THE ANCHOR DASHBOARD

Aligning Institutional Practice to Meet Low-Income Community Needs

August 2013

The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland

DC
the democracy
collaborative

THE ANCHOR DASHBOARD

Aligning Institutional Practice to Meet
Low-Income Community Needs

August 2013

Steve Dubb, Sarah McKinley, and Ted Howard

The Democracy Collaborative
at the University of Maryland

Design by Kathleen Hayes

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SUMMARY

Anchor institutions are place-based entities such as universities and hospitals that are tied to their surroundings by mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers, employees, and vendors. These local human and economic relationships link institution well-being to that of the community in which it is anchored. Increasingly, anchor institutions across the nation are realizing this interdependence and are expanding their public or nonprofit mission to incorporate what we call an "anchor mission." In other words, they are consciously applying their long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with their human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the communities in which they reside.

One key driver behind this shift is globalization. Anchor institutions, by definition, have always been largely place-bound. But before globalization, corporate, for-profit employers moved much less frequently and, typically, local business leaders provided the locus of civic leadership. Today, however, a combination of corporate consolidation (as seen in banking and other sectors) and growing corporate mobility has left a civic vacuum.

Stepping into the vacuum, in many cities, are anchor institutions. This trend is abetted by the fact that health care and education are gaining in their share of national gross domestic product. Further, anchor institutions are among the leading employers in nearly all major U.S. cities.

This study seeks to introduce a framework that can assist anchor institutions in understanding their impact on the community and, in particular, their impact on the welfare of low-income children and families in those communities.

There are other drivers as well. Prominent among these is a growing body of research that has found poverty to be at the root of health and educational disparities. Increasingly, it is hard to argue that it is even possible to achieve basic health and education objectives without addressing these root causes.

Today there is widespread recognition among anchor institutions themselves that community economic development is part and parcel of what they do. As a result, anchor institution initiatives have proliferated. Increasingly, anchor institution leaders publicly say they have an anchor institution mission to improve the well-being of their surrounding community.

But how do we know that these initiatives are working? The truth is that most anchor institutions do not know. This study seeks to introduce a framework that can assist anchor institutions in understanding their impact on the community and, in

particular, their impact on the welfare of low-income children and families in those communities.

Anchor institutions engage with their communities in complex and multi-faceted ways. They hire staff, procure goods and services, partner with local organizations, collect and disseminate important research findings, and share an array of resources. At the same time, relationships with their surrounding areas can be strained by conflicting needs and stark disparities. Although most institutions assess their impact at the level of individual programs, the field lacks agreed-upon methods for measuring or evaluating their broader impact on addressing disparities in community economic development, public health, education, and the environment.

This paper, made possible by support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, introduces a preliminary dashboard of outcomes and indicators as a way to begin a conversation about developing such measures. The dashboard builds on existing knowledge about measurement efforts already underway within anchor institutions to understand their impact on low-income children, families, and neighborhoods. The proposed dashboard also reflects findings from in-depth interviews conducted in 2012 with 75 leaders of anchor institutions, national nonprofit organizations, federal agencies, and community organizations. Supplementing these interviews, we also drew upon 32 additional Democracy Collaborative interviews of hospital leaders, most of which were conducted in 2011.

The study generated numerous findings on what motivates anchor institutions to engage with local partners, how partners would wish to improve relationships with anchor institutions, and which outcomes and indicators stakeholders believe are important to identify and measure, among others. Of these findings, three were particularly important in encouraging the development of a preliminary dashboard:

1. **Measuring community impact is challenging.** Stakeholders were well aware of the significant challenges to developing measures that associate anchor institution activities with local impact. Some noted that several definitions of "community" exist even within a single institution, while others mentioned the challenge of isolating impact in an intervention that involves numerous partners. Still others identified the challenge of measuring outcomes given the slow pace of community economic development work.

2. Despite these and other challenges, **study participants expressed an acute interest in developing "good enough" indicators and metrics.** Participants realize that there is no such thing as a perfect set of indicators, but they would like to have a tool to facilitate transparency, accountability, and learning across and within institutions.

3. **Interviewees largely agree on what outcomes the dashboard should support.** Measurement tools should capture what is important to measure, not what is simply easy to measure. We asked for specific suggestions on what an ideal measurement instrument would include. Mindful of the adage "what gets measured gets done," respondents were clear that they wanted to see anchor institutions help solve "the big problems." These 12 outcomes are reflected in the proposed dashboard.

Broadly speaking, the indicators we recommend seek to build on these insights through employing two different kinds of measurements: 1) measures that assess conditions in the community — e.g., whether or not housing is affordable, whether or not people are healthy, whether or not children get educated; 2) measures that assess institutional effort — e.g., dollars spent, procurement shifted, people hired, policies and accountability procedures in place.

Both types of measures are needed — a focus solely on community outcomes misses the truth that anchor institutions, while critically important, are hardly the only actors responsible for community outcomes. A focus solely on anchor institution effort, however, would create a different problem: namely, there are no external markers to guide decision-makers regarding whether the efforts their institutions undertake are making a difference.

Of course, a dashboard, as the name suggests, merely provides a "first cut" at assessment. If, for example, a hospital invests heavily in public health outreach yet public health results decline, this doesn't necessarily mean the hospitals' programs are ineffective, but it surely does highlight that this area merits institutional attention, helping promote improvement in effectiveness over time.

We see this paper as just one step, albeit an important one, on the road to the co-creation of an "anchor mission" community of practice.

Last, but not least, the dashboard provides a mechanism for the field to begin to more clearly coalesce on what it means for a hospital or university to say it is pursuing an anchor institution mission. Put somewhat differently, while each institution will surely adopt different measures appropriate to its own circumstances, one way of thinking about what it means to pursue an anchor mission is that the institution is implementing a strategic plan that addresses in some aspect each of the twelve areas listed on the dashboard.

We hope that presenting a set of common measures will inspire discussions about selecting and improving indicators and metrics, demonstrate that assessing anchor impact is indeed possible, and encourage more anchor institutions to adopt an anchor mission. We see this paper as just one step, albeit an important one, on the road to the co-creation of an "anchor mission" community of practice.

Ultimately, we hope that the dashboard and indicators outlined here help provide anchor institutions with a framework that can assist them to more effectively address the deep-seated problems facing our nation's children, families, and low-income communities.

LEVERAGING ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS TO BENEFIT COMMUNITY

Anchor institutions are enterprises such as universities and hospitals that are rooted in their local communities by mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers, employees, and vendors. Anchor institutions possess considerable human and economic resources that can be leveraged for local development, particularly to improve the well-being of low-income children, families, and neighborhoods that are often proximate to their campuses. U.S. public and nonprofit universities, for instance, educate 21 million students annually and employ over 3 million people. The annual purchases of universities represent roughly 3 percent of U.S. gross domestic product, and they have endowments in excess of $400 billion. The hospital industry is even larger: 5 million Americans work for hospitals. Hospital sector procurement exceeds $600 million annually. All told, hospitals and universities collectively employ 8 percent of the U.S. labor force, with concomitant shares of investment and purchasing power.[1]

An anchor strategy is more than the sum of individual community engagement programs; it is a mission developed to address tenacious community challenges, and implemented to permeate an institution's culture and change the way it does business.

Over the past few decades, many anchor institutions have come to realize that it is in their self-interest to invest in their local communities, and some have directed substantial amounts of dollars and personnel toward discrete community programs. An anchor mission approach to community development is qualitatively different. Pursuing what we call an anchor mission means that a place-based institution consciously applies its considerable resources toward improving the long-term well being of its community. An anchor strategy is more than the sum of individual community engagement programs; it is a mission developed to address tenacious community challenges, and implemented to permeate an institution's culture and change the way it does business.

The Anchor Mission: A commitment to consciously apply the long-term, place-based economic power of the institution, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the communities in which the institution is anchored.

Today, universities and hospitals regularly tout their community impact and proudly proclaim their role as anchor institutions. Yet measurement of community impact remains limited. George Mehaffy, a Vice President at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, observed that in discussions of community impact measures "There is a gap that you can drive a truck through."[2] Shari Garmise, Vice President of the Urban Initiative at the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, noted that member university presidents want to go "beyond marketing, anecdotes and good intentions."[3]

Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor of the State University of New York (SUNY) system, put the challenge in a broader perspective: "If American higher education is supposedly the best in the world, why are we plagued with so many societal problems? Surely, we need to be more engaged in solving the big problems."[4]

To date, few tools exist to help institutions step back and assess, from a broad perspective, the long-term impact of their anchor mission activities, and particularly their impact on low-income communities.

Hospitals, too, increasingly have adopted an anchor mission. Oliver Henkel, Chief External Affairs Officer of the Cleveland Clinic, stated plainly his institution's perspective: "We are only as strong as the neighborhoods in which we are located. And I can't overstate that."[5] Bill Schramm, Senior Vice President of Strategic Business Development at Henry Ford Health System in Detroit, echoed Henkel's views. "Our board, more than five years ago, before the economic meltdown, adopted as one of its six principles for an envisioned future . . . to be a significant force in the redevelopment of the city of Detroit."[6]

Many anchor institutions regularly report on the outputs and outcomes of their community programming and activities. Project-specific measures exist, but as an increasing number of anchor institutions commit to anchor missions, the demand for an instrument that would help them measure the impact of their work is increasing. To date, few tools exist to help institutions step back and assess, from a broad perspective, the long-term impact of their anchor mission activities, and particularly their impact on low-income communities.

Not surprisingly, community groups are highly interested in the accountability that clearer community impact metrics might bring. Paulina Gonzalez, Executive Director of the Los Angeles-based nonprofit group SAJE (Strategic Actions for a Just Economy), noted that "being able to, by the end of the day, track what's happening to the jobs, track what's happening to those families . . . I think that would be extremely powerful."[7] Elizabeth Yeampierre, Executive Director of UPROSE, a Brooklyn nonprofit that has partnered with a local hospital, noted that anchor institutions can have a large positive impact, but metrics that maintain accountability are vital for long-term effectiveness. For example, "hiring is huge," Yeampierre noted. "They'll hire,

but over a period of time these people will be gone . . . monitoring that for us is extremely important."[8]

The challenges to developing community impact measures are numerous and significant. Nevertheless, such measures would be useful. First, they provide a mechanism for accountability, enabling institutions to incorporate their anchor mission goals into job descriptions, personnel evaluations, institutional strategic plans, and the like. Second, measures supply a framework for transparency, communicating aims and benchmarks to nonprofit organizations, foundations, local governments, and the community in general. Third, such measures allow for organizational learning by providing an instrument with which to assess and adjust strategies over time. Finally, and especially when measures are developed with broad stakeholder input, they can facilitate the creation of a community of practice in which anchor institutions and partners share a collective responsibility for achieving mutual goals.

When measures are developed with broad stakeholder input, they can facilitate the creation of a community of practice in which anchor institutions and partners share a collective responsibility for achieving mutual goals.

Despite these challenges, we believe that the field of anchor institution research and engagement has now progressed to the point where developing a common dashboard of indicators is possible and desirable. We hope the proposed dashboard presented here will generate a lively discussion that will result in refined outcomes and indicators that might be piloted and further developed by anchor institutions and their community partners.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Democracy Collaborative has long been actively engaged in the study of the role of anchor institutions in building community wealth and community economic development.[9] This work has included detailed case study visits of sixteen hospitals and universities, supplemented by in-depth research on these two sectors as a whole.[10]

For example, in *The Road Half Traveled* we provided detailed analysis of a set of 15 best practices from ten universities. In *Hospitals Building Healthy Communities*, we identified a similar set of best practices based on case studies from six hospitals, supplemented by additional examples taken from institutions across the country. Additionally, in *The Anchor Mission: Leveraging the Power of Anchor Institutions to Build Community Wealth*, we undertook a particularly detailed case study of best practices at University Hospitals in Cleveland.

Given this prior body of work, we tailored our questions and research considerably. We began formal research on this project in January 2012, reviewing relevant literature on anchor institutions and on community impact measurement. Several efforts have been made to evaluate particular aspects of community development. The American Democracy Project and The Democracy Commitment — projects tied to comprehensive state universities and community colleges, respectively — for example, are developing indicators of civic health that measure the level of community social capital and participation in civic life, ranging from local meetings to elections. Others, such as the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, highlight economic factors, but leave out other critical areas like public health and education. Our goal, thus, has been to develop a dashboard that is more comprehensive, so that anchor institutions can better assess their anchor institution impact on children, families, and low-income communities as a whole.

The centerpiece of our research is the information provided by practitioners through interviews with 75 leaders of anchor institutions, national nonprofit organizations, federal agencies, and community organizations (see table 1; individual interviewees are identified in the appendix). We conducted interviews throughout the year, with the majority conducted in May, June, and July.

In creating our list of interview subjects, we drew heavily on the relationships we had developed through our research in the field over the past several years, as well as our assessment of research needs. This was particularly true in our interviews with leaders of anchor institutions, anchor-institution linked partnership centers, and national associations. In our interviews, we also sought suggestions for additional

interview subjects. In this way, respondents could recommend peers and colleagues that added breadth and depth to our interviews, beyond our usual networks.

Given our years of work in the field, we felt it was appropriate for us to develop a tentative list of indicators that could be tested through our interviews. We based our initial (draft) list on best practices in the field that we had observed regarding specific ways anchor institution activity has to date benefitted low-income children, families and communities.

We focused on four categories—economic development, education partnerships, health and safety, and community building—because these four categories, empirically, represent the overwhelming majority of actual anchor institution work in and with communities. For economic development, we asked about five potential indicators: 1) local hiring; 2) local purchasing; 3) business incubation; 4) housing; and 5) community investment (endowment and operating dollars). With education partnerships, we prompted respondents by naming two focus areas: 1) pre-K-12 public school partnerships (and related "cradle-to-career" efforts like Strive);[11] and 2) community education (broadly defined as two-generational learning that focuses on parents, as well as children). Within health and safety, we suggested three focus areas: 1) public health; 2) public safety; and 3) environmental heath. In the area of community building, we began with five focus areas: 1) nonprofit capacity building; 2) fostering community ownership; 3) community-based research; 4) assisting community groups to raise funds (by, for example, sharing grant funding on projects); and 5) participation in public planning.

The above approach, we felt, served us well in our interviews with anchor institution representatives, partnership center staff and directors, and national association leaders. It allowed us to put forward a target, which helped encourage specificity in responses. We felt, however, that developing indicators required broader outreach to community groups than what we had achieved in previous projects. Community organizations, we felt, could provide a reality check and on-the-ground perspective as to how "the community" benefits (or not) from community partnerships.

To expand our reach to community-based organizations, The Democracy Collaborative partnered with the Sustainable Communities Development Group (SCDG), with whom we jointly developed a list of interview subjects, which included a mix of environmental justice and neighborhood improvement groups. The Sustainable Community Development Group conducted these 15 interviews, based on a Democracy Collaborative-provided questionnaire.[12]

Because there was a lower level of familiarity of community group leaders, we opted in these interviews to use more open-ended questions regarding indicators. We also asked for community groups' broad assessments of anchor institution practices in ten

areas: local hiring, business incubation, local purchasing (support for local, minority and women-owned business), community investment, service learning partnerships, community-based research, public health, environmental quality, public education and capacity building of local nonprofits. All fifteen of the interviewed community group leaders indicated that they felt these items should be among the indicators used to assess the community activity of anchor institutions. Many of the respondents independently added affordable housing as an eleventh item.[13]

A table of interview subjects appears below.

Table 1. Interviews conducted

Interviewee Affiliation	Number Interviewed
university center directors and/or staff	17
university administrators (including five presidents)	11
community-based organizations (locally focused)	15
community development or advocacy groups (mostly nationally focused)	15
associations tied to the university sector	11
foundations	2
federal department officials	2
hospitals	2
Total	75

Interviews typically were most often conducted by phone and lasted about an hour. In some cases, where practicable, interviews were conducted in person. When speaking with respondents from universities, themes included the following:

• Motivations for community engagement efforts

- Definitions of community and community engagement, including whether the institution had an anchor mission

- Institutional measures of community engagement

- Indicators and measures for a community benefit dashboard

Interviews with community development groups, community-based organizations, and others touched on similar themes. In addition, with community groups in particular, we tried to get a sense not only of what metrics they would desire, but also what they view as working — and not working — in their current partnerships with anchor institutions.

CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING COMMUNITY BENEFIT MEASURES

Practitioners at hospitals and universities identified several challenges to developing a dashboard that measures the community impact of anchor mission activities.

Institutionalizing an anchor mission

Prior to addressing issues related to measuring an anchor mission, the institution concerned has to accept that it actually has one — a step that is hardly automatic. Respondents indicated that essential measures to achieve this end include the following: an explicit anchor mission at an administrative level that embeds community engagement principles across the institution; a clear strategic plan for institutionalizing and implementing an anchor mission; a restructuring of incentives to reward anchor mission activities; a designated office to manage anchor activities; a defined advisory body involving all partners; and a clear understanding that anchor work must be in the broad mutual interest of both the institution and the community.

A critical related question is political: that is, what areas are anchor institutions willing to hold themselves accountable for? Some formally adopt poverty reduction as a goal; others do not.[14] Fortunately, a growing number of anchor institutions are making commitments, if not to poverty reduction per se, at least to improving the welfare of the surrounding community in a manner that reduces poverty. For example, James Votruba, outgoing president of Northern Kentucky University, pointed out that even though poverty reduction is not an explicit goal, "Our work is benefiting low-income families. Very little of our rhetoric involves equality and social justice, but those values are embedded in much of this work."[15]

What does "community" mean?

A second difficulty is defining the parameters of the institution's "community." Some anchor institutions define their community as the metropolitan region while others focus on adjacent neighborhoods. A few anchor institutions, such as Emory University, have chosen to focus on specific low-income neighborhoods that are not geographically proximate. Some interviewees emphasized that the process of defining community needed to involve partners, such as city government, nonprofit

organizations, and civic groups. These diverging definitions are also driven by differing internal visions, as well as by institutional fragmentation. As Marilyn Higgins, Vice President of Community Engagement and Economic Development at Syracuse University, said, "Universities are not organizations; they are federations of colleges."[16]

How do you measure institutional effects?

Study respondents frequently mentioned the difficulty of assessing institutional impact, which, evidently involves much more than simply adding up individual program impacts. According to David Cox, University of Memphis Executive Assistant to the President, his university has more than 1,200 different partnership initiatives, making it a "huge . . . struggle to . . . systematically capture on an ongoing basis all of the community connections."[17]

Even when institutions measure the outcomes of their various programs, can the institutional impact be measured by aggregating the impacts of multiple programs, or are different measures required?

Similarly, Andrew Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement at the University of Minnesota, said that aggregating data and findings across programs is difficult because "the measurements are different, the evaluation questions are different and the outcomes are different." Even when institutions measure the outcomes of their various programs, can the institutional impact be measured by aggregating the impacts of multiple programs, or are different measures required?[18]

Whose outcome is it?

Another challenge to developing a measurement dashboard is that community development almost always involves multiple actors and multiple objectives. If an anchor institution is one of several partners in a community coalition, isolating the impact of any particular partner in the coalition becomes difficult, if not impossible. Shari Garmise, Vice President of the Urban Initiative at the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, pointed out, "We are talking about complexity here — university actions exist in a wider web. Nobody goes it alone: whose outcome is it?"[19] Rex LaMore, Director of the Center for Community and Economic Development at Michigan State University, observed that, "Interventions are often focused and modest. When there is improvement, it is difficult to determine if it is what you did or other factors."[20]

Whose data is it?

To assess the effectiveness of community work often requires that anchor institutions partner with community groups to collect the data. Because of racial and cultural divisions, this can sometimes be challenging. Margaret Gordon, Co-Director of the West Oakland Environment Indicators Project, emphasized that, "[Community] ownership of documents and materials is important. Those are part of our values that West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project has developed over the years."[21]

Can the right data be collected?

Another challenge is to make sure that indicators actually measure what is important. As former Winona State President Judith Ramaley pointed out, "We tend to focus on what we can measure rather than on the equally important outcomes that have to do with attitudes, propensities and ways to work together."[22] Andrew Frank, Executive Assistant to the President at Johns Hopkins, similarly observed the difficulty of accounting for the "qualitative things that are more difficult to measure."[23]

When will we see results?

Finally, the pace of community economic development can be slow. Even effective approaches—indeed, often the most effective approaches—may not yield measurable outcomes for years. Respondents warned that generating results that can be measured likely requires a commitment of at least 10 years. This is beyond the range of many funding cycles. For instance, national program leaders at the USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture, which works with land-grant colleges across the United States, noted that their funding authorization did not permit the tracking of outcomes beyond five years.

Even effective approaches— indeed, often the most effective approaches—may not yield measurable outcomes for years.

WHAT IS MEASURED NOW

In addition to our interview data, we also reviewed the following systems of indicators:

- Carnegie Elective Classification for Engagement

- American Democracy Project: Civic Health Indicators

- Coalition of Urban Serving Universities: membership survey

- Community Benefits Agreements provisions

- Strive ("cradle-to-career" educational strategies approach)

- Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count (focus on "Economic well being" across states)

- NeighborWorks Success Measures (using category "community building and organizing")

- CFED Assets and Opportunities Scorecard

- Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (strategic framework)

- Catholic Health Association: community benefits reporting

Of the above list, six (Carnegie, American Democracy Project, Coalition of Urban Serving Universities, Strive, Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, and Catholic Health Association) are measurements for anchor institutions, while the other four are examples of indicators used in community development and/or advocacy.

A theme that emerges from even a cursory analysis is that while solid ways of measuring community economic development exist, anchor institution metrics have often focused elsewhere. For example, Carnegie in classifying "community engagement" fails to include such obvious economic variables as hiring, purchasing, investment, and real estate development. The American Democracy Project civic health index provides a good measure of civic capacity, but does not delve into economic goals. Strive develops strong indicators around community objectives, but its focus is narrowly targeted on improving the school system.

While solid ways of measuring community economic development exist, anchor institution metrics have often focused elsewhere.

By contrast, NeighborWorks, Annie E. Casey, and CFED (Corporation for Enterprise Development) all have extensive community development metrics systems.

Community benefit agreements have also been an effective way for communities to publicly identify the indicators that matter to them and then use the contract negotiation process to codify those indicators.

The other three indicator systems we looked at do address the community development impact of anchor institutions. The Catholic Health Association identifies ways hospitals can engage in community building, but its framework is intended less for accountability purposes and more to act as a guideline in navigating cultural differences. The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities touches on some community development, but it leaves out institutional factors such as hiring, procurement, and investment. The Initiative for a Competitive Inner Cities framework identifies core institutional functions like purchasing, but is focused more on economic development generally, rather than improving the welfare of low-income children, families, and communities.

In short, while there are elements in these systems that we can draw on, no comprehensive indicator system presently exists. Our work did, however, benefit from the review of existing indicators. By combining elements from the above, as well as the valuable information we received from the interviews we conducted, we can begin to move toward metrics and an indicator dashboard to enable institutions to better track and evaluate their anchor mission work.

MOVING TOWARD METRICS: THE DASHBOARD

Despite the challenges identified above, interview respondents from anchor institutions and community-based organizations alike expressed widespread interest in developing a dashboard of measures that will provide some indication of the impact of an institution's pursuit of an anchor mission on communities. In drafting such an instrument, we set the following goals:

• **Focus on measures relevant to low-income communities.** Community engagement can take many forms, not all of which, evidently, focus on low-income communities. Here our focus is on low-income communities, a choice based not only on our organizational mission, but, critically, on the expressed desire by anchor institutions themselves to reduce poverty-related disparities in health and educational outcomes.

• **Develop measures that correspond with what communities care about.** Although not a scientific sampling, our interviews of community leaders confirmed our expectation that issues of economic development, education, health, and community building (and related indicators for each) are major community concerns. A number of community groups that we interviewed came out of the environmental justice movement, so it is not surprising that environmental indicators were seen as important. For instance, Cheryl Johnson, Executive Director of People for Community Recovery in Chicago highlighted the role the Southeast Chicago Urban Environment Initiative, developed in partnership with Chicago State and implemented over more than two decades, had played in fostering environmental remediation in her neighborhood.[24]

But community organization leaders emphasized the importance of tracking a much broader range of indicators. For example, Diane Arnold, Executive Director of Hawthorne Community Center in Indianapolis, called educational attainment "a key metric for us."[25] Paulina Gonzalez of Strategic Action for a Just Economy in Los Angeles called for "implementing tracking mechanisms in terms of job placement and job retention."[26] Elizabeth Yeampierre of UPROSE in New York City emphasized the importance of metrics that track efforts to build nonprofit capacity "so that we can be sustainable over time."[27] Beverly Wright, Executive Director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice in New Orleans emphasized the importance of racial indicators. "When they say affordable housing here, it's usually not affordable to anyone but white people," Wright observed.[28]

- **Build in flexibility.** Anchor institutions can act in countless ways to support the long-term welfare of low-income children, families, and communities. A critical question is: What areas are anchor institutions willing to hold themselves accountable for? Anchors must identify for themselves (and with stakeholder input) their specific indicators, which will be based on their anchor mission activities.

- **Identify outcomes that are important yet not overly burdensome to measure.** Given the challenges inherent in defining and measuring outcomes, we sought to ensure that the proposed dashboard was realistic and practical. We found examples of suggested measures that are already in use by anchor institutions, which we mention below.

- **Develop indicators in areas where there is institutional capacity and interest.** Each indicator we identify draws on actual examples of best practices among anchor institutions. Indeed, the initial list of 15 categories was drawn from our study of best practices in anchor mission work over an 8-year study period. In developing our dashboard, we carefully considered the suggestions and feedback we received from interview subjects. That input led us to make changes to our original design: one was to add the outcome area of arts and cultural development ("access to arts and culture"), as this was identified as a high priority by a number of respondents.

We also tweaked three categories based on respondents' comments—making sure to signal the importance of pre-K-12 partnerships ("educated children") and adding asset building ("financially secure families") and democratic leadership development ("strong community capacity"). Community education was, by contrast, dropped from the list—not because we think it is unimportant, but because we feel it is not as easily measured. The finanically secure families component, at least to the extent it incorporates financial education, creates a partial measure in this area. We also consolidated the community categories into the two broader categories of "financially secure families" and "strong community capacity." Ultimately, we ended up with 12 broad outcome categories.

Our proposed dashboard results from our goals, knowledge of best practices in the field of economic development, the research described above, and by our focus on specific ways anchor missions can benefit low-income communities. Figure 1 presents the dashboard, followed by a more detailed discussion of what to measure, and how.

What to Measure: Outcomes

Our interviews revealed significant areas of consensus among community groups and anchor institutions about which aspects of community development are most important to measure.

To stimulate discussion and feedback, we presented anchor institution interviewees with a list of 15 outcome categories. Their input led us to add, subtract, and merge outcomes, which resulted in the proposed dashboard's 12 outcome categories.

The dashboard recognizes that definitions of what constitutes the "community" vary widely. In designing our dashboard, we focus on the neighborhood level, but similar outcome categories and indicators could be applied to a municipal or regional definition of community as well.

In designing our dashboard, we focus on the neighborhood level, but similar outcomes and indicators could be applied to a municipal or regional definition of community as well.

How to Measure: Indicators

"The point is not to measure everything," said Portland State University President Wim Wiewel. "While in each area there are hundreds of things [to measure], let's agree on a few key indicators . . . Perfect data can be the enemy of the good."

No indicator is perfect, and while several indicators may present a more accurate picture of the outcome, having too many can be costly and may cloud, rather than clarify, the picture.

Selecting indicators is more an art than a science. At the same time, best practices for aligning indicators include:

(1) Measure inputs in areas where there is good reason to believe that there is a positive connection with outcomes and impact;

(2) Set benchmarks, such as percentage of procurement dollars directed toward local- and minority-owned businesses. As Chris Walker, Director of Research at the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), emphasizes, "Setting standards is a way to be more impactful than anything else. It creates an expectation that this is what should be done."[29]

(3) Identify policy indicators where numerical goals cannot be obtained, such as the existence of policies directing environmentally sustainable business practices;

Figure 1. Anchor Institution Community Benefit Dashboard

ANCHOR MISSION DASHBOARD

COMMUNITY BENEFIT

OUTCOME	INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE
EQUITABLE LOCAL AND MINORITY HIRING	• Percent of local and minority hires in staff positions • Percent employed at living wage or above	Institutional data
EQUITABLE LOCAL AND MINORITY BUSINESS PROCUREMENT	• Percent of procurement dollars directed to local, minority-owned, and woman-owned businesses	Institutional data
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	• Dollars invested in creating affordable housing • Dollars invested in community land trusts • Percent of households below 200 percent of poverty line that spend <30 percent of income on housing	Institutional data, official records (census)
THRIVING BUSINESS INCUBATION	• Jobs and businesses created and retained (1 year, 5 years) • Percent of incubated businesses serving low-income and minority populations • Dollars directed toward seed funding for community-owned business	Institutional data
VIBRANT ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT	• Dollars spent on arts and culture-based economic development • Number of arts and cultural jobs and businesses created and retained	Institutional data
SOUND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT	• Percent of endowment and operating dollars directed toward community impact investments (e.g., support of community development financial institutions)	Institutional data

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

OUTCOME	INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE
COMMUNITY BUILDING		
STABLE AND EFFECTIVE LOCAL PARTNERS	• Existence of partnership center or community advisory board • Positive feedback from survey of service-learning/capstone partners • Civic health index rating	Institutional and survey data
FINANCIALLY SECURE HOUSEHOLDS	• Percent of households in asset poverty • Dollars spent on community financial education • Dollars and human resources directed to income tax filing assistance	Official records; institutional data
EDUCATION		
EDUCATED YOUTH	• High school graduation rate • Percent of students advancing to college or apprenticeship programs • Math and reading proficiency	Public school reported data
HEALTH, SAFETY & ENVIRONMENT		
SAFE STREETS AND CAMPUSES	• Dollars spent on streetscape improvements • Rates of violent crime • Rates of property crime	Institutional data, survey data, official records
HEALTHY COMMUNITY RESIDENTS	• Dollars spent on public health initiatives (e.g., clinics) • Number of grocery stores per zip code	Institutional data, official records
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT	• Percent of carbon emissions • STARS index rating • Greenhealth index rating	Institutional data

(4) Establish goals and timelines where it makes sense to do so, such as setting local hiring goals for particular projects;

(5) Focus indicators on factors that will improve local economic multipliers; and

(6) Identify data that can be (relatively) easily obtained to reduce data collection costs.

The indicators presented on the dashboard should be viewed as illustrative only. We discuss the proposed outcomes and sample indicators below.

Economic Development

Local and Minority Access to Institutional Jobs

Institutional hiring could be called the "jobs" outcome. When anchors direct their attention toward achieving this outcome, the potential for community impact is large. A study in Detroit found that the Henry Ford Health System, Wayne State University, and the Detroit Medical Center had the potential to achieve a target level of "35 percent local employment over the next 10 years."[30] If this target were reached, then more than one in three of these institutions' employees would be Detroit city residents, a shift that would have profound and obvious community economic development consequences.

With local jobs defined as an outcome, anchor institutions must clearly define "local." In terms of data, many anchor institutions already track diversity in hiring; sorting payroll data by zip code is a way to obtain information on local hires. In addition to counting the number of jobs, research participants emphasized that it is important to track jobs that pay a living wage, offer benefits, or have other qualities of decent employment.

Best practice in this area include setting clear benchmarks with percentage goals for hiring locally; developing clearly-stated inclusive hiring practices at all levels of the institution, focus on hiring women and minorities; incentivizing human resource managers to hire local applicants through reward programs; targeting local recruitment locally through direct community outreach and engagement; and building a partnership with local community-based organizations to develop workforce training and skills development programs. For example, Henry Ford Health System, to encourage managers to hire locally, links seven percent of senior executives' bonuses to achieving defined local hiring and diversity goals. In Philadelphia, Temple University in North Philadelphia has created an Office of Community Outreach and Hiring within the human resources department of the institution, which partners with area

churches, community development corporations and other community groups and leaders to reach out to local job applicants.

Effective Local and Minority Business Procurement

Procuring goods and services locally is a well-documented way for anchor institutions to leverage their economic power to increase local wealth through and create jobs by increasing local economic multipliers. University Hospitals in Cleveland, as well as the University of Pennsylvania, are well known for their efforts in this regard. In FY2011, the University of Pennsylvania purchased $95.6 million in goods and services from local suppliers in a seven zip-code region, an area where it once purchased practically nothing.[31] A very rough estimate of the economic multiplier impact effects suggest Penn likely generates about 200 jobs and $6 million in area wages that otherwise would not exist.[32]

Procuring goods and services locally is a well-documented way for anchor institutions to leverage their economic power to increase local wealth through and create jobs by increasing local economic multipliers.

In 1999, the University of Minnesota established the Office for Business and Community Economic Development to oversee practices of local economic inclusion. This office provides incentives to University departments that do business with targeted local businesses and works to increase expenditures with these businesses. Additionally, this office also provides training and technical assistance to vendors and local businesses. Currently, the university requires that at least 10 percent of all base contracts are made with local, minority and women-owned businesses. In 2008 alone, $75 million of the university's $700-million spent on goods and services went to women- and minority-owned businesses.

One indicator could be the percentage of procurement dollars targeted toward specific neighborhoods, and institutional financial data could provide the source. A policy indicator, such as the existence of a policy that requires obtaining bids from local or minority business for procurements above a certain dollar figure, is another example.

Local and Minority Access to Business Resources

Business incubation activities linked to low-income communities can help create jobs and build wealth. Many business incubation efforts focus on technology transfers that often do not employ a significant number of low-income residents. However, it is possible to implement business incubation activities in a way that supports

low-income residents. For example, the South Side Innovation Center supported by Syracuse University has targeted programs for traditionally underserved entrepreneurial groups including low-income individuals, people with disabilities, women, and minorities. Founded in 2006, the Center has helped create over 130 new businesses. Similarly, in Portland, Oregon, Portland State University's Business Outreach Program (BOP) provides technical assistance to women and minority-owned businesses in low-income communities. Since 1994, it has supported over 420 small businesses. In 2010, they reported that they helped create 146 jobs through supporting local business development over the previous four years.

LeMoyne-Owen College, a small historically black college in Memphis, which established its own community development corporation, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC, through which it runs most of its economic development projects, provides another example. To support local businesses, the LeMoyne-Owen CDC runs the Business Development Institute, funded by the Small Business Administration's Program for Investment in Micro-Entrepreneurs grant. The Institute offers a free 10-week business course to residents, half of whom must be low-income. As of 2010, 800 people have graduated from the program, and 75 businesses and 183 jobs have been created.[33]

In terms of indicators, jobs created and retained could be tracked for one-year and five-year periods. The time frames are arbitrary but suggest a reasonable indication of lasting results.

Access to Arts and Culture

This outcome was added to the dashboard in response to a number of research participants who identified arts and cultural development as a high priority. Arts and cultural development can create interesting environments as well as a source of economic development. In Cleveland, the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, and Case Western Reserve University were instrumental in supporting the creation of the NewBridge Center for Arts and Technology, which links arts education for young people with job training for adults as a workforce development strategy. Syracuse University has gone even further in linking arts to economic development through a $46.2-million Connective Corridor partnership with local government that links University Hill with the downtown business district areas and with more than 30 arts and cultural venues.[34] A related effort located at one end of the corridor is Syracuse's $52.2-million Near West Side Initiative (NWSI). Formed in 2006 in partnership with local philanthropy, NWSI has converted two abandoned warehouses into artist live/work spaces, developed a Latino cultural center, and implemented arts/literacy programs for area schoolchildren, all part of a comprehensive community

revitalization effort that has resulted in 337 new full-time jobs in the neighborhood as well as 60 rehabilitated homes.[35]

Indicators could include dollars spent on arts-based developments, which could be obtained through institutional data, or numbers of arts and cultural jobs (that pay a living wage) that are created and retained.

Local Community Investment

Community investment is an approach to addressing social challenges by investing in local institutions that eventually turn a profit.

Community investment can be measured in numerous ways. Here we offer two: operating dollars and endowment dollars. Operating dollars have often been used for "place-making" investments, such as retail districts. For example, Sinai Health Systems in Chicago, Illinois, improved the community surrounding its main campus by renovating the abandoned brownfield site of the Hollenback Sausage Factory. Abandoned since the early 1980s, the Hollenback factory was vacant for almost a decade when Sinai Health System purchased and renovated the site. The project included a $7 million renovation of the 12,000 square foot building, which included the creation of the Center for Families and Neighbors, a human services center operated by Sinai. The Center houses a childcare center, offices for case managers, a secure mental health facility, and a 350-seat meeting room for community use. As part of this project, Sinai partnered with the City of Chicago's Affordable Housing program to develop 20 units of moderate-income housing.

Community investment can be measured in numerous ways. Here we offer two: operating dollars and endowment dollars.

Yale University—based in New Haven, Connecticut—provides another example. Over the past two decades, Yale has invested a total of $57.5 million in neighborhood and downtown real estate development. In addition to owning over 300,000 square feet of retail space that it leases to over 100 stores, the University owns over 500 units of residential property and a small amount of office space. This massive property ownership allows Yale to leverage its real estate assets to achieve both public safety and marketing goals. One of Yale's signature neighborhood development efforts is its homebuyer program, an employer-assisted housing initiative that encourages Yale faculty and staff to buy homes in New Haven. In its 15 years of existence, the program has provided $22.5 million to subsidize over 900 home purchases by University-affiliated individuals. Almost half of the participants were unionized staff, 80 percent were first-time homebuyers, and 50 percent were people of color.

A second indicator is endowment dollars. A leading example is the University of Cincinnati, which dedicated nearly 15 percent of its endowment (nearly $150 million) under former President Nancy Zimpher to capitalize a community loan fund to support redevelopment in seven nearby neighborhoods. This money was used to finance low-interest loans, as well as nearly $8 million in operating grants for redevelopment efforts. Loans were made available for very long terms at a below-market, 4-percent interest rate. Among other things, investments went to create seven community urban revitalization corporations (a variant of a community development corporation), which develop plans for their neighborhoods and have financed a wide range of retail, commercial, and residential development. This creative use of its endowment allowed the university to make a unique investment in the community that it would otherwise be unable to finance. As a result, the university has experienced a nearly three-to-one leveraging of their endowment money through tax-debt, loans from banks, and other sources.[36] As impact investing gains greater prominence, we anticipate that more anchor institutions will choose to invest a portion of their endowments to support local community economic development.

Affordable Housing

A housing indicator was a high priority for community groups interviewed. Depending on the context, employer-assisted housing may be a useful measure. In other cases, community land trusts can be a helpful tool for preservation and affordability. Duke University (Durham Community Land Trust) and the Mayo Clinic (First Homes) are examples of anchors that have supported land trusts.[37]

In Rochester, Minnesota, Mayo's investment of $7 million helped jump-start a Rochester Area Foundation program, First Homes, which provides affordable housing for the greater Rochester, Minnesota community. To date, Mayo's investment of $7 million has helped First Homes develop 875 units of affordable housing, including 210 units of community land trust housing. This use of community land trusts is significant in that it enables multiple families to benefit from each home built since the equity gains of ownership are divided between the family and the nonprofit, with the nonprofit share passed on to the next family that occupies the home. In other words, the land trust mechanism serves to maximize the affordable housing impact of Mayo's investment, while the limits on equity gains serve as a very effective break on gentrification.

In Durham, North Carolina, Duke has also worked with a land trust. As Durham Community Land Trust Executive Director Salena Mack explained, "One of the ways we're partnering is that Duke has provided funding for us to land bank property in this community . . . hundreds of properties have been bought through this land bank."

Durham Community Land Trust (DCLT), Habitat and a couple of other nonprofits then receive these properties and build affordable housing on them. Additionally, the land trust has been a regular client of Duke's community economic development law clinic and two Duke business students sit on the land trust's board.[38]

An affordability indicator — the most common indicator being measuring nationally is whether or not housing costs exceed 30 percent of income — can track whether low-income residents are at risk of being priced out of their neighborhoods by revitalization efforts.

Community Building

Strong Community Capacity

Interviewees from both anchor institutions and community groups acknowledged that distrust between anchors and community partners is a barrier to the successful implementation of anchor missions. Equitable partnerships can help build trust, and these can be facilitated through investments that build the capacity of local partners to be stable, effective, and strong.

Equitable partnerships can help build trust, and these can be facilitated through investments that build the capacity of local partners to be stable, effective, and strong.

Unfortunately, in low-income communities, it is not uncommon for strong internal community structures to be lacking. So anchor institutions can make an effort to grow the capacity of the community, be it through providing technical assistance to community organizations or educating new leadership. This is often an important step to help create the possibility of a more equitable partnership between community groups and anchor institutions by ensuring that the institution has stable and effective local partners.

For community building and democratic leadership development, based on our interview data, we recommend a focus on policy measures.

Respondents from community groups clearly indicated that they wanted to see anchor institutions with a central partnership office or center to act as a "front door," as well as a community advisory board. For example, Ishmael Israel of the Northside Residents Redevelopment Council in Minneapolis said, "I would think that if the endeavor is to partner with the community, there should be community members on the committee that decides what kind of grant opportunities they would make available."[39] Similarly, Paulina Gonzalez of Strategic Actions for a Just Economy in Los Angeles said the creation of a community advisory board would be highly beneficial.[40]

Connie Galambos-Malloy of Urban Habitat in Oakland, California, recommended the creation of some sort of centralized office both to connect community organizations within the institution and also to be able to share information."[41] Peggy Shepard of WE ACT for Environmental Justice in Harlem also said an office of community-based research that knows "all of the research partnerships that are going on" would be highly valuable. Shepard added that investment in the improvement of nonprofit partner capacity could also help. "I think the concept of an on-loan executive or loan staff fellows is really important," Shepard said.[42] Margaret Gordon of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project suggested the location of an anchor institution community-based office could serve as a central intake point for community partners.[43]

Partnership centers and advisory boards are also seen as "best practices" from practitioners on the university end. For example, Liz Hollander, formerly Executive Director of Campus Compact and now a Senior Fellow at Tufts, echoed the idea identified by many community group respondents that communications are critical and advocated that there be a central place that can coordinate effort. "Create a vehicle for the community to get to them," Hollander said. "Create a front door that people can find. The influence of that is indirect in terms of impact, but if you can't get to them, you can't use their resources."[44]

Policy indicators that demonstrate that a partnership center existed and that there is a community advisory board with democratic decision-making authority could be very powerful.

The American Democracy Project is developing an index of civic health indicators. Such an index could provide an additional useful metric for assessing anchor institutions' commitment to democratic leadership development. We also recommend a survey of service-learning and capstone partners. Gail Robinson of the American Association of Community Colleges mentioned that her organization conducted a survey between 2009 and 2011 that provides a means of beginning to look at the community impact of partnerships, in cooperation with Learn and Serve America.[45]

Financially Secure Families

Building wealth and creating a sense of community ownership were common themes in our interviews. One way of building wealth is on a family household basis. The Individual Development Account Collaborative of Louisiana, managed by Tulane and Xavier universities from 2002 to 2004, provides one example. As Lawrence Powell, a history professor who directed the center operating the program noted, "Tulane's experience administering large grants and contracts, not to mention its wherewithal

to handle large cash flows," made possible a $4 million program that enabled 600 low-income individuals to acquire homes or other assets.[46]

Bon Secours Health System in Baltimore operates a Community Works program, which provides financial education, including individual and group instruction and counseling on money management, as well as free and low-cost income tax services to local residents as an affordable alternative to commercial preparers. It combines this asset-building work with other services, including family services for low-income families; a resource center for homeless, abused, and addicted women in the community; a youth employment program; and a workforce development program for local residents.[47] Key indicators could include the percentage of families in asset poverty, and anchor institution budgets for financial education and income tax filing assistance support.

But community members also indicated the importance of building community assets. For example, in Minneapolis, Ishmael Israel, Interim Director of the Northside Residents Redevelopment Council, hailed the University of Minnesota's building of "a multi-million dollar center that's in the heart of our community." But Israel felt disappointed that the community did not own the final project. "We lease space from across the street, and I don't know whether you'd say that was just bad negotiation on behalf of the administration on our side, or what, but we lease meeting space now . . . we used to own the space."[48]

One mechanism for fostering community ownership of assets is for anchor institutions to assist community efforts to develop community-owned businesses. The Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, and Case Western Reserve University contributed seed capital to support the Evergreen Cooperative Initiative. In Syracuse, Syracuse University provide a $207,000 grant in seed funding to support the start-up of a local food co-op that broke ground in May 2012.[49] Measuring dollars provided by anchor institutions as loans or seed capital to finance community-owned business is an appropriate indicator here for fostering community ownership.

One mechanism for fostering community ownership of assets is for anchor institutions to assist community efforts to develop community-owned businesses.

Education

Educated Children

Education was a major concern of many interview respondents. Education partnerships have also been a source of anchor institution innovation, including the Strive

program mentioned above, the Harlem Children's Zone project and many university efforts.[50] Apart from the enormous economic and social value of having an educated workforce, Lina Dostilio, Director of Academic Community Engagement at Duquesne University, said, "A key purpose of higher education is to serve the dignity of all people." Anchor institutions can benefit from incorporating education work into their anchor strategy. Even anchors that are not primarily educational, such as hospitals,

Education partnerships have been a source of anchor institution innovation

can adopt education as an anchor mission outcome. Good Samaritan Hospitals in Dayton, Ohio, partners with nine local high schools to enhance student awareness of careers in health sciences.[51]

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) provides another example. Working with multiple community partners, IUPUI re-opened a recently closed high school as a community school (a school that serves all community residents, including outside the time of the academic calendar) and has since gone on to work in multiple school partnerships throughout the Near Westside of Indianapolis. These partnerships mostly involve community schools and integrate academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and civic engagement activities. Additionally, IUPUI's Community Learning Network works with local community centers to offer continuing education and workforce development. As Ira Harkavy and Rita Axelroth Hodges note, "One of IUPUI's longest-standing partners, George

Even anchors that are not primarily educational, such as hospitals, can adopt education as an anchor mission outcome.

Washington Community School, has experienced dramatic success: by 2009, 100% of graduating seniors were accepted into postsecondary education (in a neighborhood where only 5% of residents age 25 or older have a higher education degree). In 2008, IUPUI received the first federal Full-Service Community School funding—$2.4 million out of a national total of $4.9 million (the other $2.5 million was divided between nine school communities across the country)."[52]

Numerous indicators may serve in this regard, such as graduation rates, admission to postsecondary education, and math and reading proficiency at target grade levels.

Health, Safety & Environment

Safe Streets and Campuses

Public safety is often a leading factor in persuading institutions to adopt an anchor mission. Participant George Kleb, Executive Director of the *Bon Secours* of Maryland

Foundation, said that the Bon Secours Hospital adopted an anchor strategy because crime in the neighborhood surrounding the hospital was making it difficult to attract employees as well as patients, which had financial consequences for the institution. The same is also true of a number of universities: for example, the University of Pennsylvania launched its "West Philadelphia Initiatives" set of projects in the mid-1990s after the murder of a faculty member.

Safety indicators can include municipal crime data or an institution's internal incidence reports. Additionally, business improvement district (BID) organizations and other place-making strategies have proved to be effective strategies, so these could suggest potential indicators, as well. For example, the University of Pennsylvania's University City District is a multi-purpose business improvement district organization. Initially Penn provided a dominant share of UCD funding. As recently as Fiscal-Year 2003, UCD board members, led by Penn, provided 70 percent of its then-$5.2 million budget (or $3.6 million). Today, UCD's annual budget has grown to nearly $9.6 million, but board member contributions have fallen to 40.6 percent of total revenues. Penn remains UCD's largest funder, contributing well over $2 million, but as a whole Penn is now responsible for less than 30 percent of the organization's revenues. Known best for its "safety ambassador" program of quasi-police security guards, UCD has also, through its Neighborhood Initiatives program, developed streetscape improvements that have helped support local retail development. Since 2008, UCD has been an enthusiastic participant with other community-based organizations in developing a broad array of economic and workforce related programs, such as the LISC-supported Sustainable Communities Initiative-West Philadelphia (SCI-West).[53]

Public safety is often a leading factor in persuading institutions to adopt an anchor mission.

Healthy Neighborhoods

The fundamental importance of public health to community welfare is clear. A 2011 Centers for Disease Control report finds that, "People who live and work in low socio-economic circumstances are at increased risk for mortality, morbidity, unhealthy behaviors, reduced access to health care and inadequate quality of care. Striking disparities in non-completion of high school and poverty exist within the U.S. adult population and no improvement has been achieved between 2005–2009."[54] Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, President of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, is even more emphatic: "We have learned that factors that are integral to poverty, such as insufficient education, inadequate housing, racism, and food insecurity, are also indicators

of poor health. We know that a child's life expectancy is predicted more by his ZIP code than his genetic code."[55]

Anchor institutions can impact community health in any number of ways, from partnering with public education to supporting the development of local farmers markets. There are a number of universities and hospitals that work in this area. For instance, a 2011 University of Illinois at Chicago report finds that there were 884,804 contacts in the area of "Children's Health Education and Youth Development," as well as 5,692 contacts for "community health."[56] Kaiser Permanente has supported the development of more than 50 farmers markets across the country.[57] Health indicators could include anchor institution investment in public health initiatives to measures of access to healthy food, and dollars spent on public health initiatives (e.g., clinics).

Anchor institutions can impact community health in any number of ways, from partnering with public education to supporting the development of local farmers markets.

Additionally, it is vital in carrying out an anchor mission for institutions to track basic indicators of health disparities in their focus neighborhoods or region. Good indicators of public health for this purpose include infant mortality rates, life expectancy, and diabetes incidence.

Environmental Stewardship

Numerous community groups in this study were concerned with the environment. Anchor institutions likely have a large impact on local and regional environments, through such channels as carbon emissions and water use, and a number of institutions have set environmental goals. Portland State and Emory are both known for their sustainability initiatives, which include procuring goods locally to reduce transportation-related costs.[58] For example, this has been a lead rationale for Emory's participation in the Atlanta Wealth Building Initiative, whose first project, Atlanta Lettuce Works, is an employee-owned greenhouse that expects to grow millions of heads of lettuce, patterned after Cleveland's Evergreen Cooperatives. Emory has pledged to purchase lettuce from the new cooperative, which it sees as one mechanism for helping it achieve its goal of purchasing 75 percent of produce locally by 2015.[59]

Anchor institutions likely have a large impact on local and regional environments, through such channels as carbon emissions and water use, and a number of institutions have set environmental goals.

One clear indicator of environmental stewardship is carbon emissions. Wim Wiewel, President of Portland State, noted that due to the campus presidents' commitment to climate change, "We all had to come to a goal of how we're going to get to climate neutrality. We report on how well we are doing on that goal. That is an existing metric."[60]

Additionally, a second indicator might be a broad sustainability index. Here again, several tools already exist to help anchor institutions track their environmental impact. For universities, the STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) index provides a useful baseline.[61] Among hospitals, options include the U.S. Green Building Council's "LEED for Healthcare" rating, the "Green Guide for Health Care" (developed by Health Care Without Harm and the Center for Maximum Potential Building Systems), and Practice Greenhealth's Sustainability Dashboard.[62] A number of institutions have prioritized environmental goals. Jeff Rich, Executive Director of GL Envision, a subsidiary of Gundersen Lutheran Health System—based in La Crosse, Wisconsin—noted that Gundersen aims to meet 100 percent of its energy needs through renewable sources by 2014. Having a target is important, Rich said. "We set a goal and thought 'what is a reasonable timeline to do all of this?' Because if you make it too long, there's no urgency or management changes . . . but you can't make it so short that you burn yourself out in a year or two and can't sustain anything else you're doing."[63]

NEXT STEPS

In an interview with researchers, Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor of the State University of New York, said that anchor institutions "need to be more engaged in solving the big problems" of society, suggesting that anchors must "hold [themselves] accountable for solving problems that are largely outside of [their] control."

These problems are well known but are worth restating here. The Census Bureau reports that median household income in 2011 was 8.1 percent lower than it was in 2007. Nationwide, a record 46 million Americans were in poverty, for a poverty rate of 15 percent. In 2011, one in four children under the age of six lived in poverty.[64] Many problems are closely associated with poverty, including poor health, low educational achievement, and precarious job prospects.

As place-based entities that control vast economic, human, intellectual, and institutional resources, anchor institutions have the potential to bring crucial, and measurable, benefits to local children, families, and communities. Although many institutions are already engaged in their communities in a multitude of ways, we believe that consciously adopting an anchor mission to help solve "the big problems" will result in better outcomes for these institutions themselves, as well as for the communities in which they are anchored. Wim Wiewel of Portland State advised asking, "Are we making progress as a community or not?"

As place-based entities that control vast economic, human, intellectual, and institutional resources, anchor institutions have the potential to bring crucial, and measurable, benefits to local children, families, and communities.

In this paper, we present a framework that can help institutions direct their efforts toward key outcomes that community-based organizations, governments, advocacy groups, and anchor institutions themselves identify as important. We also suggest some indicators to illustrate that measuring these outcomes, while challenging, is not impossible. In fact, many sources of data are readily available to anchor institutions.

The dashboard is only a first step. An important next step will be to refine the selection of indicators, test them, and report on the results. This will no doubt be an iterative process with many lessons learned.

Developing structures for support, research, and learning may also prove important. As Bill Dillon of the National Association of College and University Business Officers observed, "There is an association for almost everything—bookstores, lawyers,

development . . . but I've never heard of an association for community development administration or officials for universities. . . . No organization is specific to community development work."[65]

Patricia Sobrero, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development at North Carolina State University, mentioned that research on anchors could be useful for institutions as they confront challenges to adopting and implementing anchor missions.

Beyond added research, sharing best practices and refining practices as indicators are tested, another important step will be to begin to integrate these indicators into broader assessments of community engagement, such as Community Health Need Assessment reports for hospitals and the Carnegie Foundation's community engagement classification criteria for universities.

This work must confront several challenges. Two critical ones are overcoming community mistrust and maintaining commitment to an anchor mission across changes in institutional leadership — in other words, institutionalizing engagement.

To be sure, as interview respondents emphasized, this work must confront several challenges. Two critical ones are overcoming community mistrust and maintaining commitment to an anchor mission across changes in institutional leadership — in other words, institutionalizing engagement.

Nonetheless, despite the challenges, over time, we look forward to seeing the further development of processes, training, and tools to enable anchors to integrate equity measures into their daily business practices.

Achieving this daily practice of a thriving anchor institution mission, we believe, will be beneficial to both anchor institutions and communities. Indeed, when done well, the anchor institution often gets as much out of the exchange as it contributes. As David Perry of the University of Illinois at Chicago pointed out, even if this is not always acknowledged, there is a mutual dependency between communities and anchor institutions that creates a set of overlapping (if not always consistent) interests of the two. "You attract people from all over the country, because of your community," Perry said. "If you only look at the anchor institution impact on the city," Perry added, "that is only half of the phenomenon."[66]

ABOUT THE DEMOCRACY COLLABORATIVE

Since 1999 The Democracy Collaborative has worked to build the deep knowledge, theoretical analysis, practical tools, network of relationships and innovative models representing a new paradigm of economic development in the United States. The hallmarks of this new approach include refocusing public and private resources to expand individual and family assets, broadening ownership over capital, restoring community banks and other local economic institutions, and returning wealth to communities as an essential strategy to end generational poverty, create quality jobs with family-supporting wages, stabilize communities and their environment, and address our nation's growing wealth inequality. This is Community Wealth Building.

The Democracy Collaborative (TDC) is the premiere innovator and field builder in the practice of Community Wealth Building, transcending underlying approaches and connecting these into an overall strategy. As the leading national voice on research, advisory and innovation for the movement of Community Wealth Building, the Collaborative promotes new models and efficient practices, informs public policy and establishes metrics for moving this work forward rapidly.

TDC sustains a wide range of projects involving research, training, policy development, and community-focused work designed to promote an asset-based paradigm and increase support for the field across-the-board. Our research, strategy and policy website — www.Community-Wealth.org — is updated regularly and is a comprehensive source for information about the community wealth building movement nationwide.

APPENDIX: INTERVIEWEES AND CONTRIBUTORS

Association representatives

Susan Albertine, Vice President for Engagement, Inclusion and Success, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Amee Bearne, National Coordinator, The Democracy Commitment

Martin J. Blank, President, Institute for Educational Leadership

John Burkhardt, Director, National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

Bill Dillon, Executive Vice President, National Association of College and University Business Officers

Jennifer Domagal-Goldman, National Manager, American Democracy Project, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Shari Garmise, Vice President, Office of Urban Initiatives, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities

Elizabeth Hollander, former President, Campus Compact and Senior Fellow, Tisch College, Tufts University

Caryn McTigue Musil, Senior Vice President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

George L. Mehaffy, Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Terrel Rhodes, Vice President for Quality, Curriculum, and Assessment, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Gail Robinson, Former Manager of Service Learning, American Association of Community Colleges

John Saltmarsh, Director, New England Resource Center for Higher Education

Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Community Development researchers, consultants and representatives

Jessica Anders, Research and Evaluation Manager, NeighborWorks, Success Measures

Omar Blaik, Founder & President, U3 Ventures

Kim Burnett, Consultant (Denver, CO)

Denise Fairchild, President, Emerald Cities Collaborative

Robin Guenther, Sustainable Health Care Design Leader, Perkins-Will (New York, NY)

Margaret (Maggie) Grieve, Director, NeighborWorks, Success Measures

James Harvie, Executive Director, Institute for a Sustainable Future (Duluth, MN)

Madeline Janis, National Policy Director, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (Los Angeles, CA)

Greg Landsman, Executive Director, Strive, Cincinnati (Cincinnati, OH)

Daniella Levine, President & CEO, Catalyst Miami (Miami, FL)

David Maurrasse, Founder and President, Marga Inc., and Director, Anchor Institution Task Force

Joseph B. McNeely, Executive Director, Central Baltimore Partnership (Baltimore, MD)

Leslie Moody, Executive Director, Partnership for Working Families

Victor Rubin, Vice President for Research, PolicyLink

Ted Schettler, Science Director, Science and Environmental Health Network (Bolinas, CA)

Lee Stuart, Program Officer, Duluth LISC

Deborah Visser, Director, Investments and Partnerships, NeighborWorks, Success Measures

Chris Walker, Director of Research and Assessment, Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Desiree Westlund, Program Director, Front Range Economic Strategy Center (Denver, CO)

Bob Wimpelburg, Executive Director, All Kids Alliance (Houston, TX)

Community Organization representatives

Diane Arnold, Executive Director, Hawthorne Community Center (Indianapolis, IN)

Connie Galambos-Malloy, Senior Director of Programs, Urban Habitat (Oakland, CA)

Paulina Gonzalez, Executive Director, Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (Los Angeles, CA)

Margaret Gordon, Co-Director, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (Oakland, CA)

Ishmael Israel, Interim Director, Northside Resident Redevelopment Council (Minneapolis, MN)

Cheryl Johnson, Executive Director, People for Community Recovery (Chicago, IL)

Selina Mack, Executive Director, Durham Community Land Trust, (Durham, NC)

Margaret May, Executive Director, Ivanhoe Neighborhood Council (Kansas City, MO)

John O'Callaghan, President & CEO, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership (Atlanta, GA)

Peggy Shepard, Executive Director, WE ACT for Environmental Justice (New York, NY)

Chuck Starrett, Administrator, Steel Valley Enterprise Zone (Homestead, PA)

Guy Williams, CEO, Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice (Detroit, MI)

Steve Williams, Executive Director, Partnership Community Development Corporation (Philadelphia, PA)

Beverly Wright, Executive Director, Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (New Orleans, LA)

Elizabeth Yeampierre, Executive Director, UPROSE: United Puerto Rican Organization of Sunset Park (Brooklyn, NY)

Foundation representatives

Scott Izzo, Director, Richard King Mellon Foundation

Margaret O'Bryon, Former President & CEO, Consumer Health Foundation

Government representatives

Ray Ali, National Program Leader, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture

Maurice W. Dorsey, Former National Program Leader, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture

Brent Elrod, National Program Leader, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture

Patricia Hipple, National Program Leader, Sustainable Farm Enterprise, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture

Ahlishia Shipley, Program Specialist, Family and Community Service, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture

Kinnard Wright, Grant Specialist, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Hospital representatives

Ed Gerardo, Director for Community Commitment and Social Investment, Bon Secours Health System

George Kleb, Executive Director, Bon Secours of Maryland Foundation

Julie Trocchio, Senior Director, Community Benefit and Continuing Care, Catholic Health Association of the United States

University administrators

Robin Bachin, Assistant Provost for Civic and Community Engagement, University of Miami

David Cox, Executive Assistant to the President, Partnerships and Administration, University of Memphis

Lina Dostilio, Director, Academic Community Engagement, Duquesne University

Leif Elsmo, Executive Director of Community and External Affairs, University of Chicago Medical Center

Robert Franco, Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Kapiolani Community College

Andrew Frank, Special Advisor to the President on Economic Development, Office of the President, Johns Hopkins University

Andrew Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, Office for Public Engagement, University of Minnesota

James T. Harris III, President, Widener University

Marilyn Higgins, Vice President, Community Engagement and Economic Development, Syracuse University

Judith Ramaley, former President, Winona State University

Patricia Sobrero, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Extension, Engagement and Economic Development, North Carolina State University

James Votruba, former President, Northern Kentucky University

Wim Wiewel, President, Portland State University

Nancy L. Zimpher, Chancellor, The State University of New York

University partnership and policy center staff and directors

Cory Bowman, Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania

Harry Boyte, Co-Director, Center for Democracy and Citizenship, Augsburg College

Richard Cook, Former Director, School of Social Work, Community Outreach Service, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Ira Harkavy, Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania

Drew Klacik, Policy Analyst, Indiana University Public Policy Institute, Center for Urban Policy and Environment, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)

Kent Koth, Director, Center for Service and Community Engagement & Seattle Youth Initiative, Seattle University

John Krauss, Director, Indiana University Public Policy Institute, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)

Katherine Kravetz, Academic Director, Transforming Communities, American University

Rex LaMore, Director, Center for Community & Economic Development, Michigan State University

Manuel Pastor, Director, Program for Environmental and Regional Equity, University of Southern California

David Perry, Former Director, Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois at Chicago

Michael Rich, Director, Center for Community Partnerships, Emory University

Gretchen Seuss, Director of Evaluation, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania

Henry Taylor, Director, Center for Urban Studies, University at Buffalo

ENDNOTES

1. Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads*, East Lansing, MI: MSU Press, 2012. Susan Aud et al., *The Condition of Education 2013* (NCES 2013-037), Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch, accessed August 9, 2013. National Association of College and University Business Officers, *Results from the 2012 NACUBO-Commonfund Study of Endowments Are Released*, Washington, DC: NACUBO, February 1, 2013, http://www.nacubo.org/Research/Research_News/Results_from_the_2012_NACUBO-Commonfund_Study_of_Endowments_Are_Released.html, accessed August 9, 2013.

2. George Mehaffy, interview by Steve Dubb, Washington, DC: March 9, 2012.

3. Shari Garmise, interview by Steve Dubb, February 7, 2012.

4. Nancy Zimpher, interview by Sarah McKinley, August 15, 2012.

5. Oliver Henkel, interview by Ted Howard and Holly Jo Sparks, Cleveland, OH: March 15, 2011.

6. Bill Schramm, interview by Holly Jo Sparks, Detroit, MI: November 19, 2011.

7. Paulina Gonzalez, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 29, 2012.

8. Elizabeth Yeampierre, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 13, 2012.

9. Two early works are: Gar Alperovitz and Ted Howard, "The Next Wave: Building a University Civic Engagement Service for the Twenty-First Century," *Journal of Higher Education, Outreach and Engagement*, spring/summer 2005, volume 10, number 2 and Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community Development*, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at The University of Maryland, August 2007.

10. See, for example: Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*; Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, *Leveraging Anchor Institutions for Local Job Creation and Wealth Building*, Berkeley, CA: Institute for Labor Relations and Employment, University of California, 2012. Farzana Serang, J. Phillip Thompson, and Ted Howard, *The Anchor Mission: Leveraging the Power of Anchor Institutions To Build Community Wealth*, College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland; David Zuckerman, *Hospitals Building Healthier Communities: Embracing the Anchor Mission*. Takoma Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, 2013.

11. On Strive's "cradle to career" education pipeine, see the organization's website. Strive Network, *Strive Network*, Cincinnati, OH: Strive, 2013, http://strivenetwork.org, accessed July 6, 2013.

12. This primary research used to develop the dashboard was supplemented with interviews in the hospital sector that The Democracy Collaborative conducted in 2011 and 2012 for a related study on the roles of hospitals in local economic development. See David Zuckerman, *Hospitals Building Healthier Communities*.

13. Deeohn Ferris, memorandum to the Democracy Collaborative, Washington, DC: SCDG, July 18, 2012.

14. For example, regarding universities, see: Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled,* pp. 87-88, 207 (fn. 91).

15. James Votruba, interview by Farzana Serang, July 3, 2012.

16. Marilyn Higgins, interview by Steve Dubb, Syracuse, NY: March 30, 2012.

17. David Cox, interview by Sarah McKinley, June 18, 2012.

18. Andrew Furco, interview by Sarah McKinley, July 23, 2012.

19. Shari Garmise, interview by Steve Dubb, Washington, DC: January 24, 2012.

20. Rex LaMore, interview by Sarah McKinley, June 27, 2012.

21. Margaret Gordon, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 14, 2012.

22. Judith Ramaley, interview by Sarah McKinley, July 25, 2012.

23. Andrew Frank, interview by Sarah McKinley, July 18, 2012.

24. Cheryl Johnson, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 9, 2012.

25. Diane Arnold, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 27, 2012.

26. Paulina Gonzalez, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 29, 2012.

27. Elizabeth Yeampierre, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 13, 2012.

28. Beverly Wright, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 15, 2012.

29. Chris Walker, interview by Sarah McKinley, Washington, DC: July 11, 2012.

30. Allison Gold, "Emerging Practices: Ideas from Cleveland & Detroit on Leveraging Anchor Institutions," *The Catalyst*: *Ideas and Insights from Living Cities*, September 20, 2011, http://www.livingcities.org/blog/?id=8, accessed October 12, 2012.

31. Penn Purchasing Services, *Economic Inclusion Statistics by Fiscal Year*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2012, www.purchasing.upenn.edu/supply-chain/sup_diversity.php, accessed October 12, 2012. On the history of this effort, see Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, pp. 124-125.

32. Making extrapolations with local economic multipliers is tricky, but the benefits can be considerable. For example, a local study of Grand Rapids and environs in 2008 found that if residents shifted 10 percent of their retail purchases to local stores ($840 million), this would generate 1,614 new jobs, $53.3 million in wages, and $137.3 million in economic activity. A shift of $100 million could thus be expected to achieve roughly one eighth of this amount, other things being equal. See: Civic Economics, *Local Works: Examining the Impact of Local Business on the West Michigan Economy*, Austin, TX and Grand Rapids, MI: Civic Economics and Local First, September 2008.

33. Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, pp. 98-101.

34. On the Connective Corridor, see Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, pp. 90–93.

35. yracuse University, *Impact in the Community: Fiscal Year 2012,* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, 2012, page 4.

36. Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, pp. 136–138.

37. Regarding Mayo Clinic's support of First Homes, a provider of community land trust housing, see: First Homes, *About Us*, Rochester, MN: Rochester Area Foundation, no date, http://www.firsthomes.org/about-us.php, accessed October 12, 2012.

38. Selena Mack, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 24, 2012.

39. Ishmael Israel, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 6, 2012.

40. Paulina Gonzalez, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 29, 2012.

41. Connie Galambos-Malloy, interviewed by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 30, 2012.

42. Peggy Shepard, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 18, 2012.

43. Margaret Gordon, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, May 14, 2012.

44. Liz Hollander, interview by Steve Dubb, July 16, 2012.

45. Gail Robinson, interview by Sarah McKinley, July 23, 2012. On the actual survey, see Mary Prentice and Gail Robinson, *Assessing Service Learning Outcomes and Telling the Story*, Mesa, AZ: Community College National Center for Community Engagement, May 24, 2012.

46. Lawrence N. Powell, "Some Unexpected Ways Universities can Prime the Community Economic Engine: Asset Building for the Working Poor and the University Back Office," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 10, Number 2, 2005, pp. 7-23.

47. David Zuckerman, *Hospitals Building Healthier Communities*, page 83.

48. Ishmael Israel, interview by Sustainable Communities Development Group, June 6, 2012.

49. Sarah Schuster, "Southside Food Co-Op holds groundbreaking ceremony Friday," *The Daily Orange,* May 4, 2012, www.dailyorange.com/2012/05/southside-food-co-op-holds-groundbreaking-ceremony-friday, accessed October 12, 2012.

50. For the Harlem Children's Zone, see the organization's website at http://hcz.org. For broader information of education partnerships at universities, see Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*. See also Ira Harkavy and Rita Axelroth Hodges, *Democratic Devolution: How America's Colleges and Universities Can strengthen their Communities*, Policy Memo, Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute, October 2012.

51. Good Samaritan Hospital, "School Partnerships – Opening Doors," *2008 Report to the Community*, Dayton, OH; Good Samaritan Hospital, 2009, http://www.goodsamdayton.org/gshdefault.aspx?id=37854, accessed October 12, 2012.

52. Ira Harkavy and Rita Axelroth Hodges, *Democratic Devolution: How America's Colleges and Universities Can Strengthen Their Communities*, Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute, October 2012, page 10.

53. Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, page 67.

54. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Fact Sheet: Health Disparities in Education and Income*, Atlanta, GA: CDC, 2011. See also the longer report from which this fact sheet is culled: Thomas R. Frieden, *CDC Health Disparities and Inequalities Report—United States, 2011*, Atlanta, GA: CDC, January 14, 2011.

55. Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, "Why Health, Poverty, and Community Development Are Inseparable," in Nancy O. Andrews and David J. Erickson, editors, *Investing in What Works in America's*

Communities: Essays on People, Place and Purpose, San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and Low Income Investment Fund, 2012, pp. 215–225.

56. University of Illinois at Chicago Neighborhoods: Initiative, *Great Cities Institute: 2011 Community Benefit Report*, Chicago, IL: UIC, 2012.

57. Health Care Without Harm, *Healthy Food in Health Care Webinar Series: Local & Sustainable Food Purchasing and Policies in Healthcare*, Reston, VA: HCWK, September 13, 2012, http://www. healthyfoodinhealthcare.org/webinar091312.php, accessed October 12, 2012.

58. Rita Axelroth Hodges and Steve Dubb, *The Road Half Traveled*, pp. 45, 102.

59. Ellen Macht, *Atlanta Lettuce Works: A Project of the Atlanta Wealth Building Initiative*, Washington, DC: presentation to Good Jobs, Green Jobs conference, April 16, 2013.

60. Wim Wiewel, interview by Steve Dubb, August 21, 2012.

61. Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, *STARS: A Program of AASHE*, Denver, CO: AASHE, 2012, https://stars.aashe.org, accessed October 12, 2012.

62. Practice Greenhealth, *Green Sustainability Dashboard*, Reston, VA: Practice Greenhealth, 2012, http://practicegreenhealth.org/tools-resources/greenhealth-sustainability-dashboard, accessed October 12, 2012. Green Guide for Health Care, *Welcome*, Chicago: GGHC, 2012, http://www. gghc.org/about.php, accessed December 12, 2012. US Green Building Council, *LEED for Health Care*, Washington, DC: USGBC, 2011, http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=1765, accessed December 12, 2012.

63. Jeff Rich, interview by Holly Jo Sparks, La Crosse, WI: June 22, 2011.

64. Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-243, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2011*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 2012, pp. 5, 13, 16.

65. Bill Dillon, interview by Sarah McKinley, June 27, 2012.

66. David Perry, interview by Steve Dubb, June 12, 2012.

THE ANCHOR DASHBOARD

Aligning Institutional Practice to Meet Low-Income Community Needs

Anchor institutions are enterprises such as universities and hospitals that are rooted in their local communities by mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers, employees, and vendors. As place-based entities that control vast economic, human, intellectual, and institutional resources, anchor institutions have the potential to bring crucial, and measurable, benefits to local children, families, and communities. All told, U.S. hospitals and universities combined spend over $1 trillion a year, have endowments in excess of $500 billion, and employ 8 percent of the labor force.

Many anchor institutions regularly report on community programming and activities. Some go even further and seek to pursue an *anchor mission* — making a commitment to consciously apply their long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with their human and intellectual resources, to better the long-term welfare of the communities in which they are anchored. Yet, to date, few tools exist to help institutions reflect and assess broadly the long-term impact of their anchor-mission activities, and particularly their impact on low-income communities.

This Democracy Collaborative paper proposes a set of indicators to begin to fill this gap. Developed through extensive research and in-depth interviews conducted with more than 75 leaders of anchor institutions, national nonprofit organizations, federal agencies, and community organizations, **The Anchor Dashboard** identifies twelve critical areas where anchor institutions can play an effective role. Additionally, it develops illustrative indicators that: 1) provide a baseline to assess conditions in the community; and 2) evaluate institutional effort — e.g., dollars spent, procurement shifted, people hired, policies and accountability procedures in place.

Our hope is that **The Anchor Dashboard** will be a valuable mechanism to help the field more clearly focus on what it means for a hospital or university to pursue an anchor institution mission. By outlining best practices in economic development, community building, education, health, safety, and the environment, along with potential mechanisms to track progress using already available data, we intend that this publication move the conversation from "programs" to "institutional impact" — and, especially, on how anchor institutions can conduct themselves to deliver crucial, and measurable, benefits for low-income children, families, and communities.