

# ANCHORED IN PLACE

How Funders Are Helping Anchor Institutions  
Strengthen Local Economies



# **ANCHORED IN PLACE**

How Funders Are Helping Anchor Institutions  
Strengthen Local Economies

**Publication Produced and Distributed by:**

Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities  
1500 San Remo Ave., Suite 249  
Coral Gables, Fla., 33146  
(305) 667-6350  
[www.fundersnetwork.org](http://www.fundersnetwork.org)

Researched and Written by:  
Katherine Pease, KP Advisors

**Acknowledgements:**

This report was undertaken by the Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities as part of our Anchor Institutions Funders' Group.

The Funders' Network would like to gratefully acknowledge the members of the Anchor Institutions Funders' Group Steering Committee: Charles Rutheiser (chair), The Annie E. Casey Foundation; Shawn Escoffery, Surdna Foundation; and Eric Muschler, The McKnight Foundation.

The Funders' Network wishes to thank Katherine Pease for her work as author and researcher, and Bruce Pfrommer of Pfrommer Ondesign for the report design. In addition, we are indebted to the representatives from the anchor institutions, funders, non-profits and other community stakeholders who gave willingly of their time and whose insights, expertise and experiences are featured in *Anchored in Place: How Funders are Helping Anchor Institutions Strengthen Local Economies*.

The views and opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities or the supporting foundations.

Comments and feedback on this report can be sent to Ann Fowler Wallace, director of programs for the Funders' Network: [ann@fundersnetwork.org](mailto:ann@fundersnetwork.org).

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	4
I. CATALYZING AND SUPPORTING ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS .....	6
II. UNDERSTANDING HOW ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS WORK .....	9
III. IMPORTANT ROLES FUNDERS CAN PLAY .....	11
IV. LESSONS LEARNED .....	15
V. MOVING FORWARD: FUNDERS LEARNING AND ACTING TOGETHER .....	17
CASE STUDIES.....	19
BALTIMORE .....	20
CHICAGO .....	23
TWIN CITIES .....	26
DENVER.....	29
ALBUQUERQUE .....	32
Appendix A: Interviewees.....	35
Appendix B: Survey Respondents .....	36

# INTRODUCTION

During the 1990s, a number of universities and hospitals located in disinvested neighborhoods within older industrial cities began to re-think their relationships with the communities and cities in which they were located. For decades, many of these institutions had turned inwards behind their walls as the areas around them experienced decline. However, a handful of institutions chose a different path: They chose to engage communities in a number of mutually beneficial efforts. What was especially novel about this engagement was the way that it sought to leverage the power of these institutions as economic engines—as sources of jobs, procurement contracts and capital investment—for more inclusive growth. In many older industrial cities, higher education and health care were the most robust and dynamic sectors of the economy. But these institutions did not have strong economic ties to local residents in the community, few of whom were able to tap the financial and social benefits of living in close proximity to these dynamic institutions.

During the 2000s, more universities and hospitals in cities began to act more strategically and intentionally about how they deployed a broad range of their intellectual, social and financial assets to improve opportunities and outcomes for lower-income communities and populations. The term “anchor institutions” emerged to identify organizations that were making these commitments.

Over the past decade, an increasing number of universities, hospitals and other entities in cities around the country have identified themselves as “anchors.” A national ecosystem of professional associations and networks, intermediaries and consultants has evolved to develop and disseminate ideas, models and approaches about anchor behavior. National and local funders have played important roles in supporting the work of both individual anchors and collaborative partnerships of multiple institutions. In addition, philanthropy has invested in nurturing the national ecosystem that supports the ability of institutions and, increasingly, networks of institutions, to implement their anchor missions.

In 2013, some of the foundations that had been most deeply invested in anchor work partnered with the Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities and created the Anchor Institutions Funders’ Group (AIFG) to share results and lessons with the aim of more effectively supporting universities, hospitals and other anchors to advance the goals of inclusive and equitable community and economic development.

In 2017, AIFG commissioned a study to assess the extent and intensity of support for anchor work within philanthropy. The results of this inquiry were both surprising and heartening and can be summarized in four principal ideas:

1. A significant number of foundations have been investing in or partnering with anchor institutions for many years, but they haven’t always referred to this as “anchors” work.
2. Foundations support anchor institutions in many ways, over and above providing grant dollars.


3. Local and national foundations have complementary roles to play in supporting anchors work.
4. Many funders are interested in exploring how foundations can become more connected with each other in order to learn and deepen their knowledge of how anchor institutions can drive inclusive and equitable community and economic development and what philanthropy can, and can't, do to support such work.

This report explores the findings from the AIFG study and recommends potential steps for continuing to deepen our collective knowledge about anchor institutions and their potential for creating and sustaining change.

The AIFG would like to acknowledge the many people who contributed their time and expertise to the report, most notably the funders who responded to an online survey and the individuals who spoke to the research team about their experiences in each of the five regions where case studies were conducted. We look forward to continuing to learn from and with the multitude of actors who are involved with anchor institutions and to growing the field of funders who are investing in anchor institutions in their pursuit of greater opportunity.

### **Charles Rutheiser**

Senior Associate, Center for Civic Sites and Community Change,  
The Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Chair, Anchor Institutions Funders' Group



# CATALYZING AND SUPPORTING ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS

## Methodology

This report was prepared by KP ADVISORS, INC. and includes data gathered in a survey that was administered to foundations interested in anchor institutions. Funders who received the survey were identified through the Funders' Network national membership and members of the AIFG. The survey was administered online Jan. 23 to Feb. 10, 2017. Twenty-three out of 40 funders who were originally contacted completed the survey (58 percent). (See Appendix A for a list of survey respondents.) The survey respondents were primarily community foundations (52 percent) and private foundations (26 percent). Of the respondents to the survey, 48 percent identified their geographic scope as local; 27 percent identified as having a statewide or regional geographic scope; and 22 percent said they are national funders. The report also includes profiles of local anchor institutions and the funders who support them in five metropolitan regions: Albuquerque, Baltimore, Chicago, Denver, and Minneapolis/St. Paul (the "Twin Cities"). Profiles were informed through interviews with local leaders of anchor institutions and their funders as well as comprehensive desk research. (See Appendix B for a list of interviewees.)

## What Are Anchor Institutions and Anchor Networks?

Anchor institutions are enterprises that are rooted in their local communities by mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers, employees, and vendors. While many people think of universities and hospitals when they think of anchor institutions, our research showed that many of the existing networks of anchor institutions are moving beyond a narrow definition and are expanding to include entities such as sports stadiums, libraries, museums, school districts, and municipal governments.

Networks of anchor institutions exist in many communities and serve multiple functions. Newly emergent anchor networks typically develop to provide a hub where relationship building and information sharing happen among local anchor institutions. More developed networks are typically designed to facilitate the process of creating shared outcomes and strategies for two or more anchor institutions. Anchor networks with an action orientation often begin their work together by establishing baseline data regarding their area of shared interest. For example, three healthcare institutions in an anchor network might set a goal of increasing the number of individuals from the local community who are hired for jobs within the participating healthcare institutions. Together, they could work with a local nonprofit partner

to develop a job-training program aimed at equipping local residents with the necessary skills for a job in healthcare. Sixty-two percent of survey respondents indicated that they support both individual anchor institutions and networks of anchors, while 33 percent only support networks of anchors. Moreover, many members of the Funders' Network have been engaging with anchors as a part of other initiatives, especially in the Restoring Prosperity in Older Industrial Cities working group, but they do not necessarily refer to their efforts as "anchors" work. For example, one survey respondent indicated that their foundation "has provided debt funds for Community Development Financial Institutions in the \$5-25 million range working with anchors," but the work doesn't necessarily fall into an "anchors" category.

### Why Develop an Anchors Strategy?

At its core, anchor institution work is fundamentally about creating vibrant local communities. For many funders, that translates to addressing economic inequality, which is seen as being deeply linked to opportunity. As Deborah Polk, senior program officer at the Polk Bros. Foundation in Chicago says, "We're all about revitalizing communities and I believe that violence and instability is about lack of economic opportunities." This orientation led her, like many other funders, to develop an anchor strategy for her foundation.


According to our survey data, the most common *internal focus area* driving foundation investment in anchor institutions is economic

## *Anchor institutions are enterprises that are rooted in their local communities by mission, invested capital, or relationships to customers, employees, and vendors.*

or workforce development, followed by community revitalization, and civic engagement and participation. The most frequently identified key objectives funders were seeking to achieve through their grants and investments included a thriving local and minority business community (82 percent) and employment of low-income members and communities of color (82 percent), which was followed by anchor institutions being engaged in addressing local community issues (68 percent). The *types of activities* funded include convening (86 percent), community development (73 percent), and fostering collaboration and partnerships (73 percent).

For many place-based foundations, anchor institutions are seen as keys to unlocking what Ted Howard, president of The Democracy Collaborative calls, "sticky capital." In other words, unlike investments in programs or events that are potentially short-lived, anchor institutions are not going to leave the community because their mission includes serving the local community. In contrast, corporations that are motivated primarily by the financial bottom line are more likely to move if by doing so they increase their profitability. Thus, an investment in an anchor institution or a

**Figure 1: Targeted Results of Funders for Anchors Work**





# Funder Advice for Other Funders on Anchors Work

## **Collaborative process, leadership, and staff support:**

- Begin the process with anchor institutions and the directly affected community members at the decision-making table. Collaborative discussions are an essential part of the process.
- Have a leader/champion to convene/organize the sector of anchors, and one or two committed staff to coordinate and drive the daily work.

## **Anchor institution partners:**

- Start with high-level leadership of anchor institutions to make the case for focused efforts that leverage local impact that feeds into their self-interests. Help them to also understand their broader impact on community well being.
- Work with anchor leaders and key staff to collaboratively develop strategies.
- Support research that documents the institution's self-interests and internal impact.

## **Partnerships:**

- Develop solid relationships and partnerships with anchor institutions and other funders to move this work forward.
- Understand that no one funder can support the entire initiative and everyone will come to the work from different perspectives.
- Have transparent and open communication with your partners.

## **Long-term commitment and no "one-size-fits-all" approach:**

- Commit to the long-term and develop a sustainable model beyond your funding and leadership.
- Recognize that no "one-size-fits-all" approach works for the unique needs, interests and opportunities of the various anchor institutions and local communities.
- Foundations make valuable financial (e.g. first dollars, grants) and non-financial (e.g. social, moral, and reputational capital; catalyst, convener) contributions to the anchors work.

network of anchors should last beyond a generation and well into the future.

Many national funders share the same interests as their local peers in working with anchor institutions as drivers of economic development and improved health outcomes for communities. However, in addition to understanding the potential for local impact, they also view anchor institutions as able to make major shifts toward pushing opportunity and capital away from impersonal structures and back into communities in ways that can have profoundly positive impacts on community health and well-being. A case in point is highlighted in a new report, *Improving Community Health by Strengthening Community Investment*, funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, that analyzes a group of healthcare institutions making investments in efforts to improve the social determinants of health at scale. The report, published by the Center for Community Health, highlights investments made by Dignity Health, the fifth-largest health system in the country. According to the report, Dignity targets its investments broadly to revitalize low-income communities, empower low-income people to create, manage and own enterprises, demonstrate a commitment to healthy communities and safeguard the environment. Since its inception in 1990, the Dignity Health Community Investment Program has had a total loan volume of \$164 million, that has been used for affordable housing and assisted living facilities for seniors, access to shelters for the homeless discharged from hospitals, access to capital for more than 55 small businesses, and healthy food projects.<sup>1</sup> This is just one example of the types of opportunities that national foundations are interested in scaling with anchor institutions and systems because of the deep and transformative potential.

Finally, it should be underscored that foundations focused on equity often find their way to anchor institutions. Many anchor institutions are located in blighted, disinvested communities with high concentrations of poverty. Individually and collectively, anchors represent a unique opportunity for economic development that few traditional workforce programs can achieve on their own. Even anchor institutions that are not located in low-income communities, however, often serve as good partners for achieving economic opportunity because they have the potential to fundamentally alter the local economic environment. For example, when anchor institutions modify their purchasing practices and build the capacity of local businesses so they can become part of a larger supply chain, this can have a deep impact on the entire ecosystem of small businesses in a region.

<sup>1</sup> Hacke, Robin. *Improving Community Health by Strengthening Community Investment* (March 2017), Center for Community Investment.



# UNDERSTANDING HOW ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS WORK

All of the funders interviewed for the research project had advice to share with their peers, especially in regards to understanding how anchor institutions work. The following points may help funders as they outline a strategy for working with anchor institutions.

## 1. Timeframe

The old adage that you can't turn the Titanic on a dime certainly holds true for anchor institutions as well. It is even truer when working with networks of anchor institutions. Anchor institutions can employ thousands or even tens of thousands of people and the pace of change within institutions of this size is necessarily slow. Furthermore, anchor institutions within the same geography and field, such as hospitals, are often competitors. In this context, trust takes time to build and it cannot be rushed. Nonetheless, some anchor partnerships seem to accelerate faster than others. For example, in Albuquerque, N.M., key healthcare systems and the local community foundation have strong working relationships and a national intermediary (The Democracy Collaborative) helped them establish working norms aimed at addressing disagreements quickly. Funders need to take time to understand the underlying dynamics among anchor institutions and support them in coming together by providing financial support, among

other things. In fact, numerous interviewees cautioned against funders becoming overly prescriptive in their desire to rush to concrete outcomes that often take years to mature. As one individual said, "More often than not, this work happens because we're in a relationship together. It's about trust. And trust takes time."

## 2. Local Context

While there are some commonalities among the communities that have active anchor strategies, there is no one prescriptive roadmap for working with anchor institutions. Each institution is unique, with different priorities, values and leadership, and each community has its own set of variables that will affect the outcome of an anchor initiative. For example, in Baltimore, there is a long history of anchor engagement in economic issues, which was borne of necessity given the city's rapidly declining tax base. In Denver and the Twin Cities, collaboration among civic institutions and funders is normative, which may have helped pave the way for coordination of anchor institutions. Funders need to recognize the assets and limitations within communities when embarking on this work and partner with the local community to develop an approach to organizing anchor institutions that fits the local context.

## *Many interviewees emphasized the importance of engaging the leadership of anchor institutions early in the process to help establish institutional commitment.*

### **3. Engage Intermediaries**

In virtually every community where a robust anchor strategy is underway there is at least one local or national intermediary organization playing a role. In some cases, the intermediary serves as the glue for a network and helps convene and connect anchors. In other cases, intermediaries help anchors (individually or collectively) to understand baseline data points (such as the number of employees who are hired from the local community) and measure progress made toward achieving their goals. Intermediaries also provide important knowledge about other anchor institution efforts and lessons learned in other communities. Sometimes they serve in a “coaching” role to help individual anchor institutions articulate their priorities and strategies. They may also be able to unearth uncomfortable truths relating to inter-agency dynamics or community issues. For example, one interviewee noted that when The Democracy Collaborative is engaged, they can bring powerful stories from other communities, but they can also say things that local actors cannot for fear of alienating their peers. National intermediaries often bring essential context and knowledge of the broader anchor field, while intermediaries excel at providing knowledge and relationships with local community groups.

### **4. Build Collaborative Structures to Engage at Multiple Levels**

Like many processes that involve making change within large institutions, the process of engaging with anchor institutions usually requires working with the leadership of anchor institutions and the people who are responsible for implementing change. Many interviewees emphasized the importance of engaging the leadership of anchor institutions early in the process to help establish institutional commitment. For example, when funders and other civic leaders in Chicago wanted to develop a multi-anchor initiative that was eventually known as the Chicago Anchors for a Strong Economy (CASE), they started by bringing together the heads of local healthcare systems and universities,

as well as city and county leaders. This was essential in order to create the institutional commitment to the work. In Albuquerque, the same thing was true: The initial planning team was composed of executives from local anchor institutions, who now form the core of an advisory committee. However, as the initiative has matured, a steering committee of other representatives from the participating anchor institutions, with leadership from the Albuquerque Community Foundation, has been established. Importantly, the structure of this network has been codified through memoranda of understanding, which have been important to keep the participating institutions aligned and engaged.

### **5. Learn from Others**

A common feature of most of the case studies in this report is that building an anchor initiative often includes a critical feature early in the process: a visit to Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland is home to one of the country’s first multi-anchor initiatives, the Greater University Circle Initiative and the Evergreen Cooperative project. In addition, The Democracy Collaborative, which has been instrumental in the development of multiple anchor institution networks in the U.S. and globally, is co-located in Cleveland and Washington, D.C. Funders often find themselves in Cleveland, and increasingly in other cities as well, to understand how the anchors work together; how they set goals; the role of local funders including the Cleveland Foundation; and, importantly, to see results from the work. Unlike other more developed fields, the available information on anchor institutions is limited (though growing quickly); therefore, the ability to talk to others who are doing the work and have a hands-on understanding of practical examples has been essential for many funders. Funders interviewed for this research repeatedly emphasized the value of using site visits as a way to help promote the concept of investment in anchor institutions for civic leaders who are reticent to engage in the work.



# IMPORTANT ROLES FUNDERS CAN PLAY

## Grant Funding

The findings from this research indicate that funders (i.e. foundations and other entities whose primary purpose is to make charitable grants) can play important roles in the evolution of a local anchor strategy, from providing grants to lending a degree of credibility to an emerging effort. In this section we will review the multiple ways that funders can help catalyze anchor efforts and then sustain an initiative once it is underway.

Over the life of an anchor strategy, funder partners are likely to deploy grant funds for a wide variety of things, often concurrently. For example, in the early phases of development, a funder might support education and travel costs to bring local anchors representatives and partners to another community, such as Cleveland, to witness the successes of an established anchor strategy. Simultaneously, they might underwrite the costs of convening local anchor institutions. As the initiative continues and one or more anchor institutions embrace the effort, funders may be asked to fund basic research to understand things such as the number of employees who are hired from the local community. In some instances, for example with The Denver Foundation, the first grant a funder might make could be to support efforts that ensure that the community is engaged early and meaningfully. Over time, as an initiative matures,

more robust technical assistance may be needed to help strengthen the impact of an initiative's programs. For example, if a group of anchor institutions decides to embark on a project to develop a new food distribution facility for local farmers, funding might be used to support a technical assistance provider with expertise in food production and distribution. Sometimes program grants or investments are provided to partner organizations who are key to implementation of an anchor strategy. For example, a grant to a local workforce development program or a program related investment (PRI) in support of a community development finance institutions (CDFI) that is supporting local minority-owned businesses. All of this work requires coordination, which typically is done by a local intermediary, community foundation, or independent contractor and requires funding to support the operations of the initiative (though, in the case of a community foundation serving as a backbone entity, the support may be in-kind.)

## Early Catalyst

Funders often play the role of catalyst in the early stages of an anchor institutions initiative. Numerous interviewees stressed the important role that funders often play in the developmental stages of an anchor initiative. In fact, people suggested that the convening


**Grant funding for anchor institutions generally falls into one of the following categories:**

- **Education**, including travel costs to learn about anchor institutions
- **Convening**
- **General support** costs such as staff/consultant fees
- **Community engagement**
- **Research**
- **Capacity building**
- **Evaluation**
- **Programs**, including grants to nonprofit and for-profit partners
- **Policy/Advocacy**

role that funders play can have a profound impact on the efficacy of an initiative.

Sometimes the role a funder plays is overt: In Chicago, the Polk Bros. Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation used their convening power to help bring the mayor and presidents of local anchor institutions together to agree on a vision and a plan for creating a collaborative made up of health and educational institutions. Similarly, in the Twin Cities, the Central Corridor Funders Collaborative took an active role in connecting a multi-sector community economic development effort to anchor institutions based within the new light rail corridor because they understood the power of anchor institutions to influence local economic development goals. In other instances the role of a funder has been more subtle. In Denver, for example, The Denver Foundation suggested to the nascent Community-Campus Partnership (CCP) on the Anschutz Medical Campus that they might provide a grant to CCP to support the salary of a community organizer. This offer of early funding encouraged the CCP to develop relationships with the community, which has had a transformative impact on the CCP's

**Figure 2: Types of Activities Funded in Anchors Work**



mission and goals, as well as their ability to achieve their long-term objectives. As the CCP's work has continued to evolve, The Denver Foundation has taken a more visible role in organizing a new learning community of anchor institutions from the broader Metro Denver region.

### **Dependable, Long-Term Partners**

Because anchors work does not happen overnight, it is important for everyone involved to understand that a sustained commitment to the work is necessary in order for there to be lasting results. The Baltimore Integration Partnership (BIP) provides a good example of how both local and national funders have made a long-term investment to support an unprecedented collaboration between the city's major hospitals and universities. On the local side, the Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers has been the hub of BIP from its inception, while The Annie E. Casey Foundation has served as both a funder and a member of the leadership board and work committees. Much of the funding for BIP has come from national sources, such as the Living Cities Integration Initiative and the Surdna Foundation.

In the Twin Cities, The McKnight Foundation and the Central Corridor Funders Collaborative were both involved in the early efforts of the Central Corridor Anchors Partnership (CCAP) and representatives from the participating foundations continue to play an active role in the executive committee and the steering committee of the CCAP. However, because the funders decided early on that they wanted the participating anchor institutions to be the main funders and thereby take responsibility for the partnership, the funders only provided financial support to the partnership for two years. The ongoing commitment from the foundation in this case is not illustrated so much by their financial commitment, but rather by their willingness to continue to lend their expertise and social capital to the effort.

## Neutral Convener of Anchor Networks

Regardless of whether anchor institutions are for-profit or nonprofit corporations, they are always concerned about their bottom lines. Along with that concern is an awareness of the competitive environment in which they operate. For many anchor institutions, the notion of gathering with their “competitors” to co-develop a set of goals and objectives is antithetical to their training and experience. It requires a mindset that is community-oriented and one that connects community benefit to institutional benefit. In the network mindset, the prevailing view is one in which a rising tide can lift all boats. Given that, the process of establishing a robust anchor network necessitates attention to process and developing strong relationships and trust. A neutral convener who can help create a more even playing field and build trust among the anchor institutions is therefore essential.

In many communities, funders play that essential role of helping level the playing field and create a fertile environment for relationship building. Sometimes this is done in partnership with a local or national intermediary. For example, as an influential civic leader in New Mexico, the Albuquerque Community Foundation plays the role of backbone and neutral convener of the Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque anchor network; however, they are assisted by The Democracy Collaborative, which provides expertise in creating multi-anchor partnerships. While funders may not always be aware of the pivotal role that they play, their anchor partners are. As the president of one anchor institution says, “The vision and encouragement from foundations is important, but the secret in the sauce is the presidents [of the anchor institutions] seeing themselves as partners not competitors and that comes at least in part from philanthropic encouragement.”

## Financial Leverage and Co-Investment

The significance of funders’ credibility is also relevant when it comes to leveraging financial capital. As an initiative grows in size and complexity (which is not to be assumed in all communities), local funders and anchor institutions almost always turn to other sources of funding for support. Especially in communities with aggressive financial goals that are often tied to community development objectives—such as in Baltimore, where the Baltimore Integration Partnership sought more than \$150 million in capital to underwrite its community development objectives in the first round of the **BIP**—local funders have played a critical role in helping leverage new capital. In the Baltimore example, additional funding came from workforce training programs, city and state funds, and national foundations. In other communities, funders and intermediaries (and intermediaries that *are* funders) have played important roles in bringing local community-based organizations working in the anchors arena to the attention of other funders. In the case of the Albuquerque Community Foundation, Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque was brought to the attention of hundreds of donors through a high-profile fundraising event hosted by the foundation. Funders have an abundance of ways to use their leverage in the community to support anchor efforts and simultaneously help achieve their programmatic objectives.

# LESSONS LEARNED

Without exception, the representatives of anchor institutions and intermediaries who were interviewed for this report were complimentary of and grateful for the support of the funders who support their efforts. However, like the funders themselves, they also recognize that there are limits around the roles that funders play. The following observations were provided by funders, anchor institutions, and/or intermediaries who shared them with the hope of encouraging successful and lasting investments in anchor institutions and networks.

## **Setting and Managing Expectations**

A challenge that a number of individuals identified is the tension that can sometimes exist between funders' expectations for progress—both the pace and the measurable results—as compared to what is feasible. On the one hand, as indicated above, collaboration takes time—and collaboration among large, sometimes competitive institutions, takes even more time. On the other hand, funders often have a desire to see results quickly and to set benchmarks and expectations for a return on investment that are unreasonable given the challenges of authentic collaboration. As a result, efforts may proceed too quickly and the key element of engagement and trust may be compromised in the name of meeting funders' goals.

Similarly, funders sometimes articulate a desire for achieving programmatic objectives that are simply not consistent with the

needs of people and institutions of that community. Another related challenge is when the funding priorities of a foundation change in the middle of a complex collaborative initiative. One veteran of working with funders said, “Sometimes the framework for funders changes so often that you feel you have to make a shift to fit this year’s vision.” This ends up compromising the ultimate efficacy of the initiative. While this phenomenon is certainly not unique to anchors work, it is amplified when the effort includes working with networks of large complex institutions that move relatively slowly and when collaboration is necessary but not always natural.

## **Engage the Community Early and Authentically**

Like many large institutions, anchor institutions are often self-referential and do not seek outside input regarding their operations or culture. The concept of soliciting and acting on input from the local community can be unfamiliar to anchor institutions. And yet, to develop and implement a plan to improve the local economy or community, it is critical to do this with the active involvement of the community. Funders can help facilitate deeper connections between the local community and anchor institutions or they can exacerbate the gulfs that exist. In this research, a number of individuals pointed out that funders do not always understand the importance of community connections to anchor institutions work and disregard natural opportunities for building connections. For example, local nonprofit organizations

often have deep and trusted relationships with their communities, but they are not always invited to participate in anchor initiatives. According to some interviewees, this is a lost opportunity that would help make the work ultimately more cost-effective and productive. One survey respondent put it this way: “If the work is not deeply grounded in authentic engagement of directly affected community members, and if these leaders are not at the decision-making table from the beginning, you will waste a lot of time and money designing something that doesn’t work and that no one wants.”

**Beyond Fad Funding**

Many foundations, including a number that are featured in this report, adopted an anchors strategy years ago and are continuing to provide support. Others are new to the anchor field, but have devoted significant time, energy, and resources into developing a meaningful anchor strategy that is aligned with their other strategic priorities. However, some key informants who were interviewed for this report voiced a concern that some funders may be taking a cavalier approach to funding anchor institutions. As is true in many fields, funders sometimes pursue funding opportunities because they are in fashion, instead of adopting new opportunities because they are strategic and will offer a good

return on investment. Without a doubt, there is widespread belief that investments in anchor institutions can be an excellent way to achieve a variety of goals related to economic opportunity, social justice, and improved health and environmental outcomes. The question posed is not whether an anchor institutions strategy works. The question is whether the funders have the commitment to stay with the strategy when new, compelling issues might lure them away from the long-term commitment that is needed.

In the following section, a number of case studies are presented that illustrate how local and national funders have worked with local anchor institutions and intermediary partners to create healthier, more economically vibrant communities. In each of the profiled communities, which include Albuquerque, Baltimore, Chicago, Denver and the Twin Cities, we learn about how funders are extending beyond traditional grantmaking roles to embrace their roles as conveners and leaders in their communities.



**Figure 3: External Barriers of Anchors Work**

**Top External Barriers with Individual Anchor Institutions**

- 43%** Lack of commitment by leadership to dedicate human and financial resources
- 38%** Lack of community involvement encouraging anchor leaders to get involved

Note: 29% of the respondents marked Not Applicable

**Top External Barriers with Anchor Networks**

- 30%** Lack of commitment by leadership within anchor institution(s)
- 25%** Weak support for the work by a critical mass of network/collaborative members

Note: 30% of the respondents marked Not Applicable

# V

## MOVING FORWARD: FUNDERS LEARNING AND ACTING TOGETHER

As these case studies and the results of the survey data indicate, funders have a lot to share about their experiences working with anchor institutions. While there are no precise templates for working with anchor institutions—because local context dictates what is most appropriate in any given community—there are clearly a number of lessons to be learned from funders. Furthermore, the field is expanding rapidly as is evidenced by the increased interest in the Anchor Institutions Funders’ Group (AIFG) and the abundance of stories that surfaced in the survey and case studies. Our experience shows that the interest in anchors is widespread coming from place-based foundations and national funders from across the country, and from foundations representing a plethora of different programmatic interest areas. Anchor insti-

tutions, in short, are increasingly perceived to be important strategic partners that can be instrumental in creating opportunity for local communities. The AIFG is building its capacity to respond to specific interests identified by funders. For example, when funders who responded to the survey were asked to rank the *resources that would be most helpful for their anchors work*, (see figure 4, page 32) the top two included building communities of practice with other foundations and research or documentation on best practices for foundations. These were followed by strategies for economic development as well as examples of strategies for impact investing.


At the same time, through the survey data it also became clear that there are some critical enablers and barriers that funders

face in supporting anchor institutions and networks of anchors, as well as resources that could be helpful to funders. Funders indicated that the top two *factors most likely to increase or decrease support of anchors work* (see figure 5, page 32) were, a.) the commitment demonstrated by the anchor institutions’ leadership, and b.) the funders’ (in) ability to demonstrate impact resulting from support for anchor institutions.


The results from the survey and case studies help paint a picture of a funder community that is eager to continue to deepen its knowledge of strategies for working with anchor institutions. They also show that there is a strong desire for continued engagement and knowledge sharing among funders. Moreover, for funders to maintain and even expand their investments in

anchor initiatives, there is a need for more robust documentation of success and models that can help leverage foundation investments. The AIFG is eager to work with funders who are already working with anchor institutions and those who are considering it to build a thoughtful, well-informed community of funders and partners who seek to make positive and enduring local impacts through engaging with anchor institutions.

**Figure 4: Resources Identified by Funders as Helpful for Anchors Work**



**Figure 5: Ranked Factors Most Likely to Increase or Decrease Support of Anchors Work**



# CASE STUDIES

Baltimore

Chicago

Twin Cities

Denver

Albuquerque



# Putting Equity and Opportunity at the Heart of Strategy

## CASE STUDY: **BALTIMORE**

**Program:** Baltimore Integration Partnership

**Geography:** Baltimore, Md.

**Organizing Entity:** Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers

### Participating Anchor Institutions:

Bon Secours Hospital  
Coppin State University  
Johns Hopkins University  
Johns Hopkins Hospital  
Kaiser Permanente  
LifeBridge Health  
Loyola University Maryland  
Maryland Institute College of Art  
Morgan State University  
Notre Dame of Maryland University  
Towson University  
University of Baltimore  
University of Maryland-Baltimore  
University of Maryland Medical Center

### Key Foundations:

The Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Associated Black Charities  
The Goldseker Foundation  
Surdna Foundation  
Living Cities

### Key Intermediaries:

Reinvestment Fund  
Job Opportunities Task Force  
Humanim

### Goals of Initiative:

Connect low-income Baltimore City residents to economic opportunity.

### Strategies:

*Purchasing* - Connect local, small and minority-owned businesses to anchor procurement opportunities in Baltimore and the region.

*Hiring* - Insure equitable opportunity connecting low-income residents to jobs within anchors and anchor-supporting businesses in Baltimore and the region.

*Reinvestment* - Make intentional local investments in real estate and small businesses to foster and support broader community benefit.

### Results:

- Fourteen institutions have new economic inclusion practices, programs and new community focused initiatives.
- Two institutions have announced formal inclusion goals; eight institutions have set draft hiring and purchasing goals.
- One new real estate fund with inclusion goals.
- Three new business development initiatives with two more being developed.
- One proposed business improvement district.
- One new workforce training program led by anchors.
- One new social enterprise launched by anchor procurement.
- Four catalytic community reinvestment projects driven by anchor commitments.

### Stage of Development:



Anchor institutions work has been going on in Baltimore for several years. As in many other cities, aligning the work of multiple anchor institutions that do not have a history of cooperation and collaboration is challenging. With that in mind, when an initiative called the Living Cities Integration Initiative invited cities from around the United States to submit proposals in 2010 to support cross-sector leaders in cities that were implementing “bold, promising approaches that have the potential to transform the lives of low-income people and communities,” a number of leaders came together to apply.

Among them was The Annie E. Casey Foundation, which is based in Baltimore and has a deep commitment to improving schools, health, economic opportunities and neighborhoods for local kids and families in Baltimore. Given the foundation’s long history of working with Johns Hopkins University and the East Baltimore Development Initiative, they were quick to jump at the opportunity to bring new investment into Baltimore. The Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers, along with Johns Hopkins University and Johns Hopkins Hospital, the Maryland Institute College of Art, the City of Baltimore, and members of the Baltimore Neighborhood Collaborative, submitted a proposal that was subsequently funded. The Baltimore Integration Partnership (BIP) was born.

The mission of the first incarnation of the Baltimore Integration Partnership, affectionately known as BIP 1.0, was to reconnect low-income Baltimore residents to the regional economy, maximize the linkage between physical and human capital development, and reinvest in targeted inner-core neighborhoods so

that they become regionally competitive, economically diverse, sustainable communities of choice. The first round of the initiative focused on capital investment and workforce development with anchor institutions as a sub-strategy. After a strong first round of project and system level outcomes, partners agreed to dig deeper into the anchor institution agenda as a way to create much-needed jobs. Through the process of working together to set and implement ambitious goals and strategies, and with encouragement resulting from an initiative by then-Mayor

*Sometimes the most important roles we can play are providing technical assistance, in convening stakeholders and through the sharing of results and lessons.”*

Stephanie Rawlings-Blake to strengthen anchor institution roles in the city, the BIP re-organized itself in 2014 with a new strategy that puts aligning and supporting anchor institutions as key drivers of economic opportunity at the heart of the strategy.

Today, BIP 2.0 is thriving and has an ambitious agenda and multiple funders, including continued support from Living Cities, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Surdna Foundation. Like other networks of anchor institutions, in addition to developing shared outcomes, individual anchors that are involved in the BIP develop their own goals and strategies. Some of these strategies might have been in play prior to the BIP, but as Sammy Hoi, president of the Maryland Institute College of Art says, “We have been involved in community leadership work

# BALTIMORE

for many years but even so, we take our **BIP** goals very seriously. It has been very affirmative.”

Organizing the various anchor institutions in Baltimore, which have huge challenges in front of them, took a long time. At different points in the process, everyone seems to concur that people got frustrated with the slow pace. It was at these points that it was especially useful to have a neutral convener organizing the anchor institutions work: the Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers. As an affinity group of philanthropic organizations, **ABAG** has the credibility to bring the anchor institutions together and, more important, to keep them at the table. It has also been able to leverage the support of the core funders to bring in new local and national funders, including the Surdna Foundation, which has become an active supporter of the **BIP**. Various funders, including The Annie E. Casey Foundation, also sit at the leadership table alongside the anchors, where they play an important role. As Kurt Sommer, director of the **BIP** says, an essential part of this success hinged on having an individual funder like The Annie E. Casey Foundation and the engagement of a national funder collaborative such as Living Cities actively involved. “As a foundation partner, Annie E. Casey helped make this project possible by helping to catalyze the application to Living Cities. Together, Casey, Surdna and Living Cities have been financial backers as well as the visionaries for how multi-sector initiatives can work together for broader community benefit.” Since then, in addition to providing essential operating support, foundation partners have often connected the **BIP** to new research, best practices in workforce and small business development, and a national network of resources including other cities that are also working in this growing area. Local foundations and public partners have also played critical roles helping co-invest in workforce initiatives and community

development projects, including the Central Baltimore Future Fund, a new real estate investment loan fund with economic inclusion goals.

Charles Rutheiser, senior associate at the Center for Civic Sites and Community Change at The Annie E. Casey Foundation, manages a national portfolio of grants focused on assisting universities, hospitals and other anchor institutions in changing the ways that they engage with their communities to improve outcomes for children and their families. He is also a member of **BIP**'s Local Purchasing/ Small Business Development workgroup. From his time working with **BIP**, as well as his national work, Rutheiser has seen and learned a lot about how funders can support anchor institutions: “Sometimes a lot of the focus is on the grants we can provide and, yes, making meaningful changes in how institutions and systems function requires financial resources. But the roles of funders extend well beyond funding. Sometimes the most important roles we can play are providing technical assistance, in convening stakeholders and through the sharing of results and lessons.” A good example of the latter role is the learning network that links the sites in the Living Cities Integration Initiative. That network, Rutheiser notes, “has been responsible for upping the games of all the participating cities when it comes to anchor practice. However, it is only one of several existing networks that link individual anchor institutions and groups of anchor institutions in cities around the United States. **BIP** has emerged as important network hub in its own right.”



# A Local Network Becomes a National Model

## CASE STUDY: **CHICAGO**

**Program:** CASE (Chicago Anchors for a Strong Economy)

**Geography:** Chicago Metro Region

**Organizing Entity:** World Business Chicago

### **Participating Anchor Institutions:**

- Advocate HealthCare
- BMO Harris
- Chicago Housing Authority
- City of Chicago
- Cook County
- ComEd
- Chicago Transit Authority
- Illinois Institute of Technology
- Museums in the Park
- Northwestern Medicine
- Northwestern University
- Presence Health
- Rush University Medical Center
- University of Chicago
- University of Chicago Medicine
- University of Illinois Chicago

### **Key Foundations:**

- Polk Bros. Foundation
- Surdna Foundation
- Heron Foundation
- MacArthur Foundation

### **Key Intermediaries:**

- NextStreet
- The Democracy Collaborative
- U3 Advisors

### **Goals of Initiative:**

- Increase local spending
- Facilitate new contracts
- Increase local hiring

### **Strategies:**

- Driving demand
- Matchmaking between anchors and local businesses
- Strengthening the collective

### **Results:**

- 443 businesses assisted.
- 180 jobs created, 53 percent to low-income individuals.
- \$51.8 million in revenue committed to small businesses through multi-year anchor contractors.

### **Stage of Development:**



Like many origin stories in the anchor institutions funding field, the story of Chicago Anchors for a Strong Economy (CASE) includes a trip to Cleveland. Through a partnership between the Cleveland Foundation and local anchor institutions, and with help from The Democracy Collaborative, Cleveland has become a model for local economic development through strong anchor institutions. In 2012, Deborah Bennett, senior program officer at the Polk Bros. Foundation in Chicago, learned about

programs, Julia Stasch (now the president of the MacArthur Foundation), had a similar vision for connecting business, philanthropy and anchor institutions to improve economic opportunity in some of Chicago's most disinvested neighborhoods. The confluence of interest by these three individuals formed the basis of what is now known as Chicago Anchors for a Strong Economy, or CASE.

Stasch and Douglas, who were already connected through their involvement with World Business Chicago, a public-private partnership that drives inclusive economic growth and job creation in the city, understood that to collectively organize anchors they would need the support of top leadership from a number of institutions. With that in mind, they enlisted the support of

*CASE is now a model for anchor networks nationally. CASE's efforts have resulted in greater collaboration and shared programming among the anchor institutions.*

the Cleveland model and organized a visit for a group of colleagues interested in innovative economic development models. Moved by the successes she saw in Cleveland, she reached out to the University of Chicago's new vice president of civic engagement and external affairs, Derek Douglas. With his long history in government and community engagement, Douglas shared an interest in mobilizing anchor institutions as centers of economic opportunity and equity. Moreover, he was already working to move the University of Chicago toward a local hiring strategy, called U Chicago Local, aimed at maximizing the university's power as a purchaser and employer to strengthen businesses and create employment opportunities for the people on the south side of Chicago. Meanwhile, the MacArthur Foundation's vice president for U.S.

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Cook County Board President Toni Preckwinkle. Together, they called a meeting of city and county leaders, heads of anchor institutions and funders. From there, a vision for a hub for anchor institutions was created. The members of the group established a collective vision, set broad goals related to local hiring and procurement, and agreed that they would need comprehensive data to guide and measure the results of their work, all of which would require financial support. The Polk Bros. Foundation provided almost all of the early funding for capacity building, including initial funding for data collection. Other funding for specific anchor projects, including the U Chicago Local project, was provided by the Surdna Foundation, while the Heron Foundation provided support for strategic planning. Over time, each of the participating

anchor institutions also contributed to the effort. CASE is now a model for anchor networks nationally. CASE's efforts have resulted in greater collaboration and shared programming among the anchor institutions by each providing an annual contribution. Today, approximately 80 percent of CASE's revenues come from anchor institutions.

CASE is now a model for anchor networks nationally. CASE's efforts have resulted in greater collaboration and shared programming among the anchor institutions. Overall, CASE can track \$51.8 million in revenue that has been committed to small businesses through multi-year contracts with local anchor institutions. It also has documented the development of 180 new jobs, of which 53 percent are held by low-income individuals from the Chicago area. They are pleased to report that 40 percent of the businesses that have interacted with CASE are minority- or women-owned, which results in increased income and wealth generation for their target communities.

As members of CASE's leadership all agree, the work has taken some time but it is paying off. Without financial support and leadership from foundations, however, it probably wouldn't have happened at all. Nitika Nautiyal, CASE's executive director, says, "Without Deborah Bennett at the Polk Bros. Foundation, CASE wouldn't have happened." While a foundation can't do it alone, their role with anchors work is often essential. But it's not always the money that makes the key difference. Speaking of the various roles that foundations have played with CASE, Derek Douglas of the University of Chicago says, "Foundations are central. When it's a new idea, it's not going to happen unless we can get foundation support. With a lot of our work, you need the foundations to help be the catalyst. You need the foundations to fund things we as anchors can't do, to take the risks that universities won't. They also have a lot of credibility because they have seen what works and what doesn't. They elevate things."

# CHICAGO



# 'Corridor of Opportunity' Inspires a Unique Model

CASE STUDY:

## TWIN CITIES

**Program:** Central Corridor Anchor Partnership

**Geography:** Minneapolis and Saint Paul, Minn.

**Organizing Entity:** Central Corridor Anchor Partnership

### Participating Anchor Institutions:

- Augsburg College
- Bethel University
- Fairview Health Services
- HealthEast Care System
- Metropolitan State University
- Minnesota Community and Technical College
- Regions Hospital/HealthPartners
- St. Catherine University
- Saint Paul College
- University of Minnesota
- University of St. Thomas

### Key Foundations:

- The McKnight Foundation
- The Saint Paul Foundation
- Central Corridor Funders Collaborative

### Key Intermediaries:

- Smith Partners
- Ellen Watters Consulting
- Nexus Community Partners (Northside and East Side funders groups)

### Goals of Initiative:

- Achieve a workforce among anchor institutions that is more representative of the diverse communities along the Central Corridor and contributes to better local

health outcomes, improved educational achievement and increased household incomes.

- Grow anchor purchasing from local communities and communities of color while providing cost savings to collaborative members.
- Help employees and students use the Green Line and other transit options to better connect to economic opportunities.
- Create wealth in communities of color adjacent to the Central Corridor by connecting anchor institutions and local partners to align and leverage community resources.

### Strategies:

- Local purchasing
- Collective procurement
- Local employment, including increased racial diversity in hiring
- Increase transit usage
- Improve last-mile connections

### Results:

- Five mechanisms for joint contracting established .

- 540 participants in fellowship program resulting in 238 students with paid employment at an average hourly rate of \$14.03 (majority low-income and students of color).
- 157 students attended SCRUBS workforce development program on two campuses, (majority low-income and students of color).
- Established preferred purchasing options for anchor institutions in CCAP resulting in discount levels for participating anchors: Appliances (25-35 percent discount); Window cleaning, snow removal (40 percent discount).
- Establishment and adoption of MetroPass program for anchor employees, faculty and students along new transit line.

### Stage of Development:



The Central Corridor Funders Collaborative (CCFC) was founded in 2007 by 14 local and national foundations to create a “corridor of opportunity” along a new light rail line in Minneapolis and Saint Paul. First and foremost, the funders collaborative was created to help ensure that the local community members—many of whom are low-wealth and people of color—felt the economic and social benefits that resulted from the light rail line. The funders collaborative also sought to minimize the negative impacts that typically arise from gentrification, such as the displacement of long-time residents. Core elements of the collaborative included protecting and expanding local businesses and opportunities for employment among local community members; creating vibrant places along the light rail line; and keeping housing options available to residents at all income levels.

As the collaborative evolved and learned from other national best practices, a formal anchor institution strategy emerged as a potential way to help achieve the CCFC’s ambitious goals. As a participant in the Living Cities Integration Initiative, compelling stories from other cities regarding the purchasing, hiring, and placemaking power of anchor institutions were highlighted. The Central Corridor had no less than 17 educational or medical anchors within walking distance of the light rail line, yet there was no coordinated effort that could align the collective power of anchors, even as individual institutions were embracing important anchor roles on their own. The McKnight Foundation was interested in the potential of anchor institutions in supporting economically efficient, environmentally sound and socially equitable regions. As a result, McKnight funded the first environmental scan of anchor institution work in the Twin Cities. From that scan titled, “Creating Shared Value”, the community learned that the anchor institutions along the Central Corridor collectively employed

67,000 people, educated 115,000 students, spent \$6.6 billion in annual payroll, and projected more than \$5 billion in capital investments in the foreseeable future. Armed with the data, McKnight, Augsburg College, and HealthPartners convened a meeting of the presidents of the anchor institutions based in the Central Corridor and proposed a partnership.

As the new Central Corridor Anchor Institutions Partnership was forming, The McKnight Foundation and the CCFC provided early seed funding for the partnership. However, McKnight

*“Because of their long-term commitment to the work, the foundations challenge us every once in a while if they see things going astray. They are our conscience.”*

Program Officer Eric Muschler was very clear from the start that it would be best for the anchor institutions to also support the work: “Our strategy was to say we’re going to give you seed funding and some rocket-fuel funding to get this thing off the ground, but if it’s really going to work, it has to be based on the self-interest of the anchor partners.” Therefore, starting from the partnership’s inception, the 13 participating anchor institutions were asked to contribute increasing amounts over time to sustain the central coordination of effort across all anchor partners. All but two of the anchor institutions made the decision to continue participation beyond the initial grant funding, making the Twin Cities a unique model for a self-supported anchor network.

# TWIN CITIES

Interestingly, even though the financial support from foundations did not continue after two years of initial funding, the funders continue to play important roles with the collaborative. For example, a representative from The Saint Paul Foundation serves on the executive committee of the collaborative and The McKnight Foundation continues to participate on the collaborative's steering committee. Paul Pribbenow, the president of Augsburg College, notes that, "Because of their long-term commitment to the work, the foundations challenge us every once in a while if they see things going astray. They are our conscience."

The Central Corridor Anchors Partnership continues to sustain its collective work and it maintains strong buy-in from its institutional partners. As the work of the funders collaborative and the anchors partnership has evolved, two additional initiatives have formed in the region: the Northside Funders Group and East Side Funders Group, both of which are looking at ways to leverage anchor institution work to more deeply touch the people and places they target. Nexus Community Partners, a local intermediary that convenes the East Side Funders Group, has furthered the understanding and opportunities of anchor work by bringing The Democracy Collaborative to town and expanding the technical and organizing capacity of community-based organizations to partner and develop shared priorities and agendas.

As an intermediary, Nexus uses an ecosystem approach to anchor institution work that first begins with its community partners. They provide technical assistance and funding to support nonprofits in communities of color, helping them build organizational capacity and test new strategies that build community wealth. Nexus then develops a bridge between its community, philanthropic, and anchor partners. A successful example of this approach involves the Hmong American

Farmers Association (**HAF**A), a Nexus grantee, and HealthEast Care System, a local anchor institution and a member of the East Side Funders Group. Partnering with **HAF**A's Alternative Markets Program, HealthEast joined forces with Regions Hospital and Fairview Health to work with Sodexo, their institutional food services provider. Using their collective bargaining influence, they were ultimately successful in getting Sodexo to commit to purchasing local produce from local growers, including the members of **HAF**A. According to Elena Gaarder, program officer for Nexus Community Partners, "Anchor institutions are key partners in community wealth creation. When they have a sense of mutuality and interdependence with community, they can be instrumental in shaping a neighborhood's long-term economic vitality."

Anchor institutions in the Twin Cities have shown a remarkable willingness to work together to achieve their shared goals. Along with the funding community and key intermediaries, they also share a desire to continue to improve and deepen their impact. By working with groups like Nexus Community Partners that help connect local communities, especially communities of color and low-income communities, anchors in the region are showing a willingness to grow and change how they work. Over the years, they have come to realize that by working together, they are far more likely to have a sustained impact that will result in improved economic, environmental, and social outcomes for the whole community.



# Forging Community Connections

## CASE STUDY: **DENVER**

**Program:** Community-Campus Partnership and Denver Anchors Cohort at Mile High Connects  
**Geography:** Metro Denver  
**Organizing Entity:** University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus and Mile High Connects

### Participating Anchor Institutions:

- University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus Community-Campus Partnership
- Members:
  - University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
  - UCHealth/University of Colorado Hospital
  - Children's Hospital Colorado
- Participants in Emerging Anchors Cohort:
  - Adams County Housing Authority
  - Denver Public Schools
  - Centura Health
  - City and County of Denver
  - Colorado State University, National Western Center
  - Community College of Denver
  - Regis University
  - University of Colorado Denver
  - University of Denver

### Key Foundations:

- The Denver Foundation
- The Colorado Health Foundation

### Key Intermediaries:

- The Democracy Collaborative
- Mile High Connects

### Goals of Initiative:

- To support partnerships already present within the campus and surrounding neighborhoods.
- To increase our access to one another in a coordinated way that makes programs more useful and relevant to people on both sides of the partnership.
- To identify new programs and call them into existence by virtue of coordinated joint efforts.
- To maintain relationships throughout the duration of programs.

### Strategies:

- Learn Local Program
- Hire Local Program
- Engage with local resident leaders

### Results:

- Hired 391 members from local community.
- Graduated 80 students primarily from local neighborhoods from 10-week training program for entry-level healthcare workers; hired 59 percent of graduates with 98 percent retention rate.

### Stage of Development:



*We envision a partnership that is equitable, mutually respectful, sustainable, responsive and that results in vibrant, healthy, learning communities both on and off campus.*

Aurora Colorado is the third-largest city in Colorado and is home to several military bases, a robust entrepreneurial and arts culture, and a diverse population that includes immigrants and refugees. But with those assets has come challenges, most notably the economic devastation that accompanied the closure of two major military bases in Aurora in the late 20th century. In the early 2000s, the future started to look brighter when a multi-billion dollar project on the northwest side of the city was announced on the site of the Fitzsimons Army Medical Center. The Anschutz Medical Campus would bring billions of dollars of investment to an economically blighted part of the city and serve as home to four institutional power houses: the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (now known as the CU Anschutz Medical Campus); the University of Colorado Hospital; Children's Hospital of Colorado; and, when it is completed, the newest Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility. The campus opened in 2007 and now employs more than 21,000 people.

Local leaders were understandably excited about the development to be built in Aurora, a suburb of Denver. But over time, local community members began to see the campus as a fortress that was disconnected from the local community. In 2012, the CU chancellor requested four university faculty at Anschutz, who were known for their leadership in community-engaged scholarship, to conduct a study of relations between the community and the campus, and determine the feasibility and interest

in developing a program that would facilitate mutually beneficial connections and partnerships. Such an effort would also help the university achieve its strategic goals around improving diversity and inclusion. The recommendations in the feasibility study led to the creation of a planning committee of community and campus leaders which developed the Community-Campus Partnership (CCP).

During the planning phase of the initiative (2012-13), the CCP's planning committee identified a "hire local" strategy as an initial signature project to help connect the community to the campus. At the same time, the CCP developed a relationship with The Denver Foundation, which had recently adopted a community wealth-building framework for their Economic Opportunity program area. The Denver Foundation funded CCP's community connector staff position, which proved to be an essential development that ensured an early commitment to meaningful engagement with the local community. Today, the full-time community connector coordinates the CCP's Resident Leader Council (RLC), comprised of people living in the adjoining neighborhoods. The RLC helps to inform the work of the CCP and ensure the best interests of the community. One of the RLC's first activities in 2014-15 was to conduct a "Connections Campaign" that involved reaching out to their respective networks to learn more about what the community wanted from the campus and how they could work together. The Connections Campaign re-affirmed the community's interest in obtaining jobs

on the campus, as did subsequent focus groups conducted in the community in 2015.

The Denver Foundation saw great potential in the CCP and connected the CCP with The Democracy Collaborative. This in turn led to The Denver Foundation supporting a delegation of 18 campus and community leaders to participate on a learning journey to Cleveland, to learn about Cleveland's Greater University Circle Initiative and the various community wealth-building strategies in which those anchor institutions are engaged.

Building on their experience with the CCP, in 2015 The Denver Foundation connected with a historic Jesuit university on the west side of Denver, Regis University. Regis was also working to develop partnerships with local community members. The university's initial commitment was based in large part on their commitment to service learning. Then, a catalyzing moment came when a local developer sought to engage the university in an effort to create healthy, active living opportunities in the community. Given the health focus of this effort, The Colorado Health Foundation stepped in and provided funding to Regis to explore the opportunity. And, once again, The Denver Foundation helped connect The Democracy Collaborative to the effort and provided funding to support a community organizing staff person.

Having seen the positive results of their investments in the CCP and Regis University, it isn't too surprising that in 2016 they encouraged a local nonprofit

partner, Mile High Connects, to explore interest among local anchor institutions in creating a learning network. Mile High Connects (MHC) is a broad partnership of organizations from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors that are committed to increasing access to housing choices, good jobs, quality schools, and essential services via public transit. MHC's mission is to ensure that the Metro Denver regional transit system fosters communities that offer all residents the opportunity for a high quality of life. Thus, they have plenty of experience serving as a backbone organization to emerging networks—or even networks of networks, which the Denver model is, considering that the Community-Campus Partnership is a member. Moreover, the potential for creating economic opportunity for low-income communities through investments in anchor institutions convinced Mile High Connects that a relatively small commitment of time and energy to build a network of anchor institutions could result in huge impacts for the community.

The Denver Foundation embraced its role as a community leader years ago and has been actively seeking to multiply its impact through its role as convener, connector, and funder. In fact, The Denver Foundation's ability to convene and support civic endeavors through its deep relationships and credibility is often at least as important as their financial contributions, and oftentimes more so. According to Robert McGranaghan, the director of CCP, "The work would have happened very differently without The Denver Foundation. Even though the university had agreed to fund

us initially, having the foundation come to the table gave us internal legitimacy initially. Further, having the economic opportunity priority area gave us further knowledge on how to do a hire local program. They also connected us to The Democracy Collaborative and the emerging anchors group in the region. I think we would still be here and doing some of what we are doing, but they've given us a lot more oomph and it's been really instrumental." As for what The Denver Foundation gets out of it, as Patrick Horvath, deputy vice president of programs says, "With our strong values around inclusiveness, racial equity, and community engagement, we saw connecting community members to anchor institutions, and helping anchors develop strategies to use their economic power to improve local economies, as a great fit. We knew that we didn't have the money to make a dent in the large-scale workforce system, but influencing anchor institutions to work at the neighborhood level and to directly engage with local residents fit with our role as a community foundation."

# DENVER





# Collaboration Builds a Healthier Community

CASE STUDY:

## ALBUQUERQUE

**Program:** Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque

**Geography:** Albuquerque, N.M.

**Organizing Entity:** Albuquerque Community Foundation

**Participating Anchor Institutions:**

- Albuquerque Public Schools
- Central New Mexico Community College
- City of Albuquerque
- First Choice Community Healthcare
- Presbyterian Healthcare Services
- University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center

**Key Foundations:**

- Albuquerque Community Foundation

**Key Intermediaries:**

- Democracy Collaborative

**Goals of Initiative:**

- Buy local
- Hire local
- Invest in business development, primarily in underinvested neighborhoods in Albuquerque.

**Strategies:**

- High school student training program
- Project Carrot cooperative for local area farmers.

**Results:**

New cooperative established for local carrot farmers resulting in \$40,000 of local purchase in first year.

**Stage of Development:**



Like many visionary leaders in healthcare, Dr. Richard Larson, executive vice chancellor at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center (UNMHSC), has been giving a lot of thought to how his institution supports a healthier local community. Health, he recognizes, is not defined solely by access to healthcare. According to Dr. Larson, “We always say that wealth makes health. About 50 percent of our community’s health has nothing to do with how we deliver healthcare so we have to address socioeconomic factors. I see this as being well within the mission of hospitals and other healthcare organizations.”

His research into how healthcare providers are addressing the social determinants of health took him to

the same place that so many others had also discovered: The Cleveland Foundation, the Democracy Collaborative, and University Hospitals in Cleveland. In 2015, Dr. Larson visited Cleveland—along with Randy Royster, president and CEO of the Albuquerque Community Foundation, the chancellor of UNMHSC, and a representative from the Albuquerque mayor’s office—and came away with a vision for organizing anchor institutions in Albuquerque to maximize their collective impact for the betterment of all of Albuquerque’s residents. Upon his return, he visited with the leadership of local healthcare anchor institutions and brought them together to learn about anchor strategies from the Democracy Collaborative. New Mexico’s second-largest healthcare system, Presbyterian Healthcare Services, joined the effort and became instrumental in providing local leadership and early financial support for the initiative, along with UNMHC. The initiative expanded to include anchor institutions that are not health focused, including Albuquerque Public Schools, the City of Albuquerque, and Central New Mexico Community College.

Given the central role that The Democracy Collaborative played in Cleveland, it seemed natural to bring on the Democracy Collaborative to Albuquerque to support the city’s emerging efforts. In addition to providing a wealth of experience from its work with numerous communities that have embarked on anchor initiatives, The Democracy Collaborative adopted a coaching model for the emerging collaborative. Through the coaching process, local teams in each of the six participating anchor institutions came together to produce data and look for new opportunities to buy and hire locally. In tandem with the information and strategy

*“We always say that wealth makes health.”*

prepared by each participating institution, the anchor institutions partnership, called Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque, identified opportunities to work together to support small businesses, especially local agricultural businesses, and is developing a shared local hiring strategy.

Individually, HNA has spurred a number of the local anchor institutions to develop programs focused on hiring local, buying local, and/or investing in businesses in disinvested neighborhoods in Albuquerque. As HNA is still quite nascent, most of the individual efforts have been focused on establishing baseline data and identifying opportunities for program development. For example, the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center is currently conducting an evaluation of its local spending practices and assessing the feasibility of initiatives in purchasing, contracting/subcontracting, and construction. Similarly, the mayor’s office has created a one-page “How to do Business with the City” guide and surveyed city departments for planned 2017 purchases, which will be shared with local businesses.

Once the Albuquerque Community Foundation came on board, a new structure was created to ensure that the leadership of the participating anchor institutions maintained a strong and visible leadership role while the ACF plays the role of even-handed convener, implementer, and fundraiser. As an anchor institution itself, the community foundation is an ideal organization to house the emerging collaborative. The leadership of the community foundation certainly understands the underlying purpose of investing in a healthy local community. With its relatively new field of interest fund, which is focused on Economic and Workforce Development, it has an even greater interest in ensuring that HNA is successful. In its multi-faceted role as participant, funder and implementing agency, the Albuquerque Community Foundation has helped accelerate the initiative in ways that no single anchor institution could.

According to Dr. Larson, having the community foundation play a central role is essential to the success of the Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque. As he views it, the community foundation serves in the following ways, all of which are essential to the success of the program:

1. Neutral convener that in real and symbolic terms demonstrates that the organization is an organization of equals and is a true partnership.
2. Connector to local organizations and government agencies that are essential partners to the success of the anchors' agenda.
3. Bridge to other local and national philanthropic organizations.
4. Provider of financial support and fundraiser to support the HNA effort.<sup>2</sup>

As someone who has seen a lot of community foundations engage in anchor institutions work, Ted Howard, president of The Democracy Collaborative, is uniquely positioned to understand the contributions that community foundations, including the Albuquerque Community Foundation, can play in convening anchor institutions. He sums it up this way: "Local anchor institutions are often fierce competitors, particularly in the health sector. They don't always 'play well' together. Community foundations can create a safe place—a new table—where anchors can build trust among themselves and learn to work together in ways that are good for their bottom-line and good for the community in which they are rooted."

<sup>2</sup> As of May 2017 the Community Foundation has raised over \$55,000 in cash support for Healthy Neighborhoods Albuquerque.

# Appendix A: Interviewees

<b>Patrick Horvath</b>	Deputy Vice President of Programs, The Denver Foundation
<b>Ted Howard</b>	President, The Democracy Collaborative
<b>Dr. Richard Larson</b>	Executive Vice Chancellor, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
<b>Robert McGranaghan</b>	Director and Senior Instructor, Community-Campus Partnership, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
<b>Mike Molla</b>	Vice President for Strategic Initiatives, Maryland Institute College of Art (MICA)
<b>Eric Muschler</b>	Program Officer, The McKnight Foundation
<b>Nitika Nautiyal</b>	Executive Director, Chicago Anchors for a Strong Economy (CASE)
<b>Paul Pribbenow</b>	President, Augsburg College
<b>Randy Royster</b>	President and CEO, Albuquerque Community Foundation
<b>Charles Rutheiser</b>	Senior Associate for Civic Sites and Community Change, The Annie E. Casey Foundation
<b>Sue Scherer</b>	Associate Vice President of Community Collaboration, Regis University
<b>Kurt Sommer</b>	Director, Baltimore Integration Partnership

# Appendix B: Survey Respondents

Albuquerque Community Foundation  
Amarillo Area Foundation  
Atkinson Foundation  
Baltimore Integrative Partnership  
Benefit Chicago  
The Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Central Indiana Community Foundation  
The Chicago Community Trust  
Citi Community Development  
Cleveland Foundation  
Community Foundation of Greater Atlanta  
The Denver Foundation

East Bay Community Foundation  
Greater Milwaukee Foundation, Inc.  
Greater New Orleans Foundation  
Health Foundation of South Florida  
The F.B. Heron Foundation  
The McKnight Foundation  
Minnesota Philanthropy Partners  
Polk Bros. Foundation  
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation  
Surdna Foundation  
Toledo Community Foundation



