METROPOLITAN Universities

OPEN ACCESS

Original Research

Types of Anchor Institution Initiatives: An Overview of University Urban Development Literature

Paul Garton[1]

[1] Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy, Seton Hall University

Cite as: Garton, P. (2021).Types of Anchor Institution Initiatives: An Overview of University Urban Development Literature. *Metropolitan Universities*, 32(2), 85-105. DOI: 10.18060/25242

Editor: Valerie L. Holton, Ph.D.

Abstract

Interest in universities as anchor institutions within their communities and cities is growing as civic leaders search for ways to build local wealth. Systematic analysis of the effects of anchor institution initiatives remains difficult due to the disparate nature of anchor initiatives and a relative lack of a shared language describing the work. This article reviews the anchor literature to summarize current understandings of universities and economic development, then develops a typology of anchor institution initiatives based upon the literature. The typology is based upon the type of capital leveraged by initiatives: (a) financial, (b) physical, (c) intellectual, and (d) human. The author then uses the typology to categorize a number of initiatives found within the literature and through a rough sampling process. This typology offers a shared language for scholars to use to guide discussions around universities as anchor institutions, and, more importantly, the typology can frame analyses of the differential effects, costs, and benefits of different anchor strategies.

Keywords: anchor institutions, community engagement, town-gown, urban universities, urban development

Introduction

Higher education was originally an urban institution in Europe (Bender, 1988), and though it assumed pastoral ideals in the United States (Geiger, 2016), urbanity is once again a defining feature of modern higher education. Universities, cities, and economic development are closely connected in a complex political economy that shapes university community relations and molds neighborhood change (Etienne, 2012; Wiewel & Perry, 2008). The specific strategies universities can deploy to build community wealth, however, are still not clearly understood. Hodges and Dubb (2012) systematically analyzed several universities to categorize overall approaches to economic engagement and what they termed the anchor mission, but anchor institution initiatives, or the targeted projects universities use to leverage their resources for purposes of development, are still not fully understood within the literature.

The anchor mission, as developed by Hodges and Dubb (2012), called for universities to productively leverage their economic footprints to build local wealth in equitable and sustainable ways. This article builds upon their work by including the concept of anchor institution initiatives, the discrete projects and strategies universities use to carry out an anchor mission. This article aims to provide an overview of the current state of literature on anchor institutions and economic development, after which the author develops a typology of anchor institution initiatives. Similar to Doberneck et al.'s (2010) typology of community engaged scholarship, an anchor institution initiative typology provides a shared language to discuss the merits and costs of different types of anchor work. The typology also allows for richer analyses of economic engagement and the differential effects of anchor institution initiatives on neighborhoods based on the strategy utilized.

In understanding universities as anchor institutions and their effects on neighborhoods, this article reviews the anchor institution literature to identify the known economic effects on local communities of universities, posits causal mechanisms connecting anchor institution initiatives and local development, examines the internal and external pressures on universities to adopt these strategies, and clarifies the types of economic activity by universities that constitute an anchor institution initiative. The author develops four types of strategies universities have used based upon the capital they are investing: (a) financial, (b) physical, (c) intellectual, and (d) human and provides examples of different anchor institution initiatives using these strategies. The strategies are not mutually exclusive; in fact, most initiatives use multiple strategies. Scholars, university leaders, and policymakers can use this typology to frame their own anchor work and find the combination of strategies that work in their context.

Anchor Institutions and Economic Development

Anchor institutions provide reliable capital locally that can be further leveraged in regional development strategies (Porter, 1997, 2016). Existing studies in economics estimating the effects of universities on local markets generally examine the establishment of new universities. Several studies utilized specific historical circumstances resulting in new postsecondary organizations to identify the effects of universities on local economies. Cantoni and Yuchtman (2014) and Liu (2015) drew from particularly dated eras to understand the role of universities and higher education in the economic development and social organization of Germany and the United States. Cantoni and Yuchtman (2014) drew from data on a uniquely feudal political economic system. Incorporated cities in the Holy Roman Empire required market grants from the emperor or a lord to host a market or festival. Multiple markets or festivals required a corresponding number of grants. The authors used issued-market grants as a proxy for commercial activity and leveraged the papal schism as an exogenous shock in the establishment of universities. Prior to the schism, most German scholars and students were in France. The Catholic church, however, split in 1309 with France, proclaiming allegiance to one wing and the Holy Roman Empire the other. As German scholars and students returned to Germany, the wing to which they were pledged began to relax restrictions on new universities. These coinciding events related directly to the schism resulted in establishing several new universities. Cantoni and Yuchtman (2014) analyzed these data using a difference-in-differences strategy with the establishment of a new university near an incorporated city as the treatment variable and receipt of market grants as the outcome. The authors found approximately 40 new markets were established due to proximity to new universities, reversing a negative trend in market grant receipt. Cantoni and Yuchtman (2014) speculate the causal mechanism is universities trained students in law, bolstering local legal institutions and providing merchants with the human capital necessary to navigate increasingly complex organizations.

Liu (2015) designed a similar study in the United States using an event-study framework. Drawing largely on historical census data, Liu's (2015) identification strategy rests on the exogeneity of decision-making related to the Morrill Act of 1862. The Morrill Act established land-grant universities in every state, and the location of each university often held a degree of randomness. To address any endogeneity in university location, Liu (2015) used a synthetic control rather than a single counterfactual. The establishment of a land-grant university increased local population density by 45% over 80 years. Additionally, though the relative size of the manufacturing sector remained unchanged, manufacturing output increased by 57% per worker. This finding is somewhat contrary to Cantoni and Yuchtman's (2014) result that markets themselves expanded, not just output, but it intuitively follows from arguments that universities foster innovation and productivity enhancements.

In a more contemporary era, Andersson, Quigley, and Wilhelmsson (2009) examined the effects of new universities in Sweden. Leveraging Swedish decentralization of higher education in 1987

that created new universities across the country, Andersson et al. (2009) examined the effect of an increased number of post-graduate researchers and research technicians on local worker productivity and innovations as measured by patents. The authors found new universities increased productivity by approximately 4% per 100 post-graduate researchers and increased patent receipt by 2.3% per 10 research technicians. Approximately half of all productivity gains were located within 3 to 5 miles of the university. This supports Liu's (2015) findings of universities as local productivity-enhancing organizations, a claim largely supported by literature on the spillovers of human capital investments (Moretti, 2004).

Though this article focuses specifically on higher education organizations, the economic effects of other types of anchor institutions offer analogous opportunities for understanding universities as actors in local development. The most commonly cited type of anchor institution other than universities are hospitals (Dubb & Howard, 2012; Hodges & Dubb, 2012). Mandich and Dorfman (2017) studied the relationship between hospitals and local labor markets using individual-level census data and county-level hospital employment data, an analysis focused on wage premiums and job growth. The authors calculated wage premiums using multiple regression, regressing log wage on a dummy indicator of whether the individual was employed at a hospital, individual characteristics, and level of education. Mandich and Dorfman (2017) find hospitals offer high wage premiums for not only doctors but bachelor and associate degree holders as well. The authors also examined the relationship between the number of hospitals and local employment using fixed effects. County employment was regressed on county-level characteristics, the number of hospitals in the county, and year and county-level fixed effects. Job growth in non-health related sectors tended to be higher in areas with hospitals (Mandich & Dorfman, 2017). Lacking a strong identification strategy, Mandich and Dorfman's (2017) estimates should not be interpreted causally, but their results match the anchor literature broadly.

Sports stadiums, though lacking the continuous activity of universities or hospitals, have similar spatial footprints. This distinction results in slightly different impacts on the local economy. Ahlfeldt and Maennig (2009) examined the effects on land values of opening three stadiums in Berlin, Germany. Using block-level data on 376 blocks from 1992 to 2006, the authors isolated the effect using a difference-in-differences method, with treatment being the construction of a stadium. Land value growth increased by approximately 2% following the construction of a stadium (Ahlfeldt & Maennig, 2009). However, evidence on other economic markers is less encouraging. Coates and Depken (2009) examined monthly sales tax revenue in four cities with major college football teams in Texas from 1984 to 2008, combined with information on home games and opponents. Including fixed effects and time trends in the models, Coates and Depken (2009) found no effects on tax revenue of hosting sporting events. Lertwachara and Cochran (2007) use an event study on city-level data to estimate the effect of professional sports teams on income. Again, there was no detectable effect, even with multiple teams. Finally, Miller (2002) used employment data on construction companies in St. Louis for regressions based on lagged

dependent variables. Employment levels did not change based on stadium construction. In summation, though stadiums tend to increase rents and land values, there is no evidence of changes in income, employment rates, or tax revenues.

Military bases also have significant effects on local economies. Zou (2018) examined the effects of military personnel contractions using census data, county-level economic data, and base locations from the Department of Defense. The identification strategy utilized synthetic control groups and instrumented for base personnel contractions. The instrument was composed of the product of the initial personnel-overall population ratio and the nationwide personnel contraction. Zou (2018) found eliminating one military worker costs 0.68 civilian jobs in locally traded industries, but only small effects on industries traded globally. Anchor institutions thus have powerful and complex effects on their local neighborhoods and economies.

Incentives for Economic Engagement

Though universities and other anchor institutions are not necessarily engaged in activities and initiatives developing their surrounding communities, they face pressure to do such work from various sources. Internally, university officials often support initiating or engaging with existing urban development efforts because they recognize the close connection between the city and the university and their intertwined fates (Dalton, Hajrasouliha, & Riggs, 2018; Maurrasse, 2007). Wittman and Crews (2012) and the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (2011) described this mutual benefit as shared value, or strategies that improve the competitiveness of an organization while also benefiting local communities. Much concern is relative to local economic development deal with recruiting and retaining students and faculty (Morris et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2018). Etienne (2012) described in detail the University of Pennsylvania's anxieties of losing its global prominence due to local conditions of poverty and crime. Administrators at the University of Pennsylvania feared high quality faculty would choose to work at other universities solely because of surrounding neighborhoods. Maurrasse (2007) also transcribed a quote from a University of Cincinnati official claiming parents pulled their children from the school after visiting campus. The university began anchor institution initiatives when administrators decided local conditions were affecting admissions.

There are also external pressures for universities to economically engage with their cities. Federal agencies such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Small Business Administration urge universities to adopt development strategies, and the Bayh-Dole Act and Small Business Technology Transfer program highly incentivize universities and researchers to translate their results into marketable products for purposes of regional development (Kochenkova, Grimaldi, & Munari, 2016; O'Shea, Fitzgerald, Chugh, & Allen, 2014). Local governments also exert pressure on universities, though municipalities often lack the strong incentive capabilities of the federal government. Despite taking advantage of municipal services such as utilities and fire and police services, universities are largely exempt

from paying property taxes, leading to tensions between municipalities and universities (Kenyon & Langley, 2010; Maurrasse, 2007). The tax exemption is to partially offset the positive externalities of higher education such as lower healthcare costs for graduates and research with societal implications/applications, but these externalities often benefit geographic areas beyond the municipality losing revenue (Kenyon & Langley, 2010). For example, universities are exempt from paying local property taxes to help subsidize education, but students do not necessarily stay within the same city of the university following graduation, so the city subsidizes a large number of students who do not benefit the city in any way after they leave the university. Thus, many local leaders lobby universities to pay payments in lieu of taxes (PILOTs) or provide other forms of local development aid.

Beyond official governance structures, community activists also pressure universities to take a leading role in urban development (Alperovitz, 2013; Hoyt, 2013; Wolf-Powers, 2010). Community benefits agreements leverage universities to invest in negotiated ways, and civic leaders exert influence as they seek methods to improve living standards. Additionally, foundations and economic development research groups write extensively about the potential of anchor institutions to facilitate local development, arguing for universities to take central roles in urban growth (CEOs for Cities with Living Cities, 2010; Crane et al., 2010; Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, 2011; Morris et al., 2010). The Democracy Collaborative, in particular, is one of the leading organizations pushing for universities to adopt anchor institution missions, convening multiple universities to evaluate and discuss their anchor strategies and partnering with the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities to disseminate findings (Democracy Collaborative, 2018).

Not all external pressures are supportive of university-led development. Community organizers and residents are often suspicious of university intentions as specific projects are emphasized over others or university investments are inconsistent (Etienne, 2012; Wolf-Power, 2010). The concept of shared value may be built on ideas of mutuality, but it does not specify the differential costs or benefits associated with development. There are also tensions inherent to the transitory student model of higher education. As enrollment grows, more students move to be close to campus and live in off-campus housing. Residents must deal with the noise, higher rents, and traffic of students (Smith, 2008: Smith & Holt, 2007). Conversely, university expansion to accommodate more on-campus housing also meets resistance as people often view universities as greedy, cloistered organizations (Maurrasse, 2007; Rooney & Gittleman, 2003). Such concerns rarely receive more than cursory mentions in literature arguing for anchor institutions as key components of economic growth and urban development.

Anchor Institution Initiatives

Based upon the literature review presented in this article, the author created a typology of anchor institution initiatives based upon the type of capital universities invest: (a) financial capital, (b) physical capital, (c) intellectual capital, and (d) human capital (Dalton et al., 2018; Maurrasse, 2007; Morris et al., 2010; Walker & East, 2018). Financial capital is a university's cash or endowment. Physical capital is the constructed portions of a university's holdings, generally thought of as the campus (Dalton et al., 2018). Intellectual capital is the knowledge held by university affiliates, generally students, faculty, and staff. Finally, human capital is university investments in local community well-being, such as education and health (Arteaga, 2017; Clark & Martorell, 2014).

Along with developing the capital typology using existing anchor literature, the author used the typology to categorize a number of anchor institution initiatives, collected both through the literature and an additional two-step process. First, the author cross-referenced members of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU) and the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) with universities that have received the Carnegie Classification for community engagement or were named to the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll. After identifying universities that were both members of CUMU or USU and had received at least one of the engagement recognitions, the author searched those universities' websites and media outlets for information on any anchor initiatives from 1970 to 2010. This provides a basic overview of the state of anchor work at different universities across the United States, described using the capital typology.

Financial capital

Universities leverage financial capital through three main types of anchor institution initiatives. First, housing programs aim to improve housing stock and raise the market value of homes in a neighborhood (Appleseed, 2003; Webber & Karlström, 2009). Strong housing markets are generally used to incentivize higher income residents and faculty to live in specific neighborhoods (Etienne, 2012; Maurrasse, 2007). The University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and Syracuse University offer mortgages backed by the university to faculty who live in specific neighborhoods, and both universities also purchased and renovated property for resale within those neighborhoods (Etienne, 2012; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Wittman & Crews, 2012).

Second, anchor institutions may prioritize local businesses when purchasing goods and services (Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, 2011; Webber and Karlström, 2009; Wittman & Crews, 2012). Not only can purchasing have direct impacts on local businesses, housing endowments in local banks can have more indirect effects as local financial institutions gain strength (Dubb & Howard, 2012). Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Penn, Yale University, and Lemoyne-Owen College all mandate that some percentage of annual purchasing must be local (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). There is some question,

however, about the degree to which economic gains from purchasing are locally sourced growth versus a transfer of jobs from other regions (Appleseed, 2003; Dubb & Howard, 2012).

The final type of anchor institution initiative that utilizes financial capital is establishing and funding community development corporations, or CDCs. CDCs, a non-legal term, are non-profits with goals related to community and economic development of a targeted neighborhood or constituency. There is no comprehensive national tracking of CDCs as it is not an official designation, but the National Alliance of Community Development Associations (NACEDA) reports at least 3,488 CDCs in current existence (NACEDA, 2020). Universities that leverage CDCs for local development generally provide the initial capital for the CDC, then maintain varying degrees of formal connections to the corporation through dual appointments or funding streams. Some university-supported CDCs become increasingly autonomous, while others remain tightly controlled by the university.

Table 1. Initiatives leveraging financial capital.

University	City	Description
Case Western Reserve University	Cleveland, OH	• Employer-assisted housing program • Local purchasing
Clark University	Worcester, MA	• Purchasing and renovating buildings for resale • Homeownership incentives for faculty/staff
Duke University	Durham, NC	• Created a nonprofit that, using loans from Duke, purchases land then resells at cost to affordable housing developers
Lemoyne-Owen College	Memphis, TN	• Created a CDC
Metropolitan State University	St. Paul, MN	• Local purchasing
Ohio State University	Columbus, OH	• Homeownership incentives for faculty/staff • Purchasing and renovating homes for resale
Syracuse University	Syracuse, NY	• Local purchasing • Homeownership grants and mortgages
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR	• Created a CDC
University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, OH	• Created multiple CDCs • Money for local police forces to target certain areas

		• Rehabilitating vacant lots and office space
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, PA	• Homeownership incentives • Purchasing and renovating homes for resale
Xavier University	New Orleans, LA	• Created a CDC • Funded home rehabilitation • Promotes cooperative home ownership • Seed funding for small businesses
Youngstown State University	Youngstown, OH	• Purchased land, regifted for development

Physical capital

Real estate development is perhaps the most visible component of anchor institution initiatives in urban development. Campus planning occurs within a complex political economy that is instantiated at the campus, campus-community interface, and campus district levels (Dalton et al., 2018). Issues such as aesthetics, utility, and sustainability must all be met by the buildings and overall campus design. To incorporate economic development further complicates the decisions to be made, but many campuses are attempting to do so (CEOs for Cities with Living Cities, 2010). Johns Hopkins sold approximately 100 properties to a development nonprofit to be transformed into mixed-use housing and biotechnology labs (Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, 2011). Arizona State University and the University of Washington both built entirely new campuses and reshaped downtown neighborhoods (CEOs for Cities with Living Cities, 2010; Dalton et al., 2018). Other urban universities are also expanding intentionally to achieve larger goals of economic development, such as Georgia State University, Clark University, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Northeastern University (CEOs for Cities with Living Cities, 2010; Dalton et al., 2018).

Table 2. Initiatives leveraging physical capital.

University	**City**	**Description**
Arizona State University	Phoenix, AZ	• Built new campus downtown
Case Western Reserve University	Cleveland, OH	• Building Museum of Contemporary Art and physical development of a main street • Transportation infrastructure
Clark University	Worcester, MA	• Brownfields clean-up • Housing developments • New research center

Emerson College	Boston, MA	• Built mixed-use cultural district
Georgia State University	Atlanta, GA	• Real estate development
Harvard University	Boston, MA	• Mixed-use development
Indiana University Northwest	Gary, IN	• New medical center
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Indianapolis, IN	• Campus expansion
Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore, MD	• East Baltimore mixed use development
Loyola University Chicago	Chicago, IL	• Off-campus property development and retail partnerships
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Cambridge, MA	• New research park and mixed-used development
Metropolitan State University	St. Paul, MN	• Library in partnership with St. Paul to also be a public library
Missouri State University	Springfield, MO	• Urban innovation park
Northeastern University	Boston, MA	• Residence hall with units available for area residents
Ohio State University	Columbus, OH	• New facilities, including mixed use
Portland State University	Portland, OR	• New academic facility and public square
Rutgers University - Newark	Newark, NJ	• Built new and rehabilitated homes
San Jose State University	San Jose, CA	• Joint university-public library
St. Louis University	St. Louis, MO	• New arena and research building
Temple University	Philadelphia, PA	• University expansion • New sports center
Trinity College	Hartford, CT	• Redeveloped bus depot and industrial buildings into mixed use development
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR	• Greenway restoration • Built new academic space • New intramural fields near student housing
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Las Vegas, NV	• Mixed use development and pedestrian infrastructure
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	Charlotte, NC	• Land-swap to give university-owned land to a developer
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, PA	• New mixed-use developments
University of Washington, Tacoma	Tacoma, WA	• Built new campus downtown
Youngstown State University	Youngstown, OH	• Built new residence halls

Intellectual capital

Some anchor institution initiatives employ the expertise and discovery capabilities of students and faculty to foster competitive business hubs through technology transfer or business incubators (Appleseed, 2003; Maurrasse, 2007; Webber & Karlström, 2009; Wittman & Crews, 2012). Technology transfer was historically operationalized as patents for marketable discoveries transferring from faculty and universities to existing firms specializing in the relevant market (Etzkowitz, 2014). More recently, however, technology transfer increasingly takes the form of firm creation (Etzkowitz, 2014; Geiger & Sá, 2005). In this model, faculty create new firms based on their discoveries. Faculty own and operate their own firms, and universities receive some percentage of royalties or hold some degree of equity (Wright, Lockett, Clarysse, & Binks, 2006). Productivity gains through university innovation, while dispersed somewhat spatially, are primarily concentrated within several miles of the university (Andersson et al., 2009).

The economic effects of knowledge generated at universities are not limited to faculty. Kantor and Whalley (2014) used census data on industries outside of education to explore knowledge spillovers, or the indirect benefits of the teaching and research missions of universities. They found a 10% increase in higher education spending increased noneducation sector wages by 0.8%. The sectors that experienced the highest increases in wages tended to rely on university patents, overlap with university labor markets, or require postsecondary degrees for their positions. Entire regional ecosystems benefit from the intellectual capital produced by universities.

A strategy to both aid faculty in commercializing their research and help students create new firms is to establish business incubators. Business incubators facilitate commercialization and innovation through three main methods (Gulbranson & Audretsch, 2008). First, they provide seed funding for new firms, helping them survive the early years in which most firms fail. Second, incubators serve as an advising resource for students and faculty to overcome knowledge deficits. Faculty who hope to commercialize research or students new to the field often are not knowledgeable about the intricacies of the private market. Third, incubators connect students and faculty to relevant industry partners, fostering the social capital needed for successful firms. University business incubators can operate using one, all three, or any combination of these strategies (Gulbranson & Audretsch, 2008).

Academic engagement can also apply faculty expertise for purposes of community and economic development (Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Initiative for Competitive Inner Cities, 2011; Rooney & Gittleman, 2003; Wittman & Crews, 2012). Academic engagement is composed of projects usually discussed under the label of community engagement or engaged scholarship (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2010) categorize academic engagement into four typologies: (a) service-learning, (b) engaged research, (c) consulting activities, and (d) commercialized research, which encompasses the activities discussed above such as technology

transfer. While academic engagement can be more difficult to coordinate and target to specific neighborhoods due to the reliance on individual faculty-community partnerships, it can be extraordinarily cost effective compared to other anchor institution initiatives (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). Large public universities, particularly land-grants, tend to emphasize this type of engagement, but targeted anchor institution initiatives at schools such as Penn or Syracuse University use academic engagement to supplement larger projects leveraging financial or physical capital (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). For example, Syracuse University led an anchor institution initiative called the Near Westside Initiative to develop a neighborhood near the university. A substantial portion of the initiative involved buying and renovating vacant homes and warehouses, but more than 350 students also participated in the initiative through service-learning courses that focused on various aspects of the neighborhood such as designing parks, fundraising for local projects, or identifying potential homes to receive mini-grants from the university (CEOs for Cities with Living Cities, 2010).

Table 3. Initiatives leveraging intellectual capital.

University	City	Description
California State University, Monterey Bay	Salinas, CA	• Student-run garden
Clark University	Worcester, MA	• Biotech incubator
Georgetown University	Washington, D.C.	• High school courses taught by Georgetown law students • Free clinic for uninsured families run by med students
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Indianapolis, IN	• Service-learning • Faculty engagement
Loyola University Chicago	Chicago, IL	• Service-learning
Rutgers University - Newark	Newark, NJ	• Start-up incubator
San Jose State University	San Jose, CA	• Service-learning for greenways
Syracuse University	Syracuse, NY	• Service-learning and engaged research in targeted areas
The University of Utah	Salt Lake City, UT	• Community engaged scholarship
University of Louisville	Louisville, KY	• Placing student teachers in targeted schools • Small business counseling and consulting • Youth Violence Prevent research center • Arts and cultural research
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, PA	• Service-learning • Engaged research

University of San Diego	Linda Vista, CA	• Community engagement center focused on the Linda Vista neighborhood
Wayne State University	Detroit, MI	• Business consulting

Human capital

Universities invest their own financial, physical, and intellectual capital in anchor institution initiatives for local economic development. Universities also invest various resources in local communities' human capital to achieve the same ends. Such investments can include partnerships with health organizations, support for local K-12 school systems, prioritizing local applicants in hiring decisions, crime reduction, or offering public events to foster cultural vitality (Appleseed, 2003; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Initiative for Competitive Inner Cities, 2011; Maurrasse, 2007; Rooney & Gittleman, 2003; Webber & Karlström, 2009; Wittman & Crews, 2012). Many universities have partnerships with local health organizations or schools, and some even have their own hospitals, clinics, or charter schools (Hodges & Dubb, 2012). For example, North Carolina State University created a community counseling center in 2015, housed in a location off-campus to be more accessible to community members (Grimmett, Lupton-Smith, Beckwith, Englert, & Messinger, 2018). Whereas health and K-12 partnerships, local hiring, and cultural events are directly tied to specific actions, crime reduction is often more difficult to achieve for universities, but improved lighting or partnerships between municipal police and campus police are steps taken by universities in the past (Etienne, 2012). There are other examples of initiatives to improve human capital in surrounding neighborhoods, but these are the most commonly cited in the anchor literature.

Table 4. Initiatives leveraging human capital.

University	**City**	**Description**
California State University, Monterey Bay	Salinas, CA	• Community learning center
Case Western Reserve University	Cleveland, OH	• Art and tech after-school activities • Job training
Clark University	Worcester, MA	• 4-year scholarships for residents
Georgetown University	Washington, D.C.	• Tutoring programs • College prep programs • Mobile health clinics
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Indianapolis, IN	• School partnerships
Metropolitan State University	St. Paul, MN	• Education pipelines

Rutgers University – Newark	Newark, NJ	• New high school in a science park
San Francisco State University	San Francisco, CA	• Training and employment center • Literacy and writing workshops for children
The University of Utah	Salt Lake City, UT	• Education pipelines • Community leadership programs
Trinity College	Hartford, CT	• New community centers, a police substation, and a magnet school
University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, OH	• Education and healthcare partnerships
University of Louisville	Louisville, KY	• Early child development center • High school partnered with Law school • College enrollment programs • Parental involvement programs • Teen pregnancy prevention programs
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, PA	• New charter school • Expanded university police beyond campus
University of San Francisco	San Francisco, CA	• Literacy programs • Transitional programming for youth moving into full-time employment
Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond	• Neighborhood policing • Health programs • New elementary school
Wayne State University	Detroit, MI	• Community leadership fellowships
Xavier University	New Orleans, LA	• Beautification and public safety partnerships

Future of Anchor Institution Literature

The futures of anchor institution initiatives are far from certain. The title of Hodges' and Dubb's (2012) book is *The Road Half Traveled*, referring in part to the lack of systematic assessment or sharing of best practices that accompanies other trends in higher education. Rutheiser (2012) responded to the book by saying the title was likely overly optimistic, extending the metaphor to claim, "the road ahead exists only as dotted lines on a map charting multiple possible rights of ways" (para. 6). Given the complex political economy of universities and cities, Rutheiser's assessment is apt, and it begins to hint at the larger question advocates of university-led urban development must face: are anchor institution initiatives appropriate strategies for democratizing economies (Iuviene, Stitely, & Hoyt, 2010)?

The answer may be more complicated than most anchor literature assumes. Morris et al. (2010) are wary of the domineering political and economic influence anchor institutions hold in their cities, and Walker and East (2018) are explicitly skeptical anchor institution initiatives are building local capacity as opposed to contributing to gentrification processes. The reality is very little work to date attempts to distinguish whether increases in neighborhood vitality measures are due to improvements in community members' lives or because community members were replaced by higher income residents. These potential gentrification processes occur at a time when universities and coalitions are searching for ways to assess their impact (Democracy Collaborative, 2018). As universities develop assessment tools and design anchor institution initiatives, evidence on the effects of prior initiatives on neighborhood change is vital to inform future, equitable development efforts. The typology created here can help frame and guide future studies, identifying which strategies are effective at building local wealth in equitable, sustainable ways.

References

Ahlfeldt, G. & Maennig, W. (2009). Arenas, arena architecture and the impact on location desirability: The case of 'Olympic arenas' in Prenzlauer Berg, Berlin. *Urban Studies, 46*(7), 1343 – 1362. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009104569

Alperovitz, G. (2013). *What then must we do? Straight talk about the next American Revolution*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Anderson, M. B. & Sternberg, C. (2012). "'Non-White' gentrification in Chicago's Bronzeville and Pilsen: Racial economy and the intraurban contingency of urban redevelopment. *Urban Affairs Review, 49*(3), 435 – 467. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087412465590

Andersson, R. Quigley, J. M., & Wilhelmsson, M. (2009). Urbanization, productivity, and innovation: Evidence from investment in higher education. *Journal of Urban Economics, 66*, 2 – 15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2009.02.004

Appleseed. (2003). *Engines of economic growth: The economic impact of Boston's eight research universities on the metropolitan Boston area*. Boston, MA: Appleseed.

Arteaga, C. (2018). The effect of human capital on earnings: Evidence from a reform at Colombia's top university. *Journal of Public Economics,157*, 212 – 225.

Baum-Snow, N. & Hartley, D. (2016). *Causes and consequences of central neighborhood change, 1970 – 2010*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto.

Bender, T. (1988). Introduction. In Bender (Ed.), *The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present* (3 – 12). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Brown-Saracino, J. (2004). Social preservationists and the quest for authentic community. *City & Community, 3*(2), 135 – 156.

Cantoni, D. & Yuchtman, N. (2014). Medieval universities, legal institutions, and the commercial revolution. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129*(2), 823 – 887. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju007

Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*, 167 – 207. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100002

Clark, D. & Martorell, P. (2014). The signaling value of a high school diploma. *Journal of Political Economy, 122*(2), 282 – 318.

Clark, W. A. V. (1986). Residential segregation in American cities: A review and interpretation. *Population Research and Policy Review, 5*, 95 – 127.

CEOs for Cities with Living Cities. (2010). *How to behave like an anchor institution*. Cleveland, OH: CEOs for Cities.

Coates, D. & Depken, C. A. (2009). The impact of college football games on local sales tax revenue: Evidence from four cities in Texas. *Eastern Economic Journal, 35*(4), 531 – 547.

Couture, V. & Handbury, J. (2017). *Urban revival in America, 2000 – 2010*. No. 24084. National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/papers/w24084.

Crane, L., Harter, J., & Trehan, A. (2010). *Institutions as fulcrums of change*. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Communities.

Dalton, L. C., Hajrasouliha, A. H. & Riggs, W. W. (2018). State of the art in planning for college and university campuses: Site planning and beyond. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 84*(2), 145 – 161. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2018.1435300

Democracy Collaborative. (2018). Anchor dashboard learning cohort. Retrieved from https://anchors.democracycollaborative.org/higher-education-anchor-mission-initiative.html.

Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(4), 5 – 35.

Dubb, S. & Howard, T. (2012). *Leveraging anchor institutions for local job creation and wealth building*. Berkeley, CA: Institute for Research on Labor and Employment at the University of California, Berkeley.

Duke-Williams, O. (2009). The geographies of student migration in the UK. *Environment and Planning A, 41*, 1826 – 1848. https://doi.org/10.1068/a4198

Edlund, L., Machado, C., & Sviatschi, M. M. (2015). *Bright minds, big rent: Gentrification and the rising returns to skill*. Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Ehlenz, M. M. (2019). Gown, town, and neighborhood change: An examination of urban neighborhoods with university revitalization efforts. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 39*(3), 285 -299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17739111

Etienne, H. F. (2012). *Pushing back the gates: Neighborhood perspectives on university-driven revitalization in West Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Etzkowitz, H. (2014). The second academic revolution: The rise of the entrepreneurial university and impetuses to firm foundation. In T. J. Allen & R. P. O'Shea (Eds.), *Building technology transfer within research universities: An entrepreneurial approach*, (12 – 32). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Geiger, R. L. (2016). The ten generations of American higher education. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (4th ed.) (3 – 34). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Geiger, R. L. & Sá, C. (2005). Beyond technology transfer: US state policies to harness university research for economic development. *Minerva, 43*, 1 – 21.

Goode, J. G. & Schneider, J. A. (1994). *Reshaping ethnic and racial relations in Philadelphia: Immigrants in a divided city*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gregory, S. (2013). The radiant university: Space, urban development, and the public good. *City & Society, 25*(1), 47 – 69. https://doi.org/10.1111/ciso.12011

Grimmett, M. A., Lupton-Smith, H., Beckwith, A., Englert, M. K., & Messinger, E. (2018). The Community Counseling, Education, and Research Center (CCERC) model: Addressing community mental health needs through engagement scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 22*(3), 201 – 230.

Gulbranson, C. A. & Audretsch, D. B. (2008). Proof of concept centers: Accelerating the commercialization of university innovation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 33*(3), 249 – 258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-008-9086-y

Hackworth, J. & Smith, N. (2001). The changing state of gentrification. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie, 92*(4), 464 – 477. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9663.00172

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

Hoyt, L. (2013). Introduction. In L. Hoyt (Ed.), *Transforming cities and minds through the scholarship of engagement* (1 – 26). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Hubbard, P. (2009). Geographies of studentification and purpose-built student accommodation: Leading separate lives? *Environment and Planning A, 41*, 1903 – 1923. https://doi.org/10.1068/a4149

Hwang, J. & Lin, J. (2016). What have we learned about the causes of recent gentrification? *Cityscape, 18*(3), 9 – 26.

Hyatt, S. B. (2010). Universities and neoliberal models of urban development: Using ethnographic fieldwork to understand the 'Death and Rebirth of North Central Philadelphia'. *Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences, 3*(3), 6 – 31. https://doi.org/10.3167/latiss.2010.030302

Initiative for a Competitive Inner City. (2011). Anchor institutions and urban economic development: From community benefit to shared value. *Inner City Insights, 1*(2), 1 – 9.

Iuviene, N., Stitely, A., & Hoyt, L. (2010). *Sustainable economic democracy: Worker cooperatives for the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Community Innovators Lab.

Kantor, S. & Whalley, A. (2014). Knowledge spillovers from research universities: Evidence from endowment value shocks. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 96*(1), 171 – 188.

Kenyon, D. A. & Langley, A. H. (2010). *Payments in lieu of taxes: Balancing municipal and nonprofit interests*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Kinton, C., Smith, D. P., & Harrison, J. (2016). De-studentification: Emptying housing and neighbourhoods of student populations. *Environment and Planning A, 48*(8), 1617 – 1635. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16642446

Kochenkova, A., Grimaldi, R., & Munari, F. (2016). Public policy measures in support of knowledge transfer activities: A review of academic literature. *Journal of Technology Transfer, 41*, 407 – 429. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-015-9416-9

Lertwachara, K. & Cochran, J. (2007). An event study of the economic impact of professional sport franchises on local U.S. economies. *Journal of Sports Economics, 8*(3), 244 – 254.

Ley, D. (1986). Alternative explanations for inner-city gentrification: A Canadian assessment. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 76*(4), 521 – 535.

Liu, S. (2015). Spillovers from universities: Evidence from the land-grant program. *Journal of Urban Economics, 87,* 25 – 41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2015.03.001

Lloyd, R. D. (2006). *Neo-bohemia: Art and commerce in the postindustrial city*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mandich, A. M. & Dorfman, J. H. (2017). The wage and job impacts of hospitals on local labor markets. *Economic Development Quarterly, 31*(2), 139 – 148. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891242417691609

Marcuse, P. (2015). Gentrification, social justice and personal ethics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 39*(6), 1263 – 1269. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12319

Maurrasse, D. (2007). *City anchors: Leveraging anchor institutions for urban success*. Cleveland, OH: CEOs for Cities.

Miller, P. A. (2002). The economic impact of sports stadium construction: The case of the construction industry in St. Louis, MO. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 24*(2), 159 – 173.

Moretti, E. (2004). Human capital externalities in cities. In J. V. Henderson & J. F. Thisse (Eds.), *Handbook of regional and urban economics: Cities and geography* (2243 – 2289). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier B. V.

Morris, K., Jones, A., & Wright, J. (2010). *Anchoring growth: The role of 'anchor institutions' in the regeneration of UK cities*. London, UK: The Work Foundation.

NACEDA. (2020). *Family portrait 2020.* Washington, D.C.: NACEDA.

O'Shea, R. P., Fitzgerald, C., Chugh, H., & Allen, T. J. (2014). University-based entrepreneurship: A synthesis of the literature. In T. J. Allen & R. P. O'Shea (Eds.), *Building technology transfer within research universities: An entrepreneurial approach,* (33 – 59). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Page, B. & Ross, E. (2016). Legacies of a contested campus: Urban renewal, community resistance, and the origins of gentrification in Denver. *Urban Geography, 38*(9), 1293 – 1328. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1228420

Pearman, F. A. & Swain, W. A. (2017). School choice, gentrification, and the variable significance of racial stratification in urban neighborhoods. *Sociology of Education, 90*(3), 213 – 235. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040717710494

Porter, M. E. (1997). New strategies for inner-city economic development. *Economic Development Quarterly, 11*, 11 – 27.

Porter, M. E. (2016). Inner-city economic development: Learnings from 20 years of research and practice. *Economic Development Quarterly, 30*(2), 105 – 116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891242416642320

Rich, M. A. & Tsitsos, W. (2016). Avoiding the 'SoHo effect' in Baltimore: Neighborhood revitalization and arts and entertainment districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 40*(4), 736 – 756. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12376

Rooney, J. D. & Gittleman, J. (2003). *A new era of higher education-community partnerships: The role and impact of colleges and universities in Greater Boston today*. Boston, MA: The Carol R. Goldberg Seminar.

Rutheiser, C. (2012). The promise and prospects of anchor institutions: Some thoughts on an emerging field. *Policy Development & Research Edge*. Retrieved from https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_hudpartrpt_062211.html.

Sage, J., Smith, D., & Hubbard, P. (2013). New-build studentification: A panacea for balanced communities? *Urban Studies, 50*(13), 2623 – 2641. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013477694

Smith, D. (2008). The politics of studentification and '(un)balanced' urban populations: Lessons for gentrification and sustainable communities? *Urban Studies, 45*(12), 2541 – 2564. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008097108

Smith, D. P. & Holt, L. (2007). Studentification and 'apprentice' gentrifiers within British provincial towns and cities: Extending the meaning of gentrification. *Environment and Planning A, 39*, 142 – 161. https://doi.org/10.1068/a38476

Smith, N. (1982). Gentrification and uneven development. *Economic Geography, 58*(2), 139 – 155.

Taylor, H. L., Luter, D. G., & Miller, C. (2018). The university, neighborhood revitalization, and civic engagement: Toward civic engagement 3.0. *Societies, 8*, 106 – 126. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8040106

Walker, L. A. & East, J. F. (2018). The roles of foundations and universities in redevelopment planning. *Metropolitan Universities, 29*(2), 33 – 56. https://doi.org/10.18060/22342

Webber, H. S. & Karlström, M. (2009). *Why community investment is good for nonprofit anchor institutions: Understanding costs, benefits, and the range of strategic options.* Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.

Wiewel, W. & Perry, D. C. (Eds.). (2008). *Global universities and urban development: Case studies and analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wittman, A. & Crews, T. (2012). *Engaged learning economies: Aligning civic engagement and economic development in community-campus partnerships*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Wolf-Powers, L. (2010). Community benefits agreements and local government. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 76*(2), 141 – 159. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360903490923

Wright, M., Lockett, A., Clarysse, B., & Binks, M. (2006). University spin-out companies and venture capital. *Research Policy, 35*, 481 – 501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.01.005

Zou, B. (2018). The local economic impacts of military personnel. *Journal of Labor Economics, 36*(3), 589 – 621.

Zukin, S. (2016). Gentrification in three paradoxes. *City & Community, 15*(3), 202 – 207. https://doi.org/10.1111/cico.12184