the joint library plans.

Although an incremental approach is probably inadvisable for major infrastructural investments, the planning process can certainly be gradual and iterative. The potential for working with public-sector entities and private partners is illustrated in several of the above examples. Though community partnerships may be helpful in smoothing the path for this strategy, they are less prominent among the documented cases. Aside from financial resources, institutional capacity will be less relevant to weighing this strategy than external factors such as political climate, the availability of leveraged funding, and the severity of neighborhood deterioration.

Involvement in Urban Planning

In a number of cases, the previous strategy of orienting infrastructural growth toward community needs and priorities has dovetailed with a direct involvement in urban planning at the local or municipal level. Georgia State's contribution to the revitalization of downtown Atlanta began with its decision, in connection with its own expansion plans, to take the lead in remedying the absence of a city master plan by spearheading the process of downtown redevelopment planning (Kelley & Patton, 2005, p. 131). Portland State's expansion and urban reorientation involved extensive cooperative planning with city agencies—a virtual necessity in a city with a highly developed urban planning structure (Bunnell &

Lawson, 2006). Youngstown State's involvement in urban planning predated its community-oriented infrastructural projects: in 2000, the new university president initiated a joint planning effort with the city government that led to a new university strategic plan, a major citywide community visioning effort, and eventually to the city's "Youngstown 2010" strategic plan (Bromley & Kent, 2006). By contrast, the University of Pennsylvania's expansion program led it subsequently into planning involvement, by way of a prominent role in a new public-private planning and development partnership aimed at revitalizing the underutilized river corridor through central Philadelphia (Rodin, 2007, pp. 170-172).

Direct involvement in urban planning can serve the dual purpose of helping to guide an institution's efforts to accommodate local development priorities in shaping its own expansion activities, while simultaneously providing leverage in planning processes that may constrain or facilitate those activities. The latter advantage, in particular, can easily offset the costs in institutional time that intensive engagement with municipal bureaucracies may entail. More generally, such involvement can strengthen an institution's hand in the broader political sphere, creating connections that may prove useful for other purposes. The risks entailed in such political engagement will vary with the local political climate and structural

alignments. When an institution is also engaged in grass-roots community partnerships, there is an inevitable danger of getting caught in the middle between community priorities and broader political processes. There are a variety of paths into urban-planning participation, some of which seem to allow for the gradual coalescence of relevant stakeholders, as in the cases of Georgia State and the University of Pennsylvania. Although in-house expertise in urban planning is obviously useful, it is hardly a prerequisite to pursuing this strategy, and external factors will play the most critical role in evaluating its feasibility.

Investing in Local Infrastructure and Commercial Development

Another strategy adopted by many anchors seeking to promote neighborhood improvement is the use of endowment funds for direct investment in improving local infrastructure or supporting local commercial development. This is often done in conjunction with one or both of the post-urban-renewal strategies discussed above. Such efforts range from the cosmetic and fairly inexpensive—beautification and improved streetscaping—to major real estate development and construction, such as new housing, retail space, or schools. The University of Pennsylvania’s first major neighborhood investments were a \$95-million

retail development project (\$19 million of which came from university funds), a major new hotel, and a \$75-million movie-theater and grocery development (Rodin, 2007, pp. 107-137). Ohio State has put \$22 million of endowment funds into its “South Campus Gateway” development, a mixed-use commercial and residential project designed to help transform the university’s interface with Columbus’s University District (Bromly & Kent, 2006, p. 55). The Greater University Circle (GUC) Initiative in Cleveland, a collaborative anchor initiative involving the Cleveland Foundation, Case Western Reserve University, The Cleveland Clinic, and University Hospitals, is using both institutional and public funding to redesign and upgrade local transportation infrastructure and foresees larger investments in new retail and housing construction.

Where there is a history of poor institution-community relations, this strategy may arouse community resistance in the short term, as was the case with Penn’s efforts. If the institution works collaboratively and tactfully with community stakeholders in planning the investments, however, the size of those investments can also be a very effective way of convincing skeptical communities of a commitment to neighborhood improvement. And while the financial commitments involved in such efforts are obviously substantial, they

also have the potential for leveraging outside money from both private and public sources. To date, Penn has leveraged \$370 million in outside funds on its own \$170 million of investments (Rodin, 2007, p. 136). Ohio State leveraged \$10 million in state and city grants and \$120 million in tax-exempt bonds and other borrowing on its \$22 million investment in the South Campus Gateway.

Effective partnering with both local stakeholders and relevant government entities is crucial to initiatives of this sort, particularly if the impression of institutional high-handedness of the urban-renewal variety is to be avoided. Although the projects mentioned above are of significant scale, many others have begun more modestly. Even with larger projects, a measure of incrementalism is possible. The GUC Initiative in Cleveland, for instance, has begun with transportation infrastructure as a clearly circumscribed area of work in order to build capacity for more ambitious later projects.⁸ Expertise that is beyond existing institutional resources will generally be needed for large-scale investments of this sort.

⁸ Lillian Kuri (Cleveland Foundation), personal communication.

Non-infrastructural Strategies

Employee Assisted Housing

Among the new approaches to neighborhood improvement that have come to the fore since the era of urban renewal, one of the most commonly implemented is the Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP). EHAPs function as an employee benefit, a way to improve institution-community ties, and a tool for neighborhood revitalization. Typically structured as a zero-interest loan forgivable over five to ten years, employee housing assistance grants tie employees to the institutions, considerably raising the cost of leaving. If an employee with a \$10,000 EHAP grant wants to leave an institution after two years but has three years left on an EHAP grant, for example, the employee would owe the institution \$6,000, a large sum for many employees. Analysis by REACH Illinois, an employee housing assistance advocacy group, suggests that, due to the reduction in turnover, EHAPs can often be of direct financial benefit to employers. Targeting EHAP benefits to key neighborhoods near an anchor institution has the benefit of increasing university influence in local neighborhoods and improving channels of communication between local residents and members of the university community. A former senior vice president at a large university who took advantage of an EHAP to

move into a neighborhood with contentious ties to the university said that the program lessened the distinction between who was “us” and who was “them.” In addition, targeted EHAPs can be structured to increase demand for market-rate housing in neighborhoods needing revitalization.

The major challenge of EHAPs is targeting. If an institution intends an EHAP as an employee benefit, or “live near work” program, it may allow employees to live in several neighborhoods. To the extent that an EHAP is a community revitalization strategy, it may usefully be targeted to a smaller geographical area.

Local Purchasing, Contracting, and Employment

Many institutions have in recent years developed local purchasing, contracting, and employment programs that give priority to local residents or members of traditionally disadvantaged groups. In virtually all cases, the programs did not compromise standards or increase the direct cost to the institution. What is required are additional search costs and capacity building. Examples include locating employment centers in communities rather than on campus, job training initiatives for local residents, and training for local entrepreneurs. Such programs, anchor institutions argue, help keep dollars in local

communities and ensure that institutional growth benefits local citizens. Particularly interesting examples of such programs are the efforts of several institutions to require major construction contractors to sponsor apprentices from the local community in union positions.⁹ The benefits to the anchor institution from these programs are both political and substantive. As local community members are hired and work as contractors at anchors, they can be a political force for the institution and its expansion. Substantively, jobs and contracts to local residents improve the local economy. The primary cost lies in the development of outreach programs.

Incrementalism and partnering are hallmarks of this strategy. Training and employment outreach programs are perfect opportunities to partner with local job-training programs and community organizations that can refer candidates. Large city governments have job-training and placement departments whose success is usually limited by the reluctance of employers to cooperate. An employer eager to hire local residents usually finds a receptive audience. Local and minority contracting programs are good opportunities to partner with minority and local business organizations

⁹ Washington University in St. Louis and the University of Chicago are among the universities that have required major contractors to sponsor apprentices.

and other major employers in a city committed to the same goals.

Investments Targeted to Specific Local Challenges

Perhaps the most common area of anchor assistance to local communities and regions is around specific programmatic initiatives in which an anchor either uses its expertise to offer a service to a local community or develops a program that combines teaching and training, and research and service. The classic example of the latter is the academic medical center that offers care to patients, particularly very ill or uninsured patients, trains the next generation of medical professionals, and develops research that improves the care of patients across the country or world. The same model has been applied in recent years in the public education area. The forms of partnership vary from single-school efforts to programs such as the Boston University/Chelsea Partnership, the Trinity College Learning Corridor, and the University of Chicago Urban Education Initiative. The Boston University/Chelsea Partnership was charged with the reform and revitalization of public schools in Chelsea, Massachusetts (HUD, 1999, p. 224). It was also intended to serve as a replicable model for urban school reform. The partnership involved the direct management by Boston University of the Chelsea public schools. The Trinity

College effort included the development of a 16-acre learning community housing a Montessori Magnet School; the Hartford Magnet Middle School; and two regional high-school programs, the Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts and the Greater Hartford Academy of Math and Science (Reardon, 2006, pp. 102-103). The University of Chicago effort, described earlier, includes ownership of public charter schools, a research center, a new academic committee, and teacher training on the South Side of Chicago (Knowles et al., 2007).

The benefits of these targeted efforts can be considerable, including safer neighborhoods, appreciative neighbors, and the removal of community barriers to expansion. Excellent public schools have the ability to serve as both a vehicle for upward mobility for long-term community residents and an attracter of new residents. At the same time, these targeted initiatives are very expensive, and taking on major responsibility for service delivery raises the stakes for the anchor to perform at very high levels. Moreover, anchors cannot be successful unless they have real substantive strengths to draw upon. Partnering is essential to success of these targeted efforts, although the partner can often be the public sector, and not the community.

Holistic Neighborhood Revitalization

Although a holistic approach to neighborhood revitalization through institutional anchoring is an ambitious undertaking, and relatively rare, its potential for effecting real change in a context of neighborhood socio-economic deterioration is considerable. Such an approach is a logical outgrowth of the targeted strategies discussed above, as it employs a range of such strategies in tandem and mobilizes synergies among them. The most well-known instance of this approach is the University of Pennsylvania's West Philadelphia Initiatives, which date to 1996 and have addressed five issues in deteriorating communities adjacent to the Penn campus: neighborhood safety and services; housing; commercial activity; economic development; and local public schools (Rodin, 2007; p. 22). Penn has made major investments in all of these areas and, by all accounts, seen significant results (Strom, 2005). Most institutions, of course, do not have Penn's deep pockets. Yet schools with large endowments are not the only ones that have pursued a holistic revitalization strategy. Trinity College is a notable case.¹⁰ A private liberal arts

college in Hartford, Connecticut, with 2,200 students and a \$450-million endowment (compared with Penn's \$6.6 billion), Trinity's anchoring efforts began modestly in the 1970s and 1980s with the formation of a neighborhood association involving local residents and businesses and focusing on housing rehabilitation work and enhancement of community policing. In the 1990s, this partnership expanded into a more ambitious neighborhood revitalization initiative anchored by the educational park mentioned earlier, which now involves not only multiple K-12 educational components, but also job training, a family resource center, a police substation, and mixed-income housing, with plans for a health clinic and retail development.

Though the financial and personnel costs of a holistic strategy can seem daunting, the potential benefits are many. Among the most important, according to Judith Rodin, who initiated and led Penn's West Philadelphia Initiatives as university president from 1994 to 2004, are the multiplier effects of concurrent projects, greater sustainability, and the strong signal of commitment conveyed by such a concerted community improvement effort (Rodin, 2007, p. 185). In terms of neighborhood revitalization, outside observers and objective indicators show that both Penn's and Trinity's efforts have had a major impact, and that these improvements have benefited

¹⁰ Published documentation of Trinity's long-running anchoring initiative is sparse, but the college website provides a detailed description and chronology (<http://www.trincoll.edu/UG/UE/OCIR/History.htm>, accessed October, 2007)

the institutions in their core (educational) mission (Reardon, 2006, p. 103; Rodin, 2007, p. 183). As an important by-product, efforts on this scale tend to generate goodwill and political capital. Trinity has seen a dramatic increase in its endowment from donors impressed by its neighborhood improvement work (Reardon, 2006; p. 103). Penn was recently able, drawing on the political capital gained through its neighborhood work, to acquire a major city-owned property for less than one-sixth of the \$30 million it had unsuccessfully offered ten years earlier (Rodin, 2007; p. 170).

On the cost side, launching a holistic initiative from scratch, as Penn did, is undoubtedly prohibitive for most institutions. But building toward it through an incremental sequence of projects and partnerships, as in Trinity's case, may be possible for many. There are risks, however. Too many simultaneous areas of work may dilute an institution's efforts and diffuse its focus, thus undermining its impact rather than enhancing it. Not all communities have the capacity to absorb such a range of efforts. And internal resistance from institutional stakeholders is more likely when significant resources are being committed. Here, an incremental approach and strong partnerships can be useful, yielding concrete results in one area before ratcheting up ambitions, and sharing costs with other

institutional anchors where possible. At this level of ambition, leadership commitment becomes a crucial factor in the prospects for success and for the perseverance over time without which a holistic strategy is likely to fail.

Job Creation through Knowledge Transfer

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the contribution of anchor institutions to regional economies is the development of new centers of economic activity through technology transfer. The story of the research triangle in North Carolina is well known, as is the role of Stanford in the growth of Silicon Valley, and Harvard and MIT in high-technology development in Massachusetts. Yale, Rutgers, and Virginia Commonwealth University have pursued technology-transfer and research-park strategies as well. The East Baltimore Initiative, one of the most ambitious university-community-city-foundation partnerships in the country, has among its core goals the development of a biotechnology industry in Baltimore.¹¹

At its best, technology transfer can transform a regional economy. Johns Hopkins University

¹¹ For a recent summary of the extensive literature in this area see Battelle Technology Practice (2007).

has the most federal funding of any academic medical school in the country. It would be surprising if the technology component of the East Baltimore initiative were not successful. But many institutions have found technology transfer difficult, expensive, and slow to develop. Although the most successful efforts produce many jobs, it is unclear how many of these jobs can be filled by local residents. The demands of new companies often allow little room for partnering with community groups.

Research and Policy Analysis around Key Local Issues

Universities are uniquely well qualified to objectively answer questions about the performance of local service delivery systems and local economies. Government officials and the public often lack the most basic information about social indicators and regional progress. This lack of information makes proper decision making very difficult. Analysis can easily engage university faculty and students and thus builds on existing strengths. It can also create new relationships with relevant state or municipal policy-making agencies. It is relatively low-cost and carries the significant ancillary benefits of providing new opportunities for faculty with relevant expertise and strengthening the university's academic standing. The University of Illinois–Chicago, for instance, through its Center for Urban Economic Development, has been

involved in “smart growth” urban planning and “green” development at the municipal level since the early 1990s; it now produces a steady stream of relevant research and has significant influence over urban redevelopment policy in Chicago (Wiewel & Knaap, 2005, p. 5). Similarly, Rutgers University has a National Center for Neighborhood and Brownfields Redevelopment that has been widely active in smart-growth urban redevelopment in New Jersey (Danis et al., 2005). The critical factor in this strategy is existing institutional expertise, and its relevant application is mostly at the municipal or regional rather than neighborhood level.

Relational Strategies

Any substantive anchor strategy inherently involves the formation of relationships between the anchor institution and other actors and stakeholders. Several aspects of this dimension of anchoring have been discussed in previous sections. In this section, we focus primarily on relational modes and approaches that constitute anchoring strategies in their own right or that fundamentally shape the anchoring process.

Project-Based Relationships

The relationships constructed by anchor institutions in pursuit of specific and circumscribed aims and projects tend to be largely pragmatic in nature and thus fairly ephemeral. Most of the relationships developed by universities pursuing urban renewal strategies fall under this heading, as do the relationships formed when institutions conduct land swaps with neighboring communities. In some cases, relations may be generally antagonistic, with the parties to them temporarily suspending hostilities in the interest of striking a mutually beneficial bargain.

The advantage of such strictly pragmatic relationships is that they carry low costs and risks, committing the institution to nothing beyond the practical aims at hand. The disadvantage is that they do little to build trust over the longer term and thus contribute little toward a broader agenda. This need not be the case, however. An anchor institution oriented toward the general value of relationships in the work of community improvement can use project-based collaboration with outside actors to begin building trust in anticipation of a deepening partnership down the road. An example is the joint municipal/university library in San Jose, a project-based collaboration that began with a degree of mutual suspicion but, once successfully

completed, resulted in an appetite for further cooperation and discussions about shared recreational facilities, classroom space, and a Wi-Fi network (Jordan, 2005). Thus, for a partnership-oriented anchor institution, even pragmatic relationships formed in the pursuit of specific projects can serve as the basis for more substantive partnering.

Convening and Visioning

A role that anchor institutions often assume, particularly at the outset of their engagement work, is that of convening relevant stakeholders and initiating a planning or visioning process. Youngstown State's pivotal role in generating such a process at the municipal level was noted earlier, but much smaller institutions can do this as well. Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, North Carolina, with just 1,500 students, initiated a convening process that brought together the chamber of commerce, city officials, builders and bankers, and local neighborhood associations to develop a shared vision for northwest Charlotte (Nye & Schramm, 1999, p. 25). Such processes are not ends in themselves. In order to be successful, they must produce tangible results—often a planning document or a new community development corporation (CDC). But the process itself can provide a context for the formation of generative relationships, not only between the convening institution and

participating stakeholders, but among the network of stakeholders. Though launching such a process may require some tenacity and skill, it is not a costly undertaking; nor does it carry much risk of over-committing the institution. It is by nature incremental and it inherently promotes the formation of relationships and potential partnerships.

Establishing or Joining a Community Development Partnership

Community development partnerships have, over the past two decades, become increasingly common vehicles for community engagement where neighborhood decline is the primary impetus. In part, this has resulted from the Community Outreach Partnership (COPC) grant-making program for colleges and universities, introduced by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1994. Such partnerships are well suited to community engagement and investment in neighborhood improvement, offering considerable institutional flexibility, the potential for real change, moderate costs, and manageable risks. These partnerships do not intrinsically rise to the level of substantive anchoring, and many real-life instances clearly have not done so. They can, however, provide a productive framework if an institutional commitment to substantive anchoring already exists. They can be a useful vehicle for exploring anchoring options and building the

kind of relationships that may facilitate substantive anchoring when such a commitment is made.

Community development partnerships vary greatly. Whereas many institutions have taken the initiative in creating a new partnership framework or organization, others have formed lasting partnerships with existing community organizations. Trinity College, discussed above, and Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, have had notable success with long-term commitments of the latter sort.¹² The Garfield Park Conservatory has brought together a range of community stakeholders under its New Communities Program, with funding from LISC/Chicago, to work on several fronts to improve quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood on Chicago's west side.¹³ Creating a new partnership obviously offers greater institutional control. Including the partnership in the institutional hierarchy and staffing it from within the institution result in nearly complete in-house control. More commonly, institutions have overseen the creation of organizations—by convening stakeholders, incubating, or providing start-up

¹² Clark University's anchor initiative, like Trinity's, has generated little independent documentation, but see Nye and Schramm (1999, pp. 38-39), Marga (2007), and www.clarku.edu/community/upp/ (accessed October, 2007).

¹³ See http://www.garfield-conservatory.org/new_communities.htm (accessed October, 2007).

funding—and then gradually given them greater autonomy.¹⁴ Based on the limited number of cases where adequate documentation is available, there seems to be a correlation between greater autonomy and better results, but a systematic review of such arrangements is beyond the scope of this report.

As noted, community development partnerships need not be costly, particularly with the availability of COPC funding,¹⁵ although a certain amount of staff time is necessary, particularly at the outset. The particular partnership structure can be determined on the basis of institutional preferences regarding control versus autonomy. Such partnerships can certainly be developed incrementally to minimize the risk of institutional overcommitment. They can provide an excellent vehicle for gauging community priorities and strengthening the internal capacity of struggling communities. They can help repair strained relationships with surrounding communities. Autonomy from university control can provide some specific benefits: clearer decision-making authority that is independent of university

decision-making processes; greater parity between the institution and community groups; greater trust; and reduced institutional exposure to potential controversy.¹⁶ A final advantage of this strategy is the wealth of practice-based knowledge being developed through such collaboration by a range of anchors and the increasing research attention and documentation that such efforts are receiving.

This approach is not entirely devoid of risks. Exaggerated expectations on the part of community participants may develop, particularly where the institution is perceived as wealthy and powerful. A failure to agree upon shared goals and priorities is often an obstacle to achieving results. Institutions may experience some loss of control, depending on the type of partnership framework. Judging from the wealth of COPC-funded initiatives that seem to have stalled or remained fairly superficial, this strategy may often have been adopted in cases where the anchor institution's commitment was fairly perfunctory, so that instead of facilitating a transition to substantive community investment, the partnership has

¹⁴ Ohio State's relationship with Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment is a particularly successful and well-documented case (Dixon & Roche, 2005).

¹⁵ This program was suspended in 2008.

¹⁶ These points are made in Keating and Sjoqvist's (2000) review of the Community Design Center of Atlanta and by Dixon and Roche (2005) with regard to Ohio State University's work with Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment.

served as a low-cost substitute for such investment.

Supporting Role Vis-à-Vis Community Organizations

A few institutions have adopted a rather different approach to working with community development organizations. Instead of partnering intensively with one or more organizations concentrated in adjacent neighborhoods, they have created an in-house institutional framework for providing support and resources to a wider range of such organizations, sometimes in adjacent areas and sometimes at the city or regional level. Collaborative research is a favored vehicle for this sort of support (Nyden et al., 1997; Silko, 2006). Loyola University has been involved in several such initiatives, first in working with a coalition of community organizations in northeast Chicago in the early 1990s (Nyden et al., 1997, pp. 32-41), then joining with three other Chicago-area universities and more than twenty community organizations to form the Policy Research Action Group (PRAG)—a collaborative research network that links community research and grassroots activism (Nyden et al., 1997, pp.19-26)—and, more recently, developing a freestanding collaborative research center, the Center for Urban Research and Learning (Nyden, 2006). The University of Illinois–Chicago has developed a similar capacity since the mid-

1990s with its Neighborhoods Initiative (UICNI), which is designed to support faculty collaboration with community organizations in two neighborhoods on Chicago’s west side in designing and implementing community development projects (Gonzalez et al., 2005). The Community Design Center of Atlanta (CDCA), founded by Georgia Tech in the 1970s, provides similar support to community groups in twelve low-income neighborhoods in metropolitan Atlanta (Keating & Sjoquist, 2000).

This approach has the advantage of building directly on core institutional capacities, particularly for schools with existing strengths in community and economic development and urban planning, while providing opportunities for faculty and students working in relevant areas. Because it remains an in-house operation, however, this strategy is subject to internal administrative vicissitudes and the politics of institutional resource distribution. The diffusion of focus across many organizations may also make it difficult to see or evaluate what is being accomplished. And while new relationships with community organizations are undoubtedly established through such efforts, the level of institutional investment in any one of those relationships may remain relatively transient and superficial.

Multi-Anchoring

Collaborative anchoring by multiple institutions, though relatively rare, is an interesting variant on institutional investment in community improvement. Insofar as it is possible to generalize from the six instances we have been able to identify, these collaborations tend to involve a wide variety of institutions—universities, medical institutions, corporations, foundations, and municipalities.¹⁷ Their focus tends to be on infrastructural investment in a confined geographical area—generally a city district—where the institutions are located. The Greater University Circle

¹⁷ The Canton Initiative in upstate New York involves SUNY Potsdam, Kraft Foods, Alcoa Aluminum Corporation, the New York State Power Authority, and the village of Canton. The East Baltimore Revitalization Project involves Johns Hopkins University and Medical Institutions, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the city of Baltimore. The Uptown Consortium in Cincinnati involves the University of Cincinnati, Health Alliance, Tri Health Inc., the Children's Hospital, and the Cincinnati Zoo. The Greater University Circle Initiative in Cleveland involves the Cleveland Foundation, Case Western Reserve University, The Cleveland Clinic, and University Hospitals. UniverCity Partnership in Worcester, Massachusetts, involves a consortium of thirteen area colleges, the city, and members of the business community. The Central Baltimore Partnership consists of Johns Hopkins University, the University of Baltimore, the Maryland Institute College of Art, the Goldseker Foundation, several community organizations and coalitions, city departments, and the Baltimore Development Corporation.

(GUC) Initiative in Cleveland, for instance, focuses on transportation infrastructure, housing and retail, open space improvements, and community development. The East Baltimore Revitalization Project is building mixed-income homes and apartments, improving parks and streetscapes, constructing a new school and subway stop, and developing retail and other consumer services (Cromwell et al., 2005). The Uptown Consortium in Cincinnati is involved in residential construction and the expansion of retail space (Bromley & Kent, 2006; Romanos et al., 2006). Although neighborhood or regional improvement seems to have been a prominent motive in all cases, expansion needs have also played a role in motivating some multi-anchor initiatives. In the case of Cleveland's GUC Initiative, for instance, the expansion plans of several institutional participants were an important element in the Cleveland Foundation's successful efforts to persuade them to make parallel off-campus investments.¹⁸ The Cleveland Foundation's convening role in this instance raises the interesting prospect of foundations as catalysts for anchor initiatives, as does the Annie E. Casey Foundation's role in Baltimore.

¹⁸ Lillian Kuri (Cleveland Foundation), personal communication.

Multi-anchor collaborations have the obvious benefit of distributing costs and risks and leveraging greater resources than a single institution might be able to invest. Conversely, each institution loses a significant measure of the control they might have had acting alone. The structural and decision-making complexities of coordinating multiple anchors may be significant. Partnerships with other participating anchors are clearly a prominent feature of this approach, but those partnerships' very prominence might reduce an institution's incentive to develop relationships with community groups and actors. The evolution of these multi-anchor initiatives is not sufficiently well documented to allow us to generalize about the significance of an incremental approach, but Cleveland's GUC Initiative, for one, began by focusing on tangible projects with a short timeline in order to convince participating institutions that the endeavor was viable.

Institutional Reorientation toward Anchor Mission

A wholesale institutional reorientation toward a local or regional anchor mission is also an unusual but interesting way for an institution to dedicate significant attention and resources to serving and improving its geographical and social surroundings. It has been adopted primarily by large state universities—leading examples are the University of Illinois–

Chicago, Portland State University, and the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.¹⁹ In these cases, the primary motivating factor, at least from the perspective of institutional self-interest, seems to have been a perceived need for institutional repositioning or renewal, although the plight or needs of the cities in which they are located were obviously a crucial contextual factor. The basic principle for this approach is that of “engaged” scholarship and teaching. Although such academic “engagement” does not constitute institutional anchoring in its own right, this strategy moves in the direction of substantive anchoring insofar as it reorients the entire institution in this direction.

This strategy is costly, as it involves a major institutional reorientation and redistribution of resources. It inevitably meets with resistance from internal stakeholders and requires vigorous leadership from the highest

¹⁹ Arizona State University appears to be a more recent example, but available documentation is ambiguous as to the level of substantive reorientation involved in its recent repositioning as a “comprehensive metropolitan research university,” which it also refers to as the “New American University” (Dubb, 2007, p. 70). On the other three cases, see Wiewel and Broski (1999) for the University of Illinois–Chicago’s “Great Cities Institute,” Wergin and Grassadonia (2002) and Percy et al. (2006) for the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee’s “Milwaukee Idea,” and Bunnell and Lawson (2006) for Portland State.

administrative level, extensive consultation, and lengthy deliberations. The payoff on this major investment of time and energy appears more likely to be improved institutional status—as with Portland State and UW–Milwaukee—than tangible improvements in community or municipal quality of life. The lack of true community payoff may stem from the complexity of reorienting an entire institution, which inevitably prioritizes institutional needs and capacities over community needs. It may also stem from the inevitable diffusion of focus caused by the systemwide character of the strategy. In the

formulation of Judith Ramaley, who pioneered this approach as president of Portland State University in the 1990s, it is based on the assumption that “positive community impact will become a natural byproduct of the research and educational efforts of the entire institution” (Ramaley, 1996, p. 140). Such by-products are unlikely to materialize, however, without more targeted community improvement work. Institutional reorientation does make an institution more likely to engage in community improvement by making it more mission-congruent, but it does not necessarily lead to community change.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Nonprofit anchor institutions have the potential to be major forces for redevelopment in cities and communities. Although the interests of anchor institutions are not always the same as those of cities and communities, large anchors have the potential to be very significant sources of capital, technical expertise, and political support for urban and community redevelopment. Far too often, however, anchors overestimate the costs and risks of local strategies and fail to understand the very considerable benefits as well as the full range of strategies available to them. In this report, we have tried to begin developing a systematic framework for evaluating the costs and benefits involved in the community investment decisions of anchor institutions. We have surveyed the major categories of cost, risk, and benefit, provided some guidelines for assessing their relative weight and significance, and indicated the ways in which they can play out in relation to a range of anchoring strategies.

Though we believe that we have made a contribution, there is a great deal of work that remains to be done in this area. We would suggest three next steps.

Extending this analysis to a broader range of institutional types. This report concerns nonprofit anchors and, following the available literature, tends to overrepresent the experience of large universities and academic medical centers. It would be useful to test the conclusions of this report against the experience of business anchors. The role of large businesses in funding cultural organizations is well known, but there are other efforts that are not well described in the literature. Focused case studies of smaller anchors, such as the under-documented work of Springfield College and Clark University, would also be a valuable contribution to the literature in this field.

Exploring cost-benefit models. Despite our skepticism regarding the feasibility of applying formal cost-benefit analysis to deep institutional involvement by anchor institutions in local communities, the relevance of such analysis deserves further exploration. There are no existing models in this field. Thus, the path forward requires the involvement of investigators who have done cost-benefit

analysis in other fields to apply their models and expertise to this area.

Identification of best practices. It would be useful to every institution that is considering developing a community strategy to have a list of the institutional leaders in each strategy. This is difficult task. Observers differ on the success of different initiatives and initiatives themselves change over time. Examples are most useful, moreover, if they are similar to the institution considering action. The success of the University of Pennsylvania's efforts in West Philadelphia will not be convincing to a smaller institution without sizeable resources. Finding the best examples of community investment for different types of institutional actors would be a major step forward.

References

- Appleseed, Inc. 2004. Harvard University's Impact on the Boston Area Economy. Cambridge: Harvard University
- Battelle Technology Practice. 2007. Characteristics and Trends in North American Research parks: 21st Century Directions (report prepared for the Association of University Research Parks).
- Bromley, Ray, and Robert B. Kent. 2006. Integrating Beyond the Campus: Ohio's Urban Public Universities and Neighborhood Revitalization. *Planning, Practice & Research* 21 (1): 45-78.
- Brukardt, Mary Jane, Stephen L. Percy, and Nancy L. Zimpher. 2006. In *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement* (Stephen L. Percy, Nancy L. Zimpher, and Mary Jane Brukardt, eds.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.
- Bunnell, Gene, and Catherine T. Lawson. 2006. A Public University as City Planner and Developer: Experience in the 'Capital of Good Planning.'" *Planning, Practice & Research* 21 (1): 25-43.
- Chesnick, Joyesha. 2007. Doing Away with Town and Gown. *The Next American City* 15 (summer 2007). (http://americacity.org/article.php?id_article=280)
- Coffey, Brian, and Yonn Dierwechter. 2005. The Urban University as a Vehicle for Inner-City Renewal: The University of Washington, Tacoma. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Cromwell, Patrice M., Robert P. Giloth, and Marsha R.B. Schachtel. 2005. East Baltimore Revitalization Project: Opportunities and Challenges in Transforming an Urban Neighborhood. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 10 (2): 113-126.
- Cummings, Scott, Mark Rosentraub, Mary Domahidy, and Sarah Coffin. 2005. University Involvement in Downtown Revitalization: Managing Political and Financial Risks. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Danis, Christine, Laura Solitare, Michael Greenberg, and Henry Mayer. 2005. Using a Geographic Information System (GIS) to Help Shape Redevelopment of Small Urban Centers. In

Partnerships for Smart Growth: University-Community Collaboration for Better Public Places (Wim Wiewel and Gerrit-Jan Knaap, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Dixon, David, and Peter J. Roche. 2005. Campus Partners and The Ohio State University: A Case Study in Enlightened Self-Interest. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Dubb, Steve. 2007. *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Engagement*. University of Maryland: The Democracy Collaborative.

Gonzalez, Atannacio, Laxmi Ramasubramanian, Aska M. Ali, and Amanda J. Eichelkraut. 2005. Organizing Partnerships for Sustainable Community Economic Development: Lessons Learned from the University of Illinois–Chicago Neighborhoods Initiative. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 10 (2): 69-84.

Halpern, Robert. 1995. *Rebuilding the inner city : a history of neighborhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hirsch, Arnold. 1998. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jordan, Anne. 2005 “Double Booking.” *Governing Magazine*, August 2005 (<http://www.governing.com/archive/2005/aug/library.txt>).

Keating, Larry, and David L. Sjoquist. 2000. The Use of an External Organization to Facilitate University-Community Partnerships. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 5 (1): 141-157.

Kelley, Lawrence R. and Carl V. Patton. 2005. The University as an Engine for Downtown Renewal in Atlanta. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Knowles, Timothy, Stephen Raudenbush, and Henry Webber. 2007. John Dewey for Today: Chicago Redefines the Role of the Research University in Urban Schools. *Education Week*, July 18, 2007.

Kronewitter, Robert. 2005. Auroria Higher Education Center and Denver Inner-City Development. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Marga, Inc. 2007. Discussion Paper: University-Community Partnerships: 2006 Worcester Speaker Series.

Nyden, Philip, Joanne Adams, and Kim Zalent. 1997. Creating and Sustaining Racially and Ethnically Diverse Communities. In *Building Community: Social Science in Action*. Philip Nyden, Anne Figert, Mark Shibley, and Darryl Burrows (eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press

Nyden, Philip, Anne Figert, Mark Shibley, and Darryl Burrows (eds.). 1997. *Building Community: Social Science in Action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Nyden, Philip. 2006. The Challenges and Opportunities of Engaged Research. In *Scholarship in Action: Applied Research and Community Change* (Linda Silka, ed.) Washington, DC: HUD.

Nye, Nancy, and Richard Schramm. 1999. *Building Higher Education-Community Development Corporation Partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development.

Ostrander, Susan A. 2004. Democracy, Civic Participation, and the University: A Comparative Study of Civic Engagement on Five Campuses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33 (1): 74-93.

Percy, Stephen L., Nancy L. Zimpher, and Mary Jane Brukardt (eds.). 2006. *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Ramaley, Judith A. 1996. Large Scale Institutional Change to Implement an Urban University Mission: Portland State University. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 18 (2): 139-151.

Reardon, Kenneth M. 2005. Straight As? Evaluating the Success of Community/University Development Partnerships, *Communities & Banking*, Summer 2005, pp.3-10.

Reardon, Kenneth M. 2006. Promoting Reciprocity within Community/University Development Partnerships: Lessons from the Field. *Planning, Practice & Research* 21 (1): 95-107.

Rodin, Judith. 2007. *The University and Urban Revival: Out of the Ivory Tower and Into the Streets*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Romanos, Michael, David Edelman, and Mahyar Arefi. 2006a. *UC/Community Interactions and Collaborations: A Study of Peer Institutions: Main Report*. Cincinnati, OH, Office of the President. http://www.daap.uc.edu/planning/uptown_report_main_report.pdf (accessed Oct. 10, 2007)

Schramm, Richard. 2002. Building and Sustaining a Commitment to Community Outreach, Development, and Collaboration. In *Building and sustaining a commitment to community outreach, development, and collaboration: Springfield College. (Lasting Engagement, vol. I)*. Washington, DC: HUD.

Silka, Linda (ed.). 2006. *Scholarship in Action: Applied Research and Community Change*. Washington, DC: HUD.

Strom, Elizabeth. 2005. The Political Strategies behind University-Based Development: Two Philadelphia Cases. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Thorsten, Richard. 2005. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Master Plan and Development Plan: Blueprints and Partners in Smart Growth. In *Partnerships for Smart Growth: University-Community Collaboration for Better Public Places* (Wim Wiewel and Gerrit-Jan Knaap, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of University Partnerships. 1999. *University-Community Partnerships in America: Current Practices, volume III*. Rockville, MD: HUD.

Webber, Henry S. 2005. The University of Chicago and Its Neighbors: A Case Study in Community Development. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds.). Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Weissbourd, Robert, and Christopher Berry. 2004. *The Changing Dynamics of Urban America*. CEOs for Cities.

Wergin, Jon F., and Jane M. Grassadonia. 2002. *The Milwaukee Idea: A Study of Transformative Change (Lasting Engagement, vol. II)*. Washington, DC: HUD.

Wiewel, Wim, and David Broski. 1999. The Great Cities Institute: Dilemmas of Implementing the Urban Land Grant Mission. *Metropolitan Universities Journal* 10: 29-38.

Wiewel, Wim, and Gerrit-Jan Knaap (eds.). 2005. *Partnerships for Smart Growth: University-Community Collaboration for Better Public Places*.

1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

T: 773.256.5100
F: 773.753.5940

www.chapinhall.org