University-City Building Workshop and Seminar

**Hosted by the Ford Foundation with support from the
Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC),
Cape Town Office**

Strand Towers Hotel, Cape Town, South Africa
10 October 2016

Workshop co-ordinator

Professor Leslie Bank (EPD)

Contents

Rapporteur: Mark Paterson

Executive Summary

Introduction

Many mutual benefits may accrue from universities making a greater contribution to their localities, particularly in remaking towns and cities and rebuilding South African communities in a wider socio-economic sense. Education and research are the core public goods provided by universities. However, they also have an important role to play as place-based institutions fostering local development.

The University as an Urban Anchor Institution

As place-based institutions, universities can play either an attritional or instrumental role in urban development. The ties between higher education institutions and their surrounding towns and cities are so close that campuses can no longer be regarded as discrete university spaces, but rather as public, urban spaces. University facilities are increasingly mixed-use developments and the master plan for the campus is increasingly an extension of the urban master plan.

In order to fulfil their roles as place-based anchors for urban development, universities must collaborate with other institutions in the area. Universities must be fully vested in a complete range of development practices. Although vice-chancellors provide crucial leadership, they need appropriate political and community partners.

South African university and city planners may learn useful lessons from urban development initiatives implemented by universities in the US. In Chicago, the city authority identified a desolate run-down part of the inner city as a potential site for development. DePaul University invested in rehabilitating an abandoned historic building with a $65 million loan provided by the city and created a successful mixed-use development. The project sparked renewal of the downtown area.

City-university collaborations can also be driven by the idea of the university as neighbour. In Atlanta, Georgia, Morehouse College's participation in a local Community Development Council enabled it to swap land with the city authority for a mixed-use university/community development and helped it to become a more attractive academic destination. In Atlanta, Georgia State University anchored downtown development in the face of massive private sector disinvestment. The University of Washington also operated as a city planner, anchoring a mixed-use project in Seattle in which warehouses were repurposed to house 7,500 students.

Universities can also act as entrepreneurs. Georgia Tech developed a successful real-estate project in Atlanta's mid-town that physically extended its economics, life sciences and nano-technology programmes into the local business and commercial community.

In general, universities expand in order to accommodate growing numbers of students (and to build new science facilities). Universities may seek to deploy political, economic, cultural and social arguments, as well as congruence with larger political goals in pursuit of their growth. However, although new developments led by universities can bring them into conflict with local authorities, such projects often have a positive impact, stimulating growth. In the context of increasingly decentralised and devolved urban-led states, universities should seek to shape the individual social contracts that work best for them and to the maximum benefit of their surrounding communities.

Implementing Urban Anchor Strategies in American Cities

Universities are centres of employment, destinations for students, purchasers of goods and services, national centres of research, curators and generators of arts and culture, and owners of real estate.

Universities' core outputs are graduates and original research. However, it is mainly in the management of their inputs – faculty, staff, students and visitors; goods and services; and real estate – that they can help to anchor local communities.

Anchor strategies that match university inputs to local community needs include: housing incentive programmes; renewing real estate; procuring and hiring locally; fostering community development; and establishing partnership schools. Such strategies can enable the attraction and retention of talent; altruistic fulfilment of the anchor's core mission in line with the model of enlightened self-interest; sustained, as opposed to transactional, local economic impact; and potential financial gains through an enhanced real-estate portfolio and more efficient procurement.

In West Philadelphia, the University of Pennsylvania partnered a local hospital and science centres to improve the neighbourhood. The project improved the security of the neighbourhood; created a year-round housing community, with enhanced job and business opportunities; fostered investment in public education; and integrated the university into the urban fabric.

In mid-town Detroit, Wayne State University, the Detroit Medical Centre and the Henry Ford Health System forged a plan to try to renew a hollowed-out inner city area by deploying their own internal demand. Young professionals were identified as potential residents. A live/buy/hire local programme was established. A capacity-building mechanism was created by merging two community development councils.

The University of Maryland at College Park was starting to lose prospective faculty and staff because the surrounding area was clearly in decline. A plan to develop Route One and renew the area was adopted. The development created and integrated dynamic academic spaces, a public-private research hub, and vibrant downtown amenities.

In general, anchor strategies have to be holistic and institutionally embedded. A broad, all-round view of planning demands and needs has to be adopted. The plans should be focussed around a specific district. If the target area is too wide, the available finance may become too diluted to show a marked impact and the market will not follow.

Western Cape Case Study: Cape Higher Education Consortium (CHEC)
The Cape Higher Education Consortium was established to promote collaboration among the four universities in the Western Cape – the University of Cape Town (UCT), the University of the Western Cape (UWC), the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) and Stellenbosch University. By 2007, structures to give effect to a partnership between the four universities and the provincial government included a joint task team with a fairly stable membership. Since 2014, the team has been co-chaired by the deputy director-general in the Office of the Premier, which has given it traction within the province.

The task team has sought to allocate research grants to projects that respond to provincial priorities. A similar collaboration protocol has been established with the municipal authority. Although important work has been undertaken, the provincial government has sometimes failed to engage with the findings of these projects, which have often been driven by academic interests. University-led projects initiated by the team are now required to partner with provincial government actors from the outset.

The joint task team has also initiated an "innovation" grant to encourage university researchers to consider new approaches to current challenges facing the province – this year, problems arising

from rapid urbanisation. The task team is seeking to promote universities as partners jointly addressing shared economic and social development challenges, although many in the provincial government would prefer universities to act as mere research service providers.

Western Cape Case Study: Western Cape Economic Development Partnership (EDP)
The Economic Development Partnership (EDP) in The Western Cape was established in 2012 to improve the performance of the economic development system overseen by the municipal authority in Cape Town and the provincial government through facilitated partnerships. The body, which is funded by national, provincial and local governments, functions as a collaborative intermediary organisation, partnering with businesses, civil society groups and universities, although its projects originate in the public sector due to its core mandate.

In assessing the viability of collaborations, EDP seeks to identify which bodies needs to work together to achieve the objective; the actions that need to be taken to achieve a common agenda; how shared objectives can be translated into effective action; and who is best-placed to convene and drive the process.

Effective partnering can take a range of forms: transversal partnering which requires the establishment of relationships across silos, professional disciplines, departments and industries; inter-governmental partnering, which entails engagement across the three spheres of government; cross-boundary partnering which can involve spatial alignment across connecting physical jurisdictions; and cross-sector partnering which can entail bringing together public, private, non-profit, philanthropic, civil society, labour and knowledge institutions. Leadership that can shape a complete system of collaborative relationships effectively is crucial to the success of these partnerships.

Western Cape Case Study: University of the Western Cape (UWC)
Although adjacent to 70 percent of the (poorest) population of Cape Town, the University of the Western Cape was isolated as an institution for many years – set apart in the bush, which was what the apartheid planners intended.

In the late 1970s, UWC became an autonomous institution and in line with its democratic credo, it opened its doors to all. In the 1980s, it increasingly became a site of the struggle against apartheid. Meanwhile, a neighbouring squatter camp was turned into a nature reserve and the campus remained hidden by surrounding trees.

As the new millennium dawned, the university was bankrupt and a process of rebuilding began. The university increasingly moved to the edges of its own land and forged relationships with its sub-region. A new life sciences development was built on one of the campus's perimeters. The aim was to raise the university's profile through a new highly visible academic precinct.

UWC's planners have also increasingly started to think beyond the campus boundaries, although they are constrained in their attempts to attract businesses and facilities to the area around the campus, which is not safe. A lack of coordination between local government and university planners has also sometimes impeded development efforts.

Western Cape Case Study: Stellenbosch University, Centre for Conflict Systems in Transition (CST)
Afrikaner elites have historically controlled both the town of Stellenbosch, which was the birthplace of apartheid ideology, and the university. However, the relationship between town and gown has often been antagonistic. The university has five times the town's budget and owns many municipal

assets but its planners have often adopted an isolationist approach. A rector-mayor forum was established to create a more cooperative relationship between the town and university and to challenge the vested interests of local Afrikaner elites.

Two major university-town planning initiatives have been developed as a result of the rector-mayor forum. The first is the formulation of a new spatial development framework driven by academics and key town officials which has offered a concrete alternative to the private-sector-driven model for suburbanisation that previously dominated housing plans.

The second evolved from post-graduate research conducted by Stellenbosch University's Centre for Conflict Systems in Transition (CST) in the informal settlement of Enkanini. The centre, which seeks to co-produce solutions to real-world problems with actual societal stakeholders, developed new "i-Shacks". A community-controlled and financed energy structure was built utilising affordable solar energy services accessed via cellphone. The university and town's support for the initiative implicated them in what had previously been designated an "illegal" land invasion.

Gauteng Case Study: Institutional Planning, University of Pretoria

Acting on concern about urban economic decay around the University of Pretoria's Hatfield campus, the institution established an Office of Government Relations and Special Projects with the mandate to develop an anchor strategy for the campus, which houses the university's administration centre and most of its nine faculties.

Local stakeholders, including government officials, the diplomatic community, students, business owners, property developers and local schools were engaged. The Department of Town and Regional Planning at the university prepared a report on joint action to improve the area. The report identified the presence of conditions considered crucial to improving the district: a collaborative private real-estate market; strong urban fabric; close university-civic alignment; adequate precinct (city improvement district) infrastructure; top-rated schools; and effective security forces.

The university's goal has been to lead the district's transformation, attracting staff, students and businesses to locate in the area and fostering an open, safe and diverse community, in particular through a culture of integration that moves beyond the gated framework. The university's 2020-2025 master plan subsequently sought to take the anchor strategy further by leveraging the institution's huge purchasing power – almost R19 billion a year – and the expertise of its graduates to create jobs and foster economic development around its six campuses in Pretoria, particularly its site at Mamelodi.

Gauteng Case Study: University of the Witwatersrand

The University of the Witwatersrand is in financial trouble and the area around its main Braamfontein campus is in decline. With little on-campus residential accommodation, it has failed to address the housing needs of its more than 37,000 students comprehensively. In general, the university's recent development indicates disconnected planning processes.

However, some university initiatives have created positive impacts. The reproductive health research unit established by the university in Hillbrow meets important local needs and government priorities. The Johannesburg Centre for Software Engineering, which was established by the university with the municipal authority, has proved to be a hub for growth in the city. The Gauteng City Regional Observatory, which is a joint venture of Wits, the University of Johannesburg and the Gauteng provincial government, seeks to provide the tools and data for improved urban planning

and management. Its presence on the Wits campus provides a tangible sense that the university is generating work of wider social significance.

Eastern Cape Case Study: University of Fort Hare

In 2004, the University of Fort Hare welcomed the opportunity to establish an urban base to complement its rural campus at Alice. The campus soon expanded and the number of student residences in the city grew rapidly as the student body almost doubled in size in 12 years.

The physical growth of the East London campus, which is in an old warehouse district above the harbour, has been through the purchase/lease and renovation/expansion of old buildings, as well as the construction of three new buildings. All student residences, which are leased, are within walking distance of the campus. However, the accommodation generally takes the form of apartments and lacks common rooms and facilities.

Meanwhile, official ties between the university and the local authority are weak. The Buffalo City municipality has seemed keen to prevent the university from making use of a site consisting of recently transferred state land earmarked for educational purposes. Publicity about the need for the university to connect to the city has appeared to offend local officials, who expressed annoyance at what they perceived to be the institution's designs on spaces owned by the local authority. In this regard, a more patient, perhaps smaller anchor strategy may be required.

In addition, the university's engagement in urban regeneration requires a change of perspective and greater engagement with local bodies, as well as the support of other local institutional stakeholders. Furthermore, the connections between Fort Hare's urban and the rural campuses (rather than merely those that subsist within East London) are crucial to the discussion.

Concluding Discussion

Spatial divisions between universities and their surrounding communities are not the only impediments to cooperative local development. Academic staff should try to find new ways of engaging their university leaders in what it means to be an anchor-institution, which may include challenging apartheid legacies that have often shaped university property portfolios, as well as greater promotion of engaged research that benefits local communities.

Consensus-building among key local actors, such as government officials and civil society and private-sector leaders is also crucial to the implementation of anchor strategies. Truly collaborative relationships can take years to establish. Different types of intermediaries may be required to make different kinds of projects work. National government may have a role in helping to fund and support such processes. Quick wins – practical, intermediary solutions that may be implemented with relative ease within relatively small geographical area – can also help to foster university-city building.

A comprehensive review of anchor strategies and needs may be useful. The Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) and the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) should consider the contributions and support that they could offer to universities seeking to develop anchor-institution initiatives.

Introduction

The student #FeesMustFall protests that have raged since the beginning of 2015 point to larger developmental problems within the higher education sector and the country. In this regard, it is

important to move the debate beyond a discussion of student fee structures to consider the larger role that universities can play in addressing some of the other developmental challenges facing South Africa.

Many mutual benefits may accrue from universities making a greater contribution to their localities and regions, particularly in remaking towns and cities and rebuilding South African communities in a wider socio-economic sense. Education and research are the core public goods provided by universities. However, they also have an important role to play as place-based institutions fostering local development.

South Africa may learn from the Chinese government's approach in this regard. Chinese higher education has been incorporated into an integrated national development plan, which features massification, expansion of the funding system, and involvement of universities in their cities and vice versa.

Universities, which often wield great economic power as employers and purchases of goods and services, as well as land and property owners, can operate as anchor organisations in their local towns and cities. The issue is particularly crucial for the University of Fort Hare, which is seeking to identify best practices and overcome stumbling blocks in order to link its East London campus to the surrounding city more effectively and to the long-term mutual benefit of town and gown.

The University as an Urban Anchor Institution
South African university and city planners may learn useful lessons from urban development initiatives implemented by universities in the US.[1]

Universities are place-based institutions with a role to play in both state formation and human development. They are inextricably linked to the surrounding communities, whether their cities are in the ascendancy or on the decline as market-based institutions leave. In the US, universities are the driving force behind many metropolitan areas, often ranking among the top local employers and owning substantial land and property. Accordingly, they can play either an attritional role in urban development – subsisting despite surrounding decline and mounting socio-economic challenges; or they can play an instrumental role in anchoring development within the cities to which they belong.

In the US, the 100 largest metropolitan areas account for 80 percent of jobs, 95 percent of venture capital and 75 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), and rank as major economies in their own right. All the most populous 50 areas have a major public research university and most also have a major private one.[2] As significant parts of these places, universities can thus wield significant economic leverage both locally and nationally.

The ties between universities and their surrounding towns and cities are so close that campuses can no longer be regarded as discrete spaces controlled only by the relevant higher education institutions, but rather as public, urban spaces.[3] University facilities are increasingly mixed-use developments. Accordingly, the nature of university buildings is changing – they are now urban

---

[1] David Perry, "The University as an Urban Anchor Institution", presentation at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

[2] Brookings Institute, "Blueprint for American Prosperity: Unleashing the Potential of a Metropolitan Nation", 2009, retrieved June 10, 2009, from The Brookings Institute website.

[3] David C Perry and Wim Wiewel (eds), *The University As Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2005).

buildings and the master plan for the campus is increasingly an extension of the urban master plan. In this regard, university planners are also helping to plan the city. In South Africa, this role can be crucial to local and national development.

Universities need to be planners, entrepreneurs and good neighbours, not just research institutions. But, in order to fulfil their roles as place-based anchors for urban development, universities must collaborate with other institutions in the area. Universities must be fully vested in a complete range of development practices. In this regard, the old "service" or "outreach" models are insufficient to the task. Vice-chancellors provide crucial leadership but they cannot initiate development on their own. Political and community partners are essential to foster effective housing, public safety and education initiatives.

A joint city-universities project in Chicago illustrates the kinds of collaboration that may be required to forge development. The city authority had identified a desolate run-down part of the inner city – known as the "south loop" – as a potential site for development. The goal was to create a model for economic recovery in an area where traditional town planning seemed to have had little purchase. Meanwhile, DePaul University (the alma mater of the then mayor of Chicago, Richard M Daley) was seeking to upgrade and expand. The Goldblatt Building, which was deemed an historic structure although deserted and abandoned by the commercial sector, was sold to DePaul for a nominal sum. The university then invested in rehabilitating the centre with a $65 million loan provided by the city authority. The municipal council pledged to lease back two floors of the refurbished building from the university to enable it to service the debt. The university, as a tax-exempt institution, created a mixed-use building. Forty percent of the space at the new DePaul Center was reserved for the university's use, a further 40 percent for local authority-owned leasable space and 20 percent for taxable private commercial and retail space.

The development proved so successful, DePaul sought to create a new residential structure and dormitory for the university down the road. But the city authority said "No" and promoted instead a joint project among Chicago's universities and colleges – DePaul, Columbia College and Roosevelt University. An intermediary financial structure was created to build 1,680 different units for the higher education sector in the area. The vice-president of Roosevelt University, who had originally opposed the joint project, later became so enamoured of it that his college built its own 40-storey student building. In ten years, the student population in the area rose from 25,000 to 90,000 and local employees from 12,000 to 22,000. The number of visitors to the area grew from 500,000 to 1.5 million a year. $1.5 billion was invested in local real estate. As a result, the south loop was turned from what the city's chief planner in the 1980s described as a "desolate hole in the downtown doughnut" into a thriving educational corridor formed along clusters of the knowledge economy.

Universities cannot act in isolation – they have to cooperate to create fully engaged, collaborative institutional strategies and win the commitment of the various place-based and private sector institutions in their urban areas. In this regard, city-university collaboration can be driven by the idea of the university as neighbour. For example, in Atlanta, Georgia, Morehouse College adopted such an approach guided by enlightened self-interest in order to bolster its student base in the city. Faced with distrust from the local community and a shortage of funds, Morehouse, which had previously operated as little more than an enclave in the surrounding city, joined a community development council (CDC) as a co-equal partner and supported neighbourhood revitalisation efforts. It contributed to new "infill" affordable housing. Participation in the neighbourhood's development helped the college to become a more attractive academic destination and enabled it to swap land with the city authority for a mixed-use university/community development on land that Morehouse needed for new academic functions.

Ohio State University also adopted the "good neighbour" model, although it established a different intermediary from the CDC model employed by Morehouse. In order to work with real estate, the university had to establish a quasi-private entity called Community Partners which then collaborated with the local authority in Columbus to establish a project called the University District. In 1996, this published a university-neighbourhood revitalisation plan which advocated the creation of improved rental housing and quality of life, greater home ownership in the district and a revitalised retail market for the area. Faculty, staff and students were encouraged to become involved in learning and service activities in the neighbourhood. The creation of the intermediary community-partnership organisation enabled the release of state funding, which greatly boosted the project's budget. A refurbished main street became a mixed-use corridor. More than 1,300 distressed housing sites were created with affordable rents to strengthen the local social fabric. In the process, the university adopted a city planning role, taking over and reinvigorating industrial and brownfield sites.

In Atlanta, Georgia State University anchored downtown development in the face of massive private sector disinvestment – the university's master plan became the city of Atlanta's de facto master plan for this area. The University of Washington also operated as a city planner, working with the Tacoma City authority to anchor a downtown mixed-use development in Seattle, without erecting a single new building. Warehouses were repurposed to house 7,500 students, with each of the university's 128 majors housed in a separate mixed-use building.

Universities can also act as entrepreneurs in helping to develop cities and towns. Atlanta, Georgia had designated its mid-town area for development. Although the area was blessed with cultural institutions, it was economically destitute. Sixty percent of its real estate consisted of vacant lots, its infrastructure was inadequate and no private corporations were prepared to invest in its upliftment. Non-market, place-based corporate investment at state, city and university levels was required. With the support of the local authority, the Federal Reserve Bank and Bell-South telecommunications moved into the area. Then Georgia Tech moved in.

A street bridge had been built with the potential to connecting existing campus buildings to a new area across the road. However, the university needed to establish a critical mass of campus facilities in the new location in order to foster effective development of the expanded campus. A real-estate project was developed to include academic programmes – in the economic and life sciences and nano-technology – that would benefit from physical extension into the business and commercial community. A Technology Square – housing the university's business, global learning and economic development departments and technology incubator, as well as a hotel and conference centre and an adjoining new office complex were built. The new campus corridor also connected the existing campus with other privately funded development in the area. Atlanta's mid-town was turned from a site of economic stagnation into a growth pole for the region.

In general, universities which are often located on the edge of urban areas, expand in order to accommodate growing numbers of students (and to build new science facilities). They tend to seek to expand as autonomously as possible, although complex local environments can constrain, as well as create opportunities for, growth. Universities may seek to deploy political, economic, cultural and social arguments, as well as congruence with larger political goals (including increased privatisation and more devolved political institutions) in pursuit of their growth. Universities can operate as community-based organisations creating mutually beneficial relationships to foster local and national development. Although the relative importance of their immediate neighbourhoods may vary among universities, the increased impact of the universities themselves can increasingly bring them into conflict with local authorities. New developments led by universities, which are often

publicly rather than privately funded (although this balance is shifting), generally have a positive impact on the immediate area. Although such developments are generally additive, they are also increasingly viewed as stimulating growth.

In order to initiate development, strong leadership from the top (vice-chancellor) level is required. The university should also be fiscally independent, although it cannot achieve mutually beneficial development on its own. Collaborative public-private partnerships are increasingly necessary to implement plans. In addition, higher education institutions need to be creative in considering their options and creating and using appropriate intermediaries to achieve their goals. Universities are driven by enlightened self-interest in seeking partnerships for growth, which can raise important issues around situational ethics.

Although, the models for higher education in the US and South Africa face quite different challenges, there are certain common factors that will shape their development. Globally, the political trend is towards the devolution of power from centralised governments to decentralised, devolved urban-led states. Local special economic zones and political contestation can also impact on the role that universities may play as anchor institutions. In this context, universities should seek to shape the specific, individual social contracts that work best for them and to the maximum benefit of their surrounding communities.

Implementing Urban Anchor Strategies in American Cities
Many universities lack real-estate departments that can focus on space-based issues and require advice on how they should invest in and around their neighbourhoods.[4] U3 Advisors consults on institutional and campus planning and acts as a convenor matching real estate needs, demands and resources. It has brought together multiple institutions and enabled them to pool resources to foster place-based economic development and has also acted as a go-between and representative in such projects.

Universities, hospitals, and non-profit organisations are referred to as anchor institutions because of their permanence and their stabilising physical and social ties to their surrounding areas. Cities can benefit from adopting creative approaches to place-based development by anchor institutions such as universities. Universities also can benefit from aligning their campus planning with urban plans.

Universities are centres of employment, destinations for students, purchasers of goods and services, national centres of research, curators and generators of arts and culture, and owners of real estate. Universities' core outputs are graduates and original research. However, it is mainly in the management of their inputs that they can help to anchor local communities. Their inputs include faculty, staff, students and visitors; goods and services; and real estate. Meanwhile, local community aspirations may include: good schools, safe streets, adequate amenities, services and health provision, job opportunities, functional public spaces and a variety of housing.

Commonly implemented anchor strategies that match university inputs to local community needs include: housing incentive programmes; renewing real estate; procuring and hiring locally; fostering community development; and establishing partnership schools. Key benefits can accrue from such anchor strategies. They can enable the attraction and retention of talent; altruistic fulfilment of the

---

[4] Jamie Flaherty, "Anchor Institution Strategies", presentation at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

anchor's core mission in line with the model of enlightened self-interest; sustained, as opposed to transactional, local economic impact; and potential financial gain through an enhanced real-estate portfolio and more efficient procurement.

The tools that may be tailored to implement anchor strategies vary widely, often depending on the financial capacity, ambitions, size and nature of the institution (for example, large publicly-endowed universities compared with small private ones), as well as local conditions (for example, the relative strength or weakness of the housing market and economy).

In the early 1990s, the area around the University of Pennsylvania's campus in West Philadelphia featured high rates of violent crime, crumbling housing stock often rented out by slum landlords and an exodus of residents. The campus itself was alienated – literally, walled off – from the surrounding community and the university was also finding it hard to attract students and staff because of the area's poor reputation. After a graduate student was murdered, the university's vice-chancellor decided to take action to integrate the campus into the surrounding urban fabric. The university partnered a local hospital and science centres to improve the neighbourhood. The project, called the West Philadelphia Initiatives, sought to make the neighbourhood secure; create a year-round housing community, with improved job and business opportunities (including new retail, dining and entertainment destinations); foster investment in public education; and, generally, integrate the university into the urban fabric. The institutions committed substantial funding to the initiatives, including $1m a year from the university. A development workforce was established to ensure that the area's streets were kept safe and clean.

The university also instituted a real-estate programme in the area, funding down-payments and external repairs on property for new owners. A district real-estate matrix was developed, which included ground-leasing on a range of terms to encourage development, as well as joint-venture and solely-owned property developments crafted in response to market readiness. Student housing and town houses for staff and faculty were provided. Although the university lacked the capacity to build all the larger developments, it started the process by investing its own money, thus demonstrating its commitment – which encouraged private sector investors to follow. Similarly, once the commitment to multi-year funding to improve the district was communicated among the local business community, retailers returned to the area. In addition, the Penn-Alexander elementary school was set up with the city authority, with an over-funding commitment from the university to boost its educational standards.

Mid-town Detroit adopted a different kind of anchor strategy led by Wayne State University, the Detroit Medical Centre and the Henry Ford Health System to foster urban renewal in the hollowed-out inner city around these three institutions. The three bodies came together and forged a plan to try to renew the area by deploying their own internal demand. Between them, the three institutions hosted 27,000 students, employed 28,000 workers, many of them with large salaries, boasted huge budgets, and spent about $1.2 billion on goods and services each year. However, the immediate district was accruing little benefit from the presence of these bodies – less than 10 percent of anchor employees and students lived in the area and only 5 percent of goods and services were purchased from Detroit.

A total of 60,000 employee and student personal records were analysed and young professionals (rather than families and older residents) were identified as potential residents who would move into the area under the right conditions. A live/buy/hire local programme was established. A capacity-building mechanism was created by merging two community development councils to form a rebranded organisation, Midtown Detroit Inc. A committed and knowledgeable local activist was

sourced to lead the body which was relocated in a new, glass-front, interactive building and awarded a five-year contract to develop the area. The institution now has a $3m annual budget and expanded staff, has completed 52 projects and has leveraged $161 million in investment since 2009. Private sector interest in the area was resurrected. Local businesses were saved – for example, a bakery that was in financial trouble adapted to the new market by producing rolls for cafes. A major brand-name whole foods store came to the neighbourhood. Meanwhile, the area experienced a 40 percent reduction in violent crimes and a 60 percent reduction in property crimes. Housing prices have risen substantially and with a 97 percent occupancy rate, rental property cannot keep pace with demand.

The University of Maryland at College Park, which boasted an attractive, walled-in flagship campus, was starting to lose prospective faculty and staff because the surrounding area, which was characterised by the presence of many liquor stores and widespread prostitution, was in disrepair and clearly in decline. Huge, thousand-bed projects to house students constituted the only real-estate investment in the area. In meetings convened by the state senator to address the development issue among the university and city and county authorities, the university generally sought to control planning. It wanted to start a housing incentive programme and establish a partnership school, but on its own terms. Accordingly, the city refused to turn over the land that the university sought for these projects. A long-term partnership with 20-year goals was agreed. But without leadership, it languished.

Then a new university president was appointed, who commissioned a comprehensive evaluation of the development problem faced by the university and surrounding area. An initial master plan which ignored the old downtown and proposed a new gated, suburban-style development was shelved. Instead a plan to develop Route One and renew the area was adopted. The goal was to transform the institution's presence from that of a college in the park, to that of a university in the city.

Before the development of College Park, only 4 percent of faculty and staff lived in the area, which lacked amenities and important cultural and service facilities and had little sense of place. The development sought to create and integrate dynamic academic spaces, a public-private research hub, and vibrant downtown amenities. A Hotel at the University of Maryland was created after the land was donated by the university to a foundation, leaving an altruistic entrepreneur free to transact to develop the site. A local bar was turned into a performing arts space, including a music school, in a bid by the university to enable members of the local community to view its dramatic arts offerings. A commercial area was developed around a Quality Inn with the support of the private sector and state/county government support, featuring mixed-use, market-rate housing with new retail spaces, including a grocery store. The focus on retailers and small businesses led to young entrepreneurs from nearby Washington DC moving to new co-working spaces in the area.

U3 Advisors was invited by the University of Pretoria to review its opportunities as an anchor institution. The different funding mechanisms and levels of philanthropy experienced by South African universities affect what kinds of anchor strategies may be developed. However, certain common factors apply – such as, for example, the importance of bringing the right people together and thinking about how universities can leverage their own internal demand effectively to make a difference within their local communities. The 652 hectare precinct at the University of Pretoria is comparable in size to the areas covered by Detroit Midtown Inc and the University-City District in West Philadelphia. In addition, the area – unlike the University of Pennsylvania, Mid-Town Detroit and the University of Maryland – boasted all the ingredients considered crucial to changing an area's trajectory: a collaborative private real-estate market; strong urban fabric; close civic-alignment; adequate precinct infrastructure; top-rated schools; and world-class security.

The University of Pretoria, which is academically competitive with committed staff and visionary leaders, also benefits from the extent of its control over land, its lack of debt, its diverse student body, the support of a national mandate, and its engagement with local partners. Challenges have included issues with safety and parking, a lack of recreational resources, an imbalanced real-estate market, rapid enrolment increases, unfunded mandates, great income disparities and its seven disparate campuses.

The goal of the Hatfield master plan that the university developed has been to try and neutralise the impact of the negatives and leverage the university's larger impact, leading the district's transformation, attracting staff, students and businesses to locate in the area and fostering an open, safe, vibrant and diverse community, in particular through a culture of integration that moves beyond the gated framework.

Development and implementation of the master plan entailed identifying the areas where university and local community interests intersected, giving rise to economic opportunities; demand-side interventions to buy, hire and live locally; supply-side interventions, for example, to adapt and/or build appropriate accommodation for staff and students in the area; partnering with a well-funded community organisation with a shared mission; and quick wins – the implementation of immediate opportunities that provide an incentive for future change and foster an environment for investment.

In general, anchor strategies have to be holistic. Leaders have to consult, and integrate the planning, procurement, personnel and policy aspects of the projects that they initiate. A broad, all-round view of university and community planning demands and needs has to be adopted in order to match university inputs to community aspirations in such a way that the required outcomes are created. Leaders need to continually reflect on their plans and how they should be adapted as change happens, In addition, these plans needs to be institutionally embedded. The planning needs to be place-based (as well as academic and strategic), focussed around a specific area. If the target area is too wide, the available funding may become too diluted and the market will not follow. The private sector engages when it has been shown that change can happen and models for future engagement by the market have been created. Community partnerships are essential to effective anchor strategies. Relationship of trust and mutual benefit must be established between universities and local communities.

Western Cape Case Study: Cape Higher Education Consortium (CHEC)
The Cape Higher Education Consortium primarily seeks to promote collaboration among the four universities in the Western Cape – the University of Cape Town (UCT), the University of the Western Cape (UWC), the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) and Stellenbosch University.[5] The focus of this collaboration was originally to foster efficiencies in the delivery of library and other services. More recently, the consortium has sought to promote partnerships between universities and external stakeholders, particularly with local government partners.

Universities and local government officials have coordinated on training in the areas of health, education and social development. In 2006, the then ANC-led provincial government signed a memorandum on cooperation with the local universities. But relationships between local government officials and university representatives required continuous renewal in line with successive changes in the ruling party in Cape Town and the province.

---

[5] Presentation made by Nasima Badsha at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

In general, the local universities' place-making role has been slight. Rather the institutions' teaching and research roles have shaped the nature of their partnership with the provincial government of the Western Cape, which has sought to harness this educational and knowledge capacity to promote local economic development.

By 2007, structures to give effect to the university/government partnership included the establishment of a joint task team with a fairly stable membership. The team, which is chaired by either a senior official from the Office of the Premier or the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, includes university planning officers. Although participation from other provincial government departments has been patchy, the team has been co-chaired by the deputy director-general in the Office of the Premier since 2014, which has given it traction within the province.

As well as a broad agreement with the provincial government, the universities have signed separate memoranda with Western Cape government departments, including with the Department of Transport and Public Works. In addition, a procurement mechanism has been agreed with the Office of the Premier, under which closed research tenders are issued to local universities.

The joint university/provincial government task team has sought to allocate research grants to projects that respond to broad provincial priorities. An annual R500,000 grant funds the administration of a system of research awards to institutional, as well as university projects. Important projects have been undertaken, but the provincial government has sometimes failed to engage effectively with the findings of these projects, which have often been driven by academic interests. In response, university-led projects initiated by the team are now required to partner with provincial government actors from the outset in order to enhance the likelihood of their findings being implemented. The most recent round of calls for research proposals was preceded by a series of workshops held jointly by academics and officials to improve alignment between the proposed projects and provincial priorities.

The joint task team has also initiated an "innovation" grant to encourage university researchers to consider new methodologies and interventions to address current challenges facing the province – this year, problems arising from rapid urbanisation. A Master's student is coordinating with the metropolitan authority to advise on provincial policies and practices that can support renovation of Cape Town's central business district.

In general, the task team is seeking to promote universities as partners jointly addressing shared economic and social development challenges, rather than as mere service providers, although many in the provincial government would prefer universities merely to implement a list of projects that is handed to them. In order to address the tension between the different perceptions of the universities' partnership role, the task team has sought to create mechanisms that address specific needs – in part, to demonstrate the concrete benefits of the partnership. For example, the Department of Transport, which has needed to drive the development of more and improved public transport, initiated a process within CHEC, inviting interested researchers to review its requirements and capacity and develop a proposal on how this work should be conducted and by whom. Research proposals, each funded with less than R500,000, were then put out to tender via the consortium to the local universities.

A similar collaboration protocol has been established with the municipal authority under which the universities and the local government together fund mutually beneficial research. Again, the joint programme took a while to establish, as its protagonists sought to build trust, define each other's roles and source appropriate champions. But, learning the lessons from the provincial

government/university partnership, the research collaboration project has now entered its second year.

Western Cape Case Study: Western Cape Economic Development Partnership (EDP)
Important partnerships between local place-based institutions in the Western Cape include collaboration between Stellenbosch University and CPUT, and Tygerberg Hospital, as well as many planning and urban development relationships between local colleges and private-sector developers.[6] In addition, place-based institutions have worked closely with local government agencies in 35 city improvement districts to improve community safety.

In order to create effective economic development partnerships among institutions with different core goals, potential mutual benefits need to be identified. In general, government partners focus on what they are mandated to deliver, which is set out in the constitution. Businesses are concerned with pushing for what they need to operate effectively, which can be shaped by market forces. Civil society also has specific objectives, often related to improved social equity and justice. However, the overall goal in an effective economic development partnership is to establish a shared vision and common agenda among the actors despite their generally different and often competing objectives. An effective way of building trust among partners and a shared commitment to action is to identify quick wins that may be achieved through cooperation – which can then help to shape a more positive dialogue. If the partners are polarised, mediation and facilitation may also be necessary.

In Cape Town, the student protests that have continued since 2015, have engaged universities in a different kind of place-building. The decolonisation discourse within UCT's history faculty extends beyond the university's research and real-estate agendas and has broad implication for city planners. The question of how South Africa should seek to decolonise its cities has been posed, raising questions of identity and memory and how these can be institutionalised – for example, in archives. In this regard, local government bodies, not just universities, need to address issues of trauma, pain, intersectionality, power and fear in their planning processes.

The Economic Development Partnership (EDP) in The Western Cape was established in 2012 to improve the performance of the economic development system overseen by the municipal authority in Cape Town and the provincial government through facilitated partnering solutions. The body, which is funded by national, provincial and local governments, is an independent non-profit, public benefit organisation. It adopts a systemic approach to identifying and promoting areas of socio-economic improvement. Although it functions as a collaborative intermediary organisation, partnering with – among other institutions – businesses, civil society groups and universities – its projects originate in the public sector (the provincial government, the municipal authority and state-owned entities) due to its core mandate.

The EDP seeks to foster achievable issue- or space-based solutions. It supports appropriate knowledge-sharing among partners, helping them to fulfil their mandates in a collaborative way. The unit has helped to foster urban management initiatives; early learning centres; open-data projects; community safety programmes; agricultural land reform; marketing and branding for the municipal authority; business leadership; integrated planning and budgeting; and enterprise and supplier development. It has worked across sectors including water, transport, energy and health and has enabled place-based programmes across the Cape Town metropole and the province.

---

[6] Andrew Boraine, "The Practice of Partnering for Development", presentation at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

In assessing the viability of collaborations, EDP seeks to identify four key drivers of change. First, which bodies needs to work together to achieve the objective (the mandates, plans and processes that need to be integrated; the human and other resources that need to be sourced; and the communication and legitimacy issues that need to be resolved). Second, the actions that need to be taken to achieve a shared vision and common agenda (aligning long-term goals with the partners' priorities and activities). Third, translating shared objectives into effective action (often through quick, trust-building solutions). And fourth, identifying who is best-placed to convene and drive the process – enacting it and solving issues of contestation. This requires promotion of institutional cultures, behaviours and leadership that foster rather than inhibit practical collaboration.

Criticism/blame, undermining, stonewalling and expressions of contempt all prevent constructive agreement/action. Effective partnering, which often takes place one step at a time, can take a range of forms. Transversal partnering requires the establishment of relationships across silos, professional disciplines, departments and industries. Large institutions often find it difficult to establish effective coordination across internal silos. Inter-governmental partnering entails engagement across the three spheres of government, public entities and agencies. Cross-boundary partnering can involve spatial alignment across connecting physical jurisdictions (sometimes integrating "leading" and "lagging" areas). Cross-sector partnering can entail bringing together public, private, non-profit, philanthropic, civil society, labour and knowledge institutions.

A landmark project initiated by the EDP entailed mainstreaming partnership practices and behaviours within the provincial and municipal government to foster greater integration of their planning and budgeting functions. A full range of potential partnership commitments available within provincial government, particularly in terms of data governance and spatial planning, were reviewed and departmental plans and budgets were aligned more closely with the provincial strategic plan as a result.

The components of successful collaboration between institutions include: joint engagements and processes; shared intelligence and common data; sufficient collaborative capacity; good inter-personal relationships; effective pooling of resources; common performance systems; shared communications; and backbone support.

Collaborative leadership is essential. Leaders need to create a compelling joint vision that motivates commitment; understand and communicate the big picture; go beyond their own disciplines and institutions to encourage inputs and participation; be able to translate divergent perspectives; facilitate win-win solutions; foster joint ownership and responsibility; embrace diversity and difference; and see conflict as an opportunity for innovation. In general, they need to be able to shape a complete system of relationships effectively.

Institutional cultures may be defined according to whether they are more or less open to collaboration. The characteristics of more open institutional cultures include: looking outward and downward rather than inward and upward; exhibiting a flexible rather than rules-bound and compliance-driven approach; promoting facilitation and engagement rather than being limited by a command-and-control management culture; promoting partnerships within a system rather than just one's own institution; analysing problems by starting with the issues rather than one's own organisational mandate and authority; seeking spaces for creativity and innovation rather than retreating into risk avoidance; and seeking collaborative rather than competitive relationships and behaviours.

Western Cape Case Study: University of the Western Cape (UWC)

Although adjacent to 70 percent of the (poorest) population of Cape Town in the neighbouring Cape Flats area, the University of the Western Cape was isolated as an institution for many years. Bounded by Symphony Road, a railway line, a busy road to the airport and the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT), it was also originally sited next to a squatter camp.[7] For the first students and academic staff, it felt as if the university was literally in the bush, which was what the apartheid planners intended.

Starting with 200 students in the 1960s, it grew to 7,000 students the following decade and to 14,000 in the 1980s. In the late 1970s, UWC became an autonomous institution and in line with its democratic credo, it opened its doors to all, including an influx of students from the Eastern Cape. The university's language of instruction changed from Afrikaans to English and coloured students, who had once enjoyed easy access to the university, started to find it harder to enter. Under the leadership of Jakes Gerwel in the 1980s, the university increasingly became a site of the struggle against apartheid.

In the 1980s, top architects were employed to develop the campus. The neighbouring squatter camp was turned into a nature reserve. However, in the 1990s, student numbers dwindled to 10,000 and many academics were retrenched. As the new millennium dawned, the university was bankrupt. The national government's higher education commissioner advised that UWC should be merged with CPUT.

However, the proposed merger did not take place and a process of rebuilding began under a new vice-chancellor, Brian O'Connell. Historically, the university had a fractured relationship with the local authority. In the 1980s, during the struggle against apartheid, the university metaphorically and literally looked away from the city government. In the 1990s, its key political relations were with the national and not the local government. The campus was hidden behind trees.

However, after the 1990s the university started to move to the edges of its own land and forge relationships with its sub-region. A new life sciences development was built on the campus's perimeter on the side of the road that leads to the airport. The aim was to raise the university's profile through a new highly visible academic precinct. In addition to the life sciences building, a new public health faculty, hydrogen facility and partly privately funded student accommodation were also built on the edges of the campus. In terms of its new found visibility and prestige, UWC was confirmed as a leading university in physics earlier this year.

UWC's planners have also increasingly started to think beyond the campus boundaries. Although the university's traditional socio-economic connections are to the Cape Flats to the south, the physical focus has been on the area to the north – for example, a large Transnet train yard, where UWC has bought some property.

The university has also sought to link together its sports facilities, although the connecting land that it hoped to purchase was allocated to low-cost housing by the city authority without any prior consultation. The local ward councillor did not appreciate the university's opposition to the allocation, which illustrated a lack of coordination between local government and university planners. The university has also encountered difficulties speaking to the provincial government about a strip of land to the south of the university that has been put under the control of a private developer, who doesn't necessarily have the common good in mind. Control of this land would

---

[7] Lois Dippenaar, "Institutional Planning at University of Western Cape", presentation at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

enable beneficial development as the university could then connect some student residences with other land that is has purchased nearby.

University planners are further constrained in their attempts to attract businesses and facilities to the area around the campus, which is not safe. Three gang-related murders were recently committed on greenfield sites near UWC student accommodation. The university's staff and students are only there nine months a year. In this regard, the university planners cannot develop the surrounding area for the sake of development.

Other accommodation options in the metropole are being explored. The university has bought a building in the Bellville CBD, which it is planning to develop. Having purchased a footprint across a city block, the municipal authority has expressed its willingness to support the development through pedestrianisation. University planners have also been talking to officials in the National Department of Public Works about a joint project in Cape Town's CBD. The university has also bought other properties in the area, including a block of flats to house hundreds of students in Kuils River, which has a direct train link to the station nearest the campus.

The university's place-based relationships to local communities have also partly been shaped by its agenda as a leading research-driven African university moving away from a geography shaped by apartheid and seeking to promote the interests and aspirations of the continent. In this regard, some research is looking at the ties and tensions between migrants and residents. Another project initiated by the university's faculty of arts seeks to broadcast and locate the work of artists from the Cape Flats. The project, which has engaged non-governmental organisations and children in a book and exhibition project, aimed to create a new kind of meeting point between the university and local youth.

University of Stellenbosch Case Study: Centre for Conflict Systems in Transition (CST)

The Centre for Conflict Systems in Transition is a flagship research facility established at Stellenbosch University specialising in trans-disciplinary research. It seeks to co-produce solutions to real-world problems with actual societal stakeholders.[8] The centre was created as a result of the establishment of a rector-mayor forum by the former vice-chancellor of Stellenbosch University, Chris Brink. Brink sought to connect town and gown in a systematic way and helped to institute monthly top-level meetings between the mayor of Stellenbosch and the vice-chancellor of the university and their teams. One of the forum's goals was to engage the university in fundamental transformation work.

Afrikaner elites have historically controlled both the town of Stellenbosch, which was the birthplace of apartheid ideology, and the university, which was an almost exclusively white institution which trained Afrikaner elites. Notwithstanding, their shared ideological and cultural background – Afrikaans is the dominant discourse – the relationship between town and gown has often been antagonistic. The university has five times the town's budget and owns many municipal assets. The university's planners have often adopted an isolationist approach, managing the campus as if it were a world unto itself.

In response, the rector-mayor forum was established to create a more cooperative relationship between the town and university and as an attempt to take on the vested interests of the Afrikaner elites still dominating much academic and community life. In this regard, Stellenbosch University has historically tended to view itself as a university in the tradition of Oxford in England – a source of

---

[8] Presentation made by Mark Swilling at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

general universal knowledge disconnected from its town and rising above the concerns of ordinary citizens (although, in reality, Stellenbosch University was long since captured by the political and other interests of local elites). By contrast, the rector-mayor forum seeks to reimagine the university as within the tradition of the University of Paris in France – a source of universal knowledge but embedded within the development of the surrounding city.[9]

Two major university-town planning initiatives have been developed as a result of the rector-mayor forum. The first is the formulation of a new spatial development framework driven by academics and key town officials, including the chief financial officer and the municipal head of planning and engineering. The framework seeks to address political problems that have impeded equitable development of the town and surrounding area. Stellenbosch's town centre is protected by a heritage group with substantial cultural capital based on a racially exclusive model. Meanwhile, mercantilist property developers are continually buying up and developing real-estate within relatively easy reach of the town centre. The status quo is supported by university property managers and local politicians. However, poor residents suffer as a result.

In response, a planning solution was developed that built on an existing horseshoe-shaped network of railway stations surrounding the town. Construction of a series of high-density mixed-use hamlets was planned around the stations supported by improved local transport. The first of these was completed at the end of last year. The racially integrated plan finally offered a genuine alternative to the private-sector-driven model for suburbanisation that had previously dominated housing plans.

The second major university/town planning initiative that emanated from the mayor-rector forum evolved from post-graduate research conducted by CST in the informal settlement of Enkanini (which means "take by force" in Xhosa) which is home to 11,000 households 21 kilometres from the centre of Stellenbosch. CST researchers were asked to conceive the real impact of official policies to upgrade informal settlements upon the average shack dweller there. The researchers concluded that the official policies constituted little more than a pledge to keep shack dwellers waiting for between eight and fifteen years before they were likely to see any improvements to their habitat. Consequently, the research issue became an exploration of interim actions that could be taken to empower and improve lives. The researchers looked at solar energy and improving shack structures and developed a series of incremental solutions for new "i-Shacks". Funded with $17 million from the government's Green Fund, a community-controlled and -financed energy structure was built utilising advanced and affordable solar energy services accessed via cellphone.

The i-Shack initiative heralded a fundamental shift in the planning roles of both the university and the town. The shacks are visible from the university campus. The university and town's support for the initiative implicated both in what had previously been officially designated an "illegal" land invasion. When the mayor signed the papers authorising the development bank's loan for the project he effectively revoked all previous council resolutions on Enkanini, which had been premised on, and confirmed, the settlement's illegal status.

Important lessons may be learned from the implementation of these two university-city building initiatives in Stellenbosch for research-driven collaborations with officials in the municipalities. Both initiatives contradicted the university's master plan, which has essentially sought to use the image of the campus as an enclave to drive through development in isolation from projects conceived by the town planners. For example, the first initiative to develop mixed-use hamlets at train stations around Stellenbosch was highly contested – university planners refused to connect with the town's

---

[9] A third university tradition was established in Europe in the thirteenth century by the University of Bologna, which essentially catered to building the skills of the local merchant class.

spatial development framework process. The second incremental process reversed a municipal plan for the forced removal of 8,000 people.

In this regard, the university's master plan, which has failed to place the institution within the local context, runs contrary to the outputs of its trans-disciplinary research, which is supported by university management. Working with societal stakeholders the field constitutes a critique of traditional extractive research. It seeks to produce researchers, often collaborating across disciplines and departments, who can promote social change locally and in other African contexts. Its proponents argue that the methodology's commitment to social change enhances the quality of the research produced, and that the idea that it is less "objective" as a result is spurious.

However, trans-disciplinary researchers in South Africa often face a range of real-world challenges that can inhibit the effectiveness of their projects. Political instability represents a particular challenge. This instability may stem from factionalism within ruling parties, as well as changes between ruling parties. It may also be manifested in splits between officials and politicians; and between academics and university property managers. At Stellenbosch, such divisions have hindered consensus over where the university stands on crucial local development issues.

Trans-disciplinary researchers in South Africa also face serious capacity and time constraints that inhibit what they can realistically achieve and must often therefore opt for interim solutions.

Gauteng Case Study: Institutional Planning, University of Pretoria
Acting on concern about urban economic decay, including declining infrastructure and increasing crime, around the University of Pretoria's Hatfield campus, the vice-chancellor and Tshwane's executive mayor visited Detroit and Philadelphia in the US at the invitation of the American government to review university-city building projects initiated with the support of U3 Advisors.[10]

As a result of the visit and having learned lessons from projects implemented by Pennsylvania State and the University of Philadelphia, an Office of Government Relations and Special Projects was established at the university with the mandate to develop and implement an anchor strategy for the Hatfield campus, which houses the University of Pretoria's administration centre and most of its nine faculties.

A preliminary evaluation of the feasibility of engaging local stakeholders to improve the university's impact on the surrounding area was conducted. Discussions were held with officials from the local, provincial and national governments, as well as with the foreign diplomatic missions in the area. Students, business owners, property developers, local schools and other stakeholders were also approached for their views. Crucially, the Hatfield campus is located within an active city improvement district (CID), to which it is the largest financial contributor. The university registrar sits on the board of this legislated entity which levies local stakeholders and mainly directs these extra funds to improving the area's safety, cleanliness and beautification.

A contract to produce a comprehensive report on joint action to improve the area around the campus was tendered and won by the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the university, which was headed by a former head of city planning. The report identified the presence of key conditions considered crucial to changing an area's trajectory: a collaborative private real-estate market; strong urban fabric; close university-civic alignment; adequate precinct (CID) infrastructure;

---

[10] Presentation made by Denver Hendricks at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

top-rated schools (to attract the right kind of community); and effective security provided by national and metro police, as well as privately contracted firms hired by the university.

In May 2015, the university convened a 30-strong stakeholder forum, which grew to more than 60 stakeholders by the following year. The stakeholders were canvassed on their opinions. Many one-on-one meetings were also held with city officials, business leaders and residents associations. These were sometimes difficult, with certain individuals and groups pressing their own interests. In order to comprehensively map the trends and challenges faced by the local precinct, the study also comprised specialist surveys and assessments, including desktop studies of other experiences; a review of newspaper articles and media items; analysis of crime surveys and other earlier studies; and a comprehensive spatial analysis of the area.

In the meantime, the work of the Hatfield city improvement district continued with the appointment of a new chief executive to improve the body's visibility and effectiveness. In support of improving the area's safety, one property developer helped to secure 17 ambassadorial residences.

More than 120 stakeholders attended the meeting at which the final report on improving the Hatfield area was submitted, and endorsed the document. The study looked at institutional issues, relationships and communications among stakeholders, communications and events for the planning process itself, transport infrastructure, and safety and social issues. It identified three scenarios for the district: a downward spiral, which sketched a catastrophic situation if stakeholders relaxed; a middle-of-the-road scenario, based on the CID continuing to operate as it was; and a third, ideal outcome if the CID's efforts were intensified.

Low-hanging fruit – actions with immediate benefits that that could be implemented quickly – were identified to retain stakeholder interest in the project. Funding streams within the university in support of the initiative were tagged.

In particular, the university's 2020-2025 master plan subsequently identified the body as an anchor institution that should seek to optimise student experiences as a part of its commitment to transformation. The plan seeks to leverage the University of Pretoria's huge purchasing power – almost R16 billion in Gauteng and nearly R19 billion in the country as a whole each year – and the expertise of its graduates in order to create jobs. The university recently signed a major deal with a big not-for-profit organisation to create as many as 8,000 jobs in the area around its Mamelodi campus. Money from the university's pension and endowment funds has been earmarked for local job creation. The aim is also to divert more of the university's purchasing and hiring power to the benefit of local residents and to support increased workforce training in the community. The university plans to fund low-cost loans and leverage its real-estate to support new businesses in the area. In addition, the university is seeking to create employment by incubating and networking new businesses that emanate from students' ideas.

The university is also seeking to utilise some of its real estate to encourage younger academics to move closer to campus. It is further seeking to help improve local schools, including by opening a sports school on campus.

Beyond the Hatfield campus, the university hopes to take the lead in developing an anchor strategy for the city (working with Unisa, the Tshwane University of Technology [TUT], local technical and vocational education and training [TVET] colleges, science colleges, and science and innovation hubs). In this regard, it is looking to develop each of its six campuses in Pretoria as anchor

institutions in their own right, especially its Mamelodi campus and its medical campus, around which the rate of urban decay is relatively high.

However, the university faces exponentially greater domestic poverty and inequality in pursuit of its anchor role than its peers in the US. It needs to address social justice and transformation as part of its work as an anchor institution. Within its own teaching and research, it needs to build diversity and ensure broad access, support and work and business opportunities for student and post-graduates. Students from poor communities need to be engaged properly, which entails raising funds for bursaries, providing them with housing near campus, offering integration within residences, providing healthy food cheaply (food trucks are being considered), developing appropriate learning and social spaces at universities, enabling the use of appropriate technologies, and offering work-integrated internships. As long-term development partners, the university and local community stakeholder partners need to demonstrate sustained political will and provide sufficient funding to have a significant long-term effect.

Gauteng Case Study: University of the Witwatersrand
Although 25 percent of South Africa's gross domestic product (GDP) is produced within a 25-kilometre radius of the University of the Witwatersrand, the institution (which is more than 100 years old) is in financial trouble and the area around its main Braamfontein campus is in decline.[11] In this regard, the university, which has historically been the site of substantial economic and political contestation, has missed some important opportunities. With little on-campus residential accommodation, it has failed to address the housing needs of its more than 37,000 students in a comprehensive fashion. Some accommodation has been built in Hillbrow and Braamfontein, but without any apparent significant attempt to integrate this provision into a larger plan. Meanwhile, useful university-owned land north of Empire Road was sold off.

In general, the recent development of the university indicates disconnected planning processes. Millions of rand were spent on external architectural consultants and on building a fence around the Braamfontein campus which cut the university off from the surrounding city. Effective communication on planning issues between the university, local government and civil society has often been lacking.

However, some university planning initiatives have created positive impacts. For example, the reproductive health research unit established by the university in Hillbrow – an historically contested area – meets important local needs and government priorities and has helped to improve the lives of tens of thousands of local residents.

The Johannesburg Centre for Software Engineering, which was established by electrical engineering professor Barry Dwolatzky with the support of the municipal authority, has proved to be a hub for growth in the city. Building on the city government's interest in the centre as a potential local source of employment/development, a R40-million Tshimologong Innovation Precinct co-funded by Wits, the local authority and the private sector was opened in downtown Johannesburg in September 2016. Tshimologong means "new beginnings" in Setswana and the precinct which occupies an entire block houses research laboratories, a start-up incubator, shared workspace, a maker-space with access to 3D printers, the provincial government's design and validation centre and an area for digital business studies.

---

[11] Presentation made by Alan Mabin at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

The Gauteng City Regional Observatory, which is sited on the Wits campus, offers another example of successful university-city building. The observatory, which is a joint venture of Wits, the University of Johannesburg and the Gauteng provincial government, seeks to provide the tools and data for improved urban planning and management, particularly by fostering more effective co-operation among the separate spheres and sections of government. As part of this work, it is also charged with extending links to all the higher education institutions, as well as knowledge councils, private sector think-tanks, research NGOs and information-exchange and learning-networks operating in the city-region. The observatory's presence on the Wits campus provides a tangible sense that the university is generating work of wider social significance.

Despite some of the successes that may be achieved in university-city building, South African universities seem to struggle to find ways of implementing projects that can effect social change in their neighbourhoods. More than visionary leadership from vice-chancellors may be needed to create the necessary change and directly engage communities beyond the campus fence. In this regard, limitations upon the (lack of) action taken by universities may stem from what may be considered their primary function: to enhance the reflective, critical and technical capacities of their students – in other words, their capacity to think about change rather than actual engagement in social change itself (although this is not precluded). Furthermore, South African universities don't adhere to a single ideological approach to what social changes they should be seeking. Accordingly, universities may need to review the precise nature of their roles in social engagement in order to establish the kinds of anchorship projects that they should pursue.

Eastern Cape Case Study: University of Fort Hare
The East London campus of the University of Fort Hare (UFH) was originally established by Rhodes University in the 1970s before it was incorporated into UFH in 2004 under a national restructuring of higher education institutions.[12]

Fort Hare, which was mandated to provide a fully fledged university to East London, welcomed the opportunity to establish an urban base to complement its rural campus at Alice. The campus, which had previously grown comparatively slowly as part of Rhodes, soon expanded and the racial profile of its student body changed as more white undergraduates joined. The number of student residences in the city grew rapidly as the student body almost doubled in size in 12 years. The numbers of undergraduates rose from 1,633 in 2004 to 4,475 in 2016, while the number of post-graduates rose from 628 to 966 over the same period. The expansion of the urban campus also placed it in competition with the rural one at Alice.

The physical growth of the East London campus, which is in an old warehouse district above the harbour, has been through a host of interventions including: the purchase/lease and renovation of old buildings; the expansion of one renovated building; and the construction of three new buildings (including a joint library co-funded by Unisa and Walter Sisulu University).

All student residences, which are leased, are within walking distance of the campus. The leasing arrangements generally favour the landlords, who are provided with a five-year loan to refurbish the properties as appropriate – after which time, all income (constituting their profits) reverts to them. In addition, the accommodation leased to students, which generally takes the form of apartments, lacks common rooms and facilities. Ideally, multi-use buildings are required to address this shortfall and meet student needs.

---

[12] Rod Bally, "Comparative Perspectives and Opportunities", presentation at "Ford Foundation University-City Building Workshop and Seminar", Cape Town, 10 October 2016.

Meanwhile, official ties between the university and the local authority are weak. A non-functional memorandum of understanding has been in place for more than six years and the Buffalo City municipality has seemed keen to prevent the university from making use of a "sleeper site" consisting of recently transferred state land earmarked for educational purposes. Relations with the local chamber of commerce also appear to have fallen into abeyance due to staff turnover at the university. However, some small-scale applied research initiatives have been established by the university within the East London Industrial Development Zone.

The university's commercial ties with the city are mainly shaped by the supply of student residences by local businesses, although increased student buying power is also beginning to have a significant impact on the local economy. Although the campus helps to meet local higher education, research, cultural enrichment and private enterprise needs, the general public in East London appears to have a slightly negative view of the local student population (which comprises 10,000 students from Walter Sisulu University in addition to those from Fort Hare). The campus also helps to meet local government skills needs, including for teachers, social workers, nurses, administrators and managers.

However, efforts to develop an effective anchoring strategy for the Fort Hare campus have foundered on the refusal of the metropolitan authority to engage, which may relate to the larger issue of how political formations have developed in the region. Publicity about the need for the university to connect to the city (while maintaining the integrity of its Alice campus) which was released as part of Fort Hare's centenary celebrations in 2016 appeared to offend city officials. They expressed annoyance at what they perceived to be the institution's designs on spaces owned by the local authority. The expansion's potential cost was also met with disapproval.

A more patient, perhaps smaller anchor strategy was required. Although Fort Hare, as the university of the South African liberation movement, prides itself on its close ties with national officials, its engagement in urban regeneration requires a change of perspective and greater engagement with local bodies. In addition, with the support of the National Treasury, the anchor responsibility may be shared with other local institutional stakeholders such as Frere Hospital, St Dominic's Hospital, St Thomas private clinic, the Unisa campus, Walter Sisulu University and the East London Museum. In addition, politically active students could usefully turn their energies to university-city building in East London in support of local and national development. The need to improve East London's downtown, including its local schools, is so great that gentrification of the university precinct may be considered better than nothing.

The University of Fort Hare is also considering the idea of building a university precinct in the middle of Alice. Many African universities are located outside cities, often on hills encouraging distant reflection. In this regard, the connections between rurally-based universities and their environments also need to be considered, as well as the relationships of higher education institutions to cities. In relation to Fort Hare with its two campuses, the connections between the urban and the rural (rather than merely those that subsist within urban centres) are crucial to the discussion.

Concluding Discussion
Most place-based institutions – hospitals, community-based foundations, universities – can usefully assess and reassess the role of their land ownership and usage. City authorities have a crucial role to play in this process in terms of leveraging the value of institutional assets, including land. Universities have to be engaged as more than a campus. New kinds of social contracts need to be

forged among institutions in pursuit of development. In this regard, academic staff should try to find new ways of engaging their university leaders in what it means to be an anchor-institution. In South Africa, this may entail challenging apartheid legacies that have often shaped university property portfolios.

Spatial divisions between universities and their surrounding communities – the campus borders – are not the only impediments to cooperative local development. Academics should pursue integrated and sustainable anchor-institutions strategies, which can also include their promotion of engaged research that benefits local communities. Truly embedded universities continually connect to their environments. For example, the work of water institutes should explore the effective deployment of water resources. Interdepartmental initiatives on food systems should inform the work of food economists and the politics of production. The use of complex systems-thinking traditionally employed in theoretical physics has applications in the life sciences that can enable some of the old divisions between the social and natural worlds to be transcended. In general, social scientists should be seeking solutions, rather than reworking versions of old critiques.

Although anchor agendas are often not widely broadcast – partly because they are not the core business of universities – they can produce substantial benefits in South Africa, which has quite a lot of institutions in its city centres. More joint university-city mixed-use projects can help to foster a joint approach to development. Consensus-building among key local actors, such as government officials, civil society leaders and private-sector leaders, is crucial to the implementation of effective anchor strategies. In this regard, it can literally take years to establish worthwhile collaborative relationships.

Different types of intermediaries may be required to make different kinds of projects work. Outside perspectives can often help to break conceptual logjams that hinder development. In addition, identifying where the appropriate leadership resides in academic/community-building partnerships is important. Such leadership generally takes the form of enlightened self-interest – and the beneficial impact that may be produced by anchor strategies are often clearly measurable. In this regard, quick wins – practical, intermediary solutions that may be implemented with relative ease within relatively small geographical area – can help to foster further university-city building.

The role of universities as anchor institutions in city- and community-building need to be written into the script of higher education of South Africa. A comprehensive review of anchor strategies and needs would support this, from relatively narrow cases such as universities needing to provide the right kind of accommodation to broader cases where the self-interest is less evident and the changes envisaged are broader socio-economic ones.

The issue of leadership, which is crucial, although individual leaders are often constrained, also needs to be examined, particularly the role of national government in terms of funding and support as a third stream.

The Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) and the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) could usefully consider the contributions and support that they could offer to universities seeking to develop anchor-institution initiatives. A review of practical solutions may be helpful, as well as strategic advice on how to work with municipalities and communities to improve communications and joint planning.

A network may be established to share information, perspectives and advice in this field, including through joint seminars and workshops. In this regard, important lessons may be learnt from CHEC's strategically important work in the Western Cape.

Programme

08h30   Welcome, Purpose of the Day, Introduction of Speakers
Professor Ivan Turok, Chair, HSRC, Executive Director
Professor Leslie Bank, HSRC/University of Fort Hare
Professor Nico Cloete, CHET, Director

09h00 International Keynote Speakers
Professor David Perry, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA
"The University as an Urban Anchor Institution"
Dr Jamie Flaherty, U3 Advisors, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
"Implementing Urban Anchor Strategies in American Cities"

11h00 Tea Break

11h30 Western Cape Case Studies
Dr Nasima Badsha, CHEC, CEO
"Cape Higher Education Consortium"
Ms Lois Dippenaar, Director of Institutional Planning, University of the Western Cape
"University of the Western Cape"
Mr Andrew Boraine, EDP, CEO
"Western Cape Economic Development Partnership"

13h00 Lunch

13h45 Gauteng Case Studies and Stellenbosch
Professor Mark Swilling, School of Public Management and Planning, Stellenbosch University
"Stellenbosch University: Centre for Conflict Systems in Transition"
Professor Denver Hendricks, Director, University Relations, University of Pretoria
"Institutional Planning, University of Pretoria"
Professor Alan Mabin, Director, Alan Mabin
"University of the Witwatersrand"

15h15 Tea Break

15h30 Eastern Cape Case Study
Professor Rod Bally, University Planner, University of Fort Hare
"University of Fort Hare"

16h15 Wrap Up
Professor David Perry, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA
Dr Jamie Flaherty, U3 Advisors, Philadelphia, USA
Professor Leslie Bank, HSRC/University of Fort Hare

Participants

Wilson Apkan	Dean of Research, University of Fort Hare
Nasima Badsha	CEO, CHEC
Rod Bally	University Planner, University of Fort Hare
Leslie Bank	Deputy Executive Director, HSRC Economic Performance and Development (EPD) and University of Fort Hare
Andrew Boraine	CEO, Western Cape EDP
Nico Cloete	Director, CHET
Paul Court	Senior Economist: Economic Information and Research, City of Cape Town
Lois Dippenaar	Director of Insitutional Planning, University of the Western Cape
Jaime Flaherty	Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, U3 Advisors
Samuel Fongwa	Research Specialist, HSRC
Denver Hendricks	Director, University Relations, University of Pretoria
Ayesha Jeffery	Coordinator/PA, HSRC EPD
Zola Hewu	Regional Director of Department of Economic Development, Province of the Eastern Cape
Alan Mabin	Director, Alan Mabin
David Maclean	Director, Business/Education/Consulting
Oyama Makalima	General Manager: Public Entity and Oversight and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Economic Development, Province of the Eastern Cape
Owen Mbundu	Project Manager: Institutional Planning, University of the Western Cape
Angela Mias	PA, CHET
Laura Nkula-Wenz	Affiliated Researcher at African Centre for Cities, Environmental and Geographical Sciences Department, University of Cape Town
Mawethu J Nyakatya	Manager, Research Partnerships Division for Social Impact, Stellenbosch University
Mark Paterson	Independent Consultant, Ford Project Team
David Perry	Urban Planning and Policy and Public Affairs Senior Fellow, University of Illinois at Chicago
Judith Perry	University of Illinois at Chicago

Suren Pillay	Associate Professor, Centre for Humanities Research, University of the Western Cape
Natasha Primo	Head of Policy and Research, Development Information and Geographic Information System Department, City of Cape Town
Diana Sanchez Betancourt	Senior Researcher, HSRC, Democracy, Governance and Service Delivery
Andreas Scheba	Chief Researcher, HSRC EPD
Suraya Scheba	African Centre for Cities Lecturer, Environmental and Geographical Sciences Department, University of Cape Town
Derrick Sekgala	Researcher, HSRC, Population Health, Health Systems and Innovation
Sipho Sibanda	Ford Intern, Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research (FHISER), University of Fort Hare
Francis Sibanda	Research Manager, FHISER, University of Fort Hare
Jerome Slamat	Executive Manager: Rectorate, Stellenbosch University
Crain Soudien	CEO, HSRC
Mark Swilling	School of Public Management and Planning, Stellenbosch University
Ivan Turok	Executive Director, HSRC EPD
Justin Visagie	Director, Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development