Trying times, trying harder
It seems to me that every person, always, is in a kind of informal partnership with his community. His own success is dependent to a large degree on that community, and the community, after all, is the sum total of the individuals who make it up. The institutions of a community, in turn, are the means by which those individuals express their faith, their ideals and their concern for fellow men.

“So broad and so deep are the objectives of the Mott Foundation that they touch almost every aspect of living, increasing the capacity for accomplishment, the appreciation of values and the understanding of the forces that make up the world we live in. In this sense, it may truly be called a Foundation for Living — with the ultimate aim of developing greater understanding among men.

“We recognize that our obligation to fellow men does not stop at the boundaries of the community. In an even larger sense, every man is in partnership with the rest of the human race in the eternal conquest which we call civilization.”

Charles Stewart Mott (1875-1973), who established this Foundation in 1926, was deeply concerned from his earliest years in Flint, Michigan, with the welfare of his adopted community.

Soon after he had become one of the city’s leading industrialists, this General Motors pioneer found a practical and successful way to express his interest. He served three terms as mayor (in 1912, 1913 and 1918) during a period when the swiftly growing city was beset with problems, with 40,000 people sharing facilities adequate for only 10,000.

As a private citizen, he started a medical and dental clinic for children and helped establish the YMCA and the Boy Scouts, along with the Whaley Children’s Center, in Flint.

Nine years after the Foundation was incorporated for philanthropic, charitable and educational purposes, it became a major factor in the life of Flint through organized schoolground recreational activities, which developed into the nationwide community school/education program.

From this start, the Foundation’s major concern has been the well-being of the community, including the individual, the family, the neighborhood and the systems of government. This interest has continued to find expression in Flint and also has taken the Foundation far beyond its home city.
Charles Stewart Mott’s central belief in the partnership of humanity was the basis upon which the Foundation was established. While this remains the guiding principle of its grantmaking, the Foundation has refined and broadened its grantmaking over time to reflect changing national and world conditions.

Through its programs of Civil Society, Environment, Flint Area and Pathways Out of Poverty, and their more specific program areas, the Foundation seeks to fulfill its mission of supporting efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.

Inherent in all grantmaking is the desire to enhance the capacity of individuals, families or institutions at the local level and beyond. The Foundation hopes that its collective work in any program area will lead toward systemic change.

Fundamental to all Mott grantmaking are certain values:

- Nurturing strong, self-reliant individuals with expanded capacity for accomplishment;
- Learning how people can live together to create a sense of community, whether at the neighborhood level or as a global society;
- Building strong communities through collaboration to provide a basis for positive change;
- Encouraging responsible citizen participation to help foster social cohesion;
- Promoting the social, economic and political empowerment of all individuals and communities to preserve fundamental democratic principles and rights;
- Developing leadership to build upon the needs and values of people and to inspire the aspirations and potential of others; and
- Respecting the diversity of life to maintain a sustainable human and physical environment.

**OUR CODE OF ETHICS**

Respect for the communities we work with and serve;
Integrity in our actions;
Responsibility for our decisions and their consequences.

- We are committed to act honestly, truthfully and with integrity in all our transactions and dealings.
- We are committed to avoid conflicts of interest and to the appropriate handling of actual or apparent conflicts of interest in our relationships.
- We are committed to treat our grantees fairly and to treat every individual with dignity and respect.
- We are committed to treat our employees with respect, fairness and good faith and to provide conditions of employment that safeguard their rights and welfare.
- We are committed to be a good corporate citizen and to comply with both the spirit and the letter of the law.
- We are committed to act responsibly toward the communities in which we work and for the benefit of the communities which we serve.
- We are committed to be responsible, transparent and accountable for all of our actions.
- We are committed to improve the accountability, transparency, ethical conduct and effectiveness of the nonprofit field.
Vision: The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation affirms its founder’s vision of a world in which each of us is in partnership with the rest of the human race — where each individual’s quality of life is connected to the well-being of the community, both locally and globally. We pursue this vision through creative grantmaking, thoughtful communication and other activities that enhance community in its many forms. The same vision of shared learning shapes our internal culture as we strive to maintain an ethic of respect, integrity and responsibility. The Foundation seeks to strengthen, in people and their organizations, what Mr. Mott called “the capacity for accomplishment.”

**Mission:** To support efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.

---

**CIVIL SOCIETY**

**Mission:** To support efforts to assist in democratic institution building, strengthen communities, promote equitable access to resources, and ensure respect of rights and diversity.

**Program Areas**
- Central/Eastern Europe and Russia
- South Africa
- United States
- Special Initiatives – International

**ENVIRONMENT**

**Mission:** To support the efforts of an engaged citizenry working to create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies, and appropriate models of development that protect the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world.

**Program Areas**
- Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems in North America
- International Finance for Sustainability
- Special Initiatives

---

**FLINT AREA**

**Mission:** To foster a well-functioning, connected community that is capable of meeting the economic, social and racial challenges ahead.

**Program Areas**
- Arts, Culture and Education
- Community Revitalization and Economic Development
- Special Initiatives

---

**PATHWAYS OUT OF POVERTY**

**Mission:** To identify, test and help sustain pathways out of poverty for low-income people and communities.

**Program Areas**
- Improving Community Education
- Expanding Economic Opportunity
- Building Organized Communities
- Special Initiatives

---

**EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS**

**Mission:** To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. *(Proposals are by invitation only; unsolicited proposals are discouraged.)*

**Program Areas**
- Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities
- Special Projects
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2008: Need I say more?

2008 was marked by two historic events. The first was the election of Barack Obama, an African American, to the presidency of the United States, and the second was the global economic crisis.

Much has been written about these events, so I do not plan to go into detail except to make a few comments.

After Barack Obama was elected, one of my good friends in Europe, John Richardson — who was the founding president of the European Foundation Centre — said to me, “Just when we had all given up on you, you Yanks have once again reinvented yourselves and, in the process, democracy.”

As I write this, President Obama has been in office for less than a year. Clearly, his presidency will have as great an impact on our grantmaking programs — regardless of where they occur — as will anything else in the foreseeable future. The President and his staff have been reaching out to the foundation community to learn more about projects that have demonstrated success that could be more broadly replicated. The Mott Foundation is not alone in saying, “While it is still the early days in Barack Obama’s presidency, we wish him well.”

The second major event of 2008 was the global economic meltdown. This economic catastrophe, from which no nation has fully recovered, is having a dramatic effect upon our Foundation, as well as almost every organization, business and individual I have run across. It seems that no one has been spared from its impact.

I believe, as most people do, that the recovery from this collapse will take several years. In my mind, the genesis of this collapse took place in the late 1990s and continued through 2002. During that time, there was too much false optimism or hubris — or greed, if you wish — governing and leveraging up the markets. Fundamentals were ignored, and too many investments were obscure. Derivatives, hedges and “bets” became popular. Bad policies contributed to the decline, as did two wars that were waged without the fiscal discipline and monetary restraints that are necessary in times of war.

I am not going to go into great detail about how we are responding to the economic decline, which has, in our case, resulted in a decrease in our assets. (See chart titled “Total assets at market value & total assets in 2008 dollars” on page 5.) But, I would like to share a few thoughts on our approach.

As assets dropped, we have been forced to reduce our grantmaking, but we have done so in a way that has allowed us to remain focused on our core programs and protect long-standing grantees. Through all this, we have honored our existing commitments, but frankly have had less capacity and flexibility to respond to unusual opportunities that present themselves regularly.

Throughout the downturn, we have tried to examine our activities and continued our long-standing practice of investing in our grantees for the long term. We also have tried to make sure grantees have been able to maintain their basic capacity. Likewise, we have invested our resources in nonprofit leaders and infrastructure.

Over the past eight years, the processes of natural attrition — including retirements and employees moving on to other opportunities — have...
reduced our staff ranks by more than 20 percent. That has allowed us to avoid layoffs.

I believe both events — President Obama’s election and the economic downturn — will result in many wonderful opportunities to reinvigorate programs, reinvent ourselves and develop new ways of doing business. for us and others.

In 2008, we also witnessed what was, for us, a bittersweet event. Our hometown of Flint, Michigan — “The Birthplace of General Motors” — celebrated the 100th anniversary of GM. But this community has been experiencing the loss of automotive employment for more than 30 years, and the Flint area and our entire state ended up at the epicenter of the collapse of domestic automotive manufacturing, which culminated in GM (and Chrysler) filing for bankruptcy this spring.

We have lived day-to-day in the midst of the tremendous economic loss, community strain and personal suffering this collapse has ignited, and we have increased our Michigan grants for economic development and diversification projects, workforce retraining and education, and basic social services.

Flint: a major part of our history

I would like to talk a little bit about the Flint area and some of the lessons we have learned from our decades of grantmaking here. At the same time, I want to emphasize strongly our continuing, deep commitment to our other three programs — our work in environment, education and poverty alleviation, as well as to our Civil Society program, both here in the U.S. and abroad in South Africa, Central/Eastern Europe and particularly Russia (the former Soviet Union).

Simply put, Flint has a special place in the history of the Mott Foundation. The lives and fortunes of William C. (Billy) Durant, the founder of GM, and Charles Stewart Mott, our founder, were closely intertwined.

In the late 1890s and early 1900s, C.S. Mott’s family owned the Weston-Mott Company, originally a manufacturer of bicycle hubs and wire wheels and later a producer of wire wheel assemblies for light carriages and the new “horseless carriages.” The company received its first big order for 500 of these wire wheels and forged axles from Ransom Olds in 1900. According to C.S. Mott’s autobiography, Foundation for Living, “There were Weston-Mott axles on the 16 Buicks made in 1903 and on the 37 that followed in 1904.”

In 1905, Durant invited Mr. Mott to open a branch of his axle plant in Flint. Rather than establishing this branch operation, he moved the entire company from Utica, New York, to Flint in 1906. Two years later, GM acquired 49 percent of Weston-Mott and, in an exchange of stock in 1913, the remaining 51 percent.

At that time, Mr. Mott joined the Board of Directors of GM and remained there until his death in 1973. When he created the C.S. Mott Foundation in 1926, he did so with a gift of 2,000 shares of GM stock worth $320,000. Before his death, he gave the bulk of his fortune to the Foundation, much of it in the form of GM stock.

When the first oil embargo occurred in the early 1970s, the Foundation began systematically diversifying our holdings as part of the work of our Investment Office, which was established about the same time. By May 2005, we had sold most of our GM stock, except those shares that might be part of an index fund or other funds we hold.

Nevertheless, GM — its history and its people, in good times and bad — has been an integral part of our history as an organization and as a member of the Flint community.

At one time there were more than 80,000 GM employees working in Genesee County. As of September 1, 2009, the new GM that emerged from bankruptcy had 219,000 employees in 140 countries, including 75,000 in the U.S. About 9 percent of the U.S. total — or 6,694 employees — were working in Genesee County.

We are optimistic that the Flint region will continue to be an important part of GM. While Genesee County’s remaining GM facilities are producing world-class engines and trucks, however, a number of the company’s large factory complexes have been leveled in recent years and are now empty brownfields awaiting redevelopment.
Place-based grantmaking

Thomas P. (Tip) O’Neill Jr., the late speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, had a favorite maxim: “All politics is local.” Another frequently expressed sentiment is the truism “Think globally, act locally.”

If you substitute “philanthropy” for “politics,” you will find an axiom that is at the heart of our grantmaking in Flint. While we fund projects in many parts of the world, we continue our tradition of active local engagement — or place-based grantmaking.

Granted, national and local grantmaking are similar in many ways. Each requires vision, creativity, strategy, discipline, responsible relationships and professionalism. However, there are some very real differences.

When you design a national program, you can hand-pick the communities and the grantees to test ideas and programs. As part of that process, Mott program staff members investigate the organizations we want to fund, assessing their capacities, the quality of their staffs, their track records and reputations. Once the grant is made, we employ extensive monitoring and due diligence activities.

Local grantmaking is often a tougher business, in large part because it takes place in a pre-designated locale with its existing structures and organizations, economic and human resources, and challenges.

Our experience has taught us that place-based grantmaking is more gritty. A local grantmaker quickly becomes aware of the complex relationships and interdependencies that can affect a project. The grantmaking is often about more than dispersing funds. There is greater direct engagement, technical assistance and collaboration. Even turning down a request for funding is more complex; you need to go beyond the denial letter and assist the organization seeking funds to figure out next steps.

As one of our program directors put it, the local grantmaking clock ticks at a different pace. The opportunities and needs are very real, and equally hard to ignore or dismiss. You confront the impact of your decisions — both the successes and failures — on a daily basis as you walk to lunch, attend a community meeting or see your neighbors at the grocery store.

Our program staff has specific areas of expertise in the national grantmaking arena — in environmental issues, poverty reduction and workforce development, and strengthening the nonprofit sectors, to name just a few. In recent years, we have been blurring the lines between our national funding programs and our local grantmaking as our staff takes on responsibilities in both national and Flint area initiatives.

The learning and sharing that occur as a result of this collaboration benefit both our national and local grantmaking. We believe each is becoming stronger and more effective through the sharing of experiences, expertise and ideas.

Lessons learned

As noted earlier, out of his long-term concern and involvement in the community, Mr. Mott established this Foundation in 1926. Since then, we have been through many phases. With the benefit of hindsight, we have learned some valuable and sobering lessons about our work in Flint.

First, there are no guarantees the projects we fund will have the outcomes we expect. We know full well there are many factors outside our control that influence the quality of life, employment opportunities and the environment in which area residents live and work. Increasingly, those influences are not just local or domestic, but global in nature.

Second, many projects seem to have life cycles. Some are longer. Some are more sensitive to outside influences. And all have different capacities for adaptation.

Third, how one defines a successful project can change over time.

Fourth, long-established organizations, such as this Foundation, have to be prepared to respond to changing environments and opportunities in order to remain effective.

Fifth, Mr. Mott believed in people and invested in people. This philosophy remains at the heart of our grantmaking. At the core, we hope all of our investments will have a positive impact on people’s lives. We support the work of effective leaders — people with good ideas who are committed to this community and who doggedly keep putting one foot in front of the other to pursue a goal or vision.

Leadership can take many forms. Leaders can be chief executive officers, executive directors of a small business or nonprofit organization, or neighborhood residents who have the respect and backing of their communities. Equally important are the individuals who get the nuts-and-bolts work accomplished in organizations.
Increasingly, partnerships are essential. Even with our considerable resources, this Foundation is a very small player in today’s global economy. We value partnerships of all shapes and sizes. In today’s complex and intertwining world, no organization has the knowledge, resources or agility to go it alone.

Our contributions to these partners or collaborations are not just grant dollars. Frequently, they take the form of our staff’s time and expertise. At other times, we act as a convener to bring together different groups and people.

We realize we should be looking not only to fund good programs, but also to peek beneath the programs to see what policies are either in place, or are needed, to ensure programs’ success.

Finally, we have learned patience and persistence.

A tale of two cities

For a variety of reasons, including our long commitment to this community and the historic events affecting GM, this report focuses on our recent work in Flint and Genesee County. This special section, titled “Trying times, trying harder,” begins on page 7.

While the U.S. has been in a recession for the past year, the Flint area, Southeast Michigan and indeed the entire state have been in more dire straits for far longer.

We faced several challenges in presenting a snapshot of our work in Flint and Genesee County. We decided to focus on projects that were funded — or came online — in 2008 in order to create bookends for what is a complex and lengthy story with many intertwined elements.

Historically, we have provided nearly $650 million — or 28.5 percent of our grant dollars — for projects that benefited organizations and residents of our home community. Our engagement here has spanned eight decades, and today’s funded projects are often the result of earlier investments and experiences.

There also is a certain continuity and progression to the work. In other words, it is not unusual that the projects and programs you will read about in this report have evolved — directly or indirectly — from studies, projects and programs that we supported years, or sometimes decades, before.

But most importantly, our grantmaking in Flint and Genesee County is about building connections and linkages — between and among grantees, local organizations, people, ideas and resources.

We also would like readers to understand that our efforts around economic development and job creation, and workforce development and training, go beyond Genesee County and include support of many regional and statewide initiatives.

While we do not go into the details in this narrative, our efforts in these arenas have intensified over the past 20 years as the state of Michigan and its residents have faced increasingly difficult economic times.

We have supported projects as diverse as providing venture capital for research and developments at the state’s leading research institutions, participating in a collaboration of funders to stimulate entrepreneurship in Southeast Michigan and helping to preserve valuable natural resources such as land and water for future generations.

The second challenge has been how to best balance the community’s positives and negatives. As many people know, Flint repeatedly has been held up as the poster child for everything that can possibly go wrong — from corporate governance and governmental dysfunction to poverty, social collapse, violence and personal suffering.
In the material that follows, we have tried to paint a realistic picture of our hometown, acknowledging its challenges, but also highlighting the many good things that are taking place. It is almost our own version of Dickens’ Tale of Two Cities.

We do not have the resources to solve all of the world’s problems, let alone Flint’s. But what we can do is figure out where we can have impact to bring about some fundamental changes that will improve the lives of people.

An argument for philanthropic perpetuity

In recent years, one of the great debates about the philanthropic world has been the question of whether a foundation should make all of its grants during the donor’s lifetime or shortly thereafter (i.e., spend down), or whether it should manage its resources and grant-making to exist for a very long time (perpetuity).

When Mr. Mott established this Foundation, he chose perpetuity.

If our Foundation had been set up — or required by law — to spend down or go out of existence within a few years after Mr. Mott’s death, it would have done so at a time when GM still was one of the largest, if not the largest, industrial corporations in the world and probably the most influential.

Because of its status as the center of GM operations, Flint was the epitome of the American dream. Generations of families had moved here from other states and then remained in the community to receive good wages and benefits and partake in a solidly middle-class lifestyle.

But because of this dependence on one industry and company, the community had far more resources at that time than it does today.

If the Foundation had embraced a spend-down philosophy or been required to do so, it clearly would have benefited Flint nonprofits and the community at that time. But this would have meant we would not be present today to help Flint, its organizations and its people when they are going through very tough times and a wrenching transition from one type of economy to another.

Over the years, we have made our share of mistakes and false moves, but we are still here trying to lend a hand to people. There is not a lot of new wealth currently being created in Flint or, for that matter, in Michigan.

The Mott Foundation and other foundations like it are needed more than ever before. We can invest some money in important activities that do not have access to other resources or enough of them. We can help leverage other resources for greater impact. We can take the long view. We also can help some organizations not only to survive these trying times, but also to fight back.

In planning his Foundation, Mr. Mott also took the long view. He placed great faith in the Foundation’s Board of Trustees not only during his lifetime, but also in future generations, to make thoughtful decisions and prudent use of our resources. Certainly, he hoped they would honor his wishes but, at the end of the day, he did not put constraints or limits on future Trustees. We believe that our Trustees continue to honor his intent, and that current and future Trustees will continue to make decisions beneficial to Flint and its residents.

Governance and administration

Our Board of Trustees held four regularly scheduled meetings for a total of six days in 2008; in addition, the Trustees met as a board one time via conference call. The Investment Committee met four times; a special independent subcommittee of that committee met five times. The Audit Committee met twice and the Executive Committee did not meet.

Earlier this year, we made some changes in our Johannesburg, South Africa, office. Vuyiswa Sidzumo, who joined Mott in 2005 as an associate program officer and served as a program officer since 2007, was promoted to director of that office in June 2009.

William S. White
President
Trying times, trying harder
Enrollment in Flint public schools has dropped from more than 46,000 to 12,500 in the past four decades, resulting in more than two dozen school buildings being closed.
The city of Flint is home to four institutions of higher education with a total enrollment of 29,400 full- and part-time students.
Finding hope among fields of quicksand
Michael Brown chooses vivid word pictures to describe Flint’s precarious economic situation.

“It seems like the bottom is quicksand. Every time we make decisions, we sink a bit deeper,” said Brown, who served as interim mayor for six months after the elected mayor resigned in February 2009, less than 10 days before a scheduled recall vote.
When Brown spoke on CNN’s “State of the Union with John King” in June 2009, he told an international television audience that Flint’s economic crisis pre-dates the recent global meltdown.

“We’ve been experiencing this recession for 25 years, so we’re really the epicenter of this crisis.”

For most of those 25-plus years, the greater Flint area has been the topic of socioeconomic research projects, the butt of jokes, the fodder for non-flattering movies, and at or near the bottom of several “worst of” national lists, including “Worst Cities for Recession Recovery,” “Worst Cities for U.S. Housing Markets” and “America’s Fastest Dying Cities.”

The city itself has made headlines in the past decade for its mayoral and council recalls, employee indictments, record foreclosures and even a financial takeover by the state in 2002.

Sean McAlinden, vice president of research and chief economist at the Center for Automotive Research in Ann Arbor, Michigan, says Flint illustrates the negative impact of the current global financial crisis.

“The Dark Angel flew over this city during the country’s economic downturn,” said McAlinden, who also is co-author of “Beyond the Big Leave,” a study about the future of automotive employees in the U.S.

Few deny that Flint’s longtime overdependence on automotive-related jobs, especially those linked to General Motors Corporation, has been a major cause of Genesee County’s ongoing economic woes. For decades, a well-worn adage was “As GM goes, so goes the country.” That was especially true for the county.

One hundred and one years after GM was founded in Flint, the company was emerging from bankruptcy in the summer of 2009. Meanwhile, the city was trying to stay afloat amid $15 million of municipal red ink while facing a jobless rate of 27 percent as of August 2009.

Part of the city’s financial problems has been a 50 percent decline in its industrial tax base. In addition, its property tax base has declined in the past decade. In 1999, Flint’s property tax valuation of $1.81 billion was 20.6 percent of Genesee County’s total $8.82 billion valuation. In 2009, the city’s valuation had declined to $1.64 billion, which was 13.2 percent of the county’s total valuation of $12.46 billion.

Still, Brown, McAlinden and especially Flint’s newly elected mayor, Dayne Walling, 35, point to glimmers of hope in Flint, the Mott Foundation’s home community.

As the father of two young sons, Walling says he prefers to look at the community through “the front windshield and not the rearview mirror.”
“My goal as mayor is to accelerate the positive change that I see taking place across the city, especially around downtown, the hospitals, and the colleges and universities, while at the same time reforming City Hall to serve the community in the 21st century.”

As someone who was raised in Flint and its public schools and then went on to become a Rhodes Scholar, Walling says he knows Flint’s challenges up close and personally. But he also recognizes its potential after having traveled nationally and internationally.

“Business owners from anywhere in the world should take a close look at our low-cost land, world-class infrastructure and unique location halfway between Toronto and Chicago.”

Unlike the failed revitalization efforts of the 1980s, community leaders are not looking to outsiders to bring the magic-bullet solution this time, says Philip Shaltz, a lifelong Flint-area resident and local business owner since 1975.

Instead, he says, they rolled up their sleeves, made a realistic assessment of the community’s strengths and challenges, and started putting their energy and finances into promising projects, especially those in the city’s downtown area.

“That’s the key difference between back then and now,” Shaltz said. “This time, local people who have a history of being successful here are putting their own money at risk.”

As president of Shaltz Automation Inc., a Flint-based automotive supplier, he was an original investor in the Uptown Six, a group of prominent businessmen who together have provided $2.5 million since 2004 to support downtown redevelopment projects. That investment has leveraged almost $200 million in projects by linking with other private, public and nonprofit partners, including the Mott Foundation, according to Scott Whipple, project manager for Uptown Development, LLC.

He says a variety of projects are reshaping Flint’s downtown landscape, including restaurants, commercial businesses, retail establishments, parking ramps, and housing options, such as lofts, university housing and renovated historic hotels that will serve as apartment buildings.

For the past five years, the ongoing development has been a visible sign that Flint, and more broadly, Genesee County, is trying to reduce its dependency upon
the automotive industry while diversifying its economy. There has been steady growth for several years in two specific sectors: medicine and higher education.

Each sector has strong anchor institutions, with the county serving as home to three major hospitals — Genesys Regional Medical Center, Hurley Medical Center and McLaren Regional Medical Center — and four educational institutions — Baker College of Flint, Kettering University, Mott Community College and the University of Michigan-Flint.

The three hospitals employ more than 8,300 people, while the four colleges and universities (with a total of 29,400 full- and part-time students) employ almost 2,900. Along with the struggling automotive industry, those are Genesee County’s three largest employers.

The community also is home to the Flint Cultural Center, which has been recognized nationally because it provides a range of activities and services that are usually found only in larger cities, including: a 2,100-seat performance auditorium; a regional historical museum; the state’s largest planetarium; separate institutes of music and arts; and a youth theater.

The Flint area also is ideally suited for continent-wide trade because two major interstate highways — I-69 and I-75 — intersect near the city. While I-75 runs north and south and can transport goods from Canada to Florida, I-69 runs east and west through Flint and stretches from Canada south toward Mexico. Both countries are the U.S.’s major trading partners.

Flint’s Bishop International Airport provides yet another form of transportation for people and cargo.¹ (See endnotes, page 38.)

While community leaders point to all of those strengths, they acknowledge that Genesee County’s many challenges did not develop overnight and will not be resolved quickly.

For example, in the early 1970s there were 80,000 GM employees in the county, said to be the largest concentration of one employer in any county in the U.S. Today, GM’s local workforce is less than 10 percent of that figure. When Flint-area jobs started leaving the county with the first automotive decline during the oil crisis of the early 1970s, its people fol-
lowed. This exodus has been most obvious in the city of Flint, where the population dropped from 193,317 residents in the 1970 census to 112,900 in the 2008 census estimate. And that number continues to drop.

The city’s shrinkage is reflected in its public schools, which have been losing an average of 1,100 students annually for the past 10 years. Consequently, the district has closed 10 city schools since 2008. In 1975, the Flint school district operated 56 schools — the most ever. But in the fall of 2009, after the most recent school closings, that number will drop to 27.

About 70 percent of students remaining in Flint schools qualify for free or reduced lunches, which is an indicator of childhood poverty. In addition, both middle schools, as well as two of the city’s three high schools, haven’t met the national academic standards for Adequate Yearly Progress for two years, meaning they’ve been identified as needing improvement.

The statistics for adults living in Genesee County also are troubling because the per capita rate of domestic violence is the highest for all of Michigan’s 83 counties, according to the Michigan State Police’s 2006 Uniform Crime Report, the most recent figures available.

Contrary to common perception, FBI and Flint police records for 2008 show the crime rate in downtown Flint is not much different from the rate in surrounding suburbs. In fact, there hasn’t been a downtown homicide in the past two years, and the assault rate is about the same in the city as in the nearby affluent suburb of Grand Blanc.

Those figures bode well for wooing county residents back to downtown Flint to live, work, attend post-high school classes or worship services, shop, dine and be entertained, says Shaltz of the Uptown Six.

He says the investors “jump-started” the redevelopment and are setting the stage for the city’s comeback. But whether the changes are long-lasting really depends on whether local residents support Flint’s downtown.

“When we started all this, there were people who literally laughed at me,” Shaltz said.

“They called me an idiot, said I was crazy and told me I was throwing my money away. But those same people are telling me that they have seen the progress. They didn’t believe it, but they are seeing it.”

As a Flint booster, Shaltz encourages people to follow the downtown’s month-to-month progress and also to support special events that bring visitors to the community from around the state, nation and even other countries. He points to two major summer events: the world-renowned Crim Festival of Races, and Back to the Bricks Cruise and Car Show.

In recent years, participants in those events or other visitors might have noticed new housing options available near the downtown area. University Park Estates is a 72-acre subdivision of about 155 new houses one-half mile north of the UM-Flint campus, and the nearby Metawanenee Hills neighborhood contains 24 units of new single-family houses and duplexes.
Visitors also might notice more green space in Flint’s 31.7 square miles. The change reflects an effort to “right-size” and revitalize the city using smart growth and urban land reform principles.

The “right-size” concept was designed largely by Genesee County Treasurer Daniel Kildee, who also is founder and chairman of the Genesee Land Bank, an award-winning tool to manage and improve publicly owned properties within a specific region. (See page 31.)

After sharing his right-sizing idea broadly in June 2009, Kildee generated national and international media attention, including an interview with the British Broadcasting Corporation and an on-air discussion by radio personality Rush Limbaugh.

For Kildee, right-sizing makes sense.

“Decline is a fact of life in Flint. Resisting it is like resisting gravity,” he said.

“The real question is not whether we’re shrinking, but whether we let it happen in a destructive or sustainable way.”

He points to the 4,800 city properties that now belong to the land bank; 3,000 are vacant and abandoned lots, and 1,800 are abandoned, dilapidated and dangerous houses. Kildee says they need to be either demolished or sold to people who will repair and occupy them.

The city of Flint is in agreement and plans to pay demolition costs for 500 buildings in 2009, a 50 percent increase from the number of structures leveled in 2008. From the land bank’s creation in 2002 through July 2009, 960 county structures have been demolished, 912 of which were within the city of Flint. Consequently, the city is filled with hundreds of acres of vacant residential land, and some plots have been purchased for urban gardening by residents.

Additionally, the city has 1,400 acres of former industrial land, commonly called “brownfields,” that are available for redevelopment.

For Brown, the former interim mayor, the land bank is one piece of a large new puzzle that needs to be fitted together to reshape the city. He says that after attention is given to all the pieces — the city’s aging infrastructure, its struggling schools, its need for stronger city/county cooperation and a new master plan to replace the outdated one done in the 1960s — hope will resurface for the city’s future. He now heads the newly created Flint Area Reinvestment Office, designed to attract federal and state funding to Genesee County. The office is supported by a collaboration of local funders, including the Mott Foundation.

“We’ve got to redefine and reposition the city, and we’ve got to manage ourselves better,” Brown said.

“After we start doing all that, we will be managing the city well with less.”
Hands-on leadership can make difference

Philip Shaltz is one of the original investors in the Uptown Six, which is helping revive Flint’s downtown. He says that almost anything is possible when community leaders pool their time, energy, passion and “a little bit of money.”

Reta Stanley, president of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint, adds another requirement — tenacity.

Meanwhile, Joel Rash — manager of Launch, an entrepreneurial program at the University of Michigan-Flint — says that to make positive change happen, leaders also need a healthy balance of creative risk-taking and practical skills.

“It’s not usually the pie-in-the-sky ideas that work, but things that come from real life,” he said.

“We can make a difference and we are making a difference.”

PHILIP SHALTZ
Shaltz the businessman, Stanley the nonprofit professional, and Rash the calculated risk-taker all grew up in the Flint area and have spent many years — publicly and privately — implementing real-life ideas to improve the city and its organizations for individuals and families.

The trio’s hands-on leadership style is a common trait in people who head nonprofit organizations and institutions that the Mott Foundation funds, whether locally, nationally or internationally.

Decades ago, when Charles Stewart Mott, the institution’s founder, was considering whether to fund an organization, he often said he liked to “bet on people,” especially those in leadership roles. For him, investing Foundation resources in smart, creative and passionate leaders was as important as investing his personal finances wisely.

That principle still guides Mott’s grantmaking.

In 2008, as in previous years, Mott program staff reviewed the vision, skills and track records of leaders in the Foundation’s home community of Flint before providing financial support to their organizations. While the specifics varied, those given grants routinely earned high marks for strong and effective leadership.

Shaltz, Stanley and Rash all know well the community’s challenges and opportunities, yet they have decided to work diligently to turn the former into the latter.

“We can make a difference, and we are making a difference,” Shaltz said.

“But it’s been a horrendously difficult task — emotionally, physically, psychologically and logistically. So far, we’re pleased with where we’re at.”

The change Shaltz refers to is visible along either side of the red bricks of S. Saginaw Street, the north-south artery through the heart of downtown Flint. Several formerly boarded-up storefronts and hotels are now either open for business or preparing to open within the next 12 to 18 months, with development dollars totaling almost $200 million since 2004. Of that amount, $12.2 million came from five Mott grants and two Foundation-administered projects in 2008 alone.

Decisions about how to revitalize the city’s core are not made quickly or in a vacuum, Shaltz says, because everyone involved wants to minimize the chances of failure.
“There have been a lot of disappointments in Flint during the past 15 or 20 years, but now there’s a sense of expectation with new employees working downtown and college students living downtown,” he said.

“We’re not rushing to put businesses into storefronts, because we don’t want to be boarding up any buildings that have already been unboarded.”

While much of the downtown’s progress has resulted from public, private and nonprofit partnerships, the same has been true for the successes seen at Launch, says Rash, a longtime Flint booster who maneuvers downtown streets and sidewalks on his bicycle — a replacement for the skateboard he rode when working as a promoter for visiting punk rock bands in the late 1980s and 1990s.

Launch, located on UM-Flint’s urban riverfront campus, taps the entrepreneurial skills and community connections Rash developed as a young commercial property owner and as coordinator for the Downtown Facade Improvement Program at the Community Foundation of Greater Flint.

Mott has provided UM-Flint Launch with two grants totaling $290,000 for its entrepreneurial programs.

Approximately 50 university students are in some stage of starting a small business through Launch — whether it is a graphic design firm, an urban culture and fashion magazine, or a Web server and technology company. They listen to Rash, they say, because he’s made mistakes, knows the pitfalls to avoid and has a sixth sense for moving ideas to market or “commercializing ideas” in the Flint context.

“Joel reminds us of the competitive advantage of being in Flint,” said Eric Knific, CEO of Epic Technologies Solutions, a company that started through Launch and operates 20 to 30 Web servers in the Detroit area and 20 to 30 more in Flint.

“The cost to rent office space is cheaper here than in a place like Austin, Texas, so why wouldn’t technology companies like mine, or phone call centers, be located here?”

Flint’s low threshold for entry, as Rash calls it, paved the way for him to buy commercial property years ago.

“I only had $500 to put down,” he said.

“I didn’t own a house, I didn’t own a car; I owned a skateboard. I had no collateral, but I was able to buy a downtown building. I couldn’t have done that in very many other cities.”

Flint’s distressed economy, primarily due to the region’s longtime dependence on the automotive industry, is also what makes it an inexpensive place to do business, Rash says.

Flint’s tough socioeconomic conditions also affect the number and categories of children mentored through Big Brothers Big Sisters, Stanley says.

Although the local chapter has served children of prisoners for many years, in 2004 it increased efforts to provide mentorships for children of incarcerated parents after receiving funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to participate in
Big Brothers Big Sisters’ national Amachi prisoner project.

In 2008, Flint Big Brothers Big Sisters expanded its reach by linking the national Amachi prisoner project with a local partnership between itself and Motherly Intercession, a Flint-based nonprofit.

The new program has received support through a one-year, $175,000 Mott grant.²

About 32 percent, or 352 of the total 1,100 children and youth enrolled in Flint’s program, qualify for special services, such as mentoring, academic support and visitations with their incarcerated parents. During the first six months of 2009, 238 of the 352 qualified children of prisoners were served through the program. Since 2004, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint has provided services to nearly 700 children whose parents were incarcerated in a state or federal prison, Stanley says.

“For her, describing the leadership skills required to serve in the top spot of one of the community’s oldest operating nonprofit organizations is akin to spelling out the qualities needed to be an effective Big Brother or Big Sister.

“My mom taught me the importance of staying with a task and the importance of being dependable,” Stanley said.

“She taught me to do what you say you will do, and to care about others.”

Stanley’s expectation for the new program mixes with her enthusiasm about the positive changes she sees in the city where she and her husband, Woodrow, grew up. He served as mayor and now is a state representative. The couple also raised their two children, Heather Williams and Jasmine McKenney, in Flint.

“There’s a real excitement in Flint right now that change is possible,” Reta Stanley said.

“I’m privileged to sit in this seat at Big Brothers Big Sisters at this time; to be here to invest in our children and to support them in whatever future they choose — for themselves and this city.”
Alfred Bruce Bradley has lived his dream: He has either met or shared the stage with the top tap-dancers in the world. Still, he’s hungry for something more. “To see my best day yet, that’s what drives me,” the Mount Morris resident said.

“I’ve laid the foundation for that best day to come into being. I’ve done something with my time on this planet by trying to make life a little better for others and being faithful in the small things.”

Others, such as Paul Torre, president of the Flint Institute of Music (FIM), say Bradley is a community leader who has been faithful in the big things too, such as empowering Flint-area youth to create positive goals for themselves. Torre describes Bradley as “an exceptional man and a hero to many.”

“Bruce wants to use tap to help young people reach their dreams, not just in tap or music, but in whatever area they pursue,” Torre said.

Although Bradley has taught tap dancing to hundreds of people of all ages for decades, it’s the Tapology Dance Festival that gets his pulse racing.

In 2008, the Mott Foundation provided a $50,000 grant to FIM to help support the sixth annual festival on the Flint Cultural Center campus.

In addition to bringing together talented dancers from many states, the festival creates an opportunity for about 1,000 Flint public school students to learn the history, music and culture of tap dancing, along with gaining basic dance skills from visiting performers.

For Bradley, hosting an event that allows tap dancers of all ages and skill levels to interact with, learn from and perform for others is one way to give back — and spark interest in the craft — in his hometown.

While Bradley’s tap talent (and strong bass voice) might have landed him a career anywhere in the country, he intentionally planted roots in the Flint area for himself; his wife, Sherry; and their four children, because family connections are important to him.

So, what started as a two-week summer teaching job in 1988 at Flint’s Department of Parks and Recreation has evolved into Bradley’s passion.

“There are life lessons kids can learn from tap dancing, lessons that you would never imagine,” he said. “You learn about giving and sharing and being true to who you are.”

Tap dance is the great American dance, Bradley says, because it crosses racial, social, economic and religious lines.

He began dancing publicly when he was about 7 years old as “Glenda’s little brother,” tagging along while she walked to Flint community centers with her Hawaiian guitar and a desire to win neighborhood talent show competitions. While she strummed and plucked, Bradley duplicated dance steps he had memorized from “American Bandstand,” a then-popular afterschool television program that showcased teenagers dancing to Top 40 music.

But the Alabama State University visual arts graduate didn’t take his first formal dance lesson until he was 33. While on tour in Toronto with a theater group, Bradley paid for 13 private lessons with the popular Len Gibson.

“I am getting so much gratification from knowing that the meager investment I made with my money and time is now paying off,” Bradley said.

“I can see that seed growing into a branch — one that is full of kids with talent. I believe tap gives hope. It is a skill that can become a positive creative force in anyone’s world.”
Power of numbers can bring results

Social change is most likely to be genuine and lasting when people and organizations pull together, says Renee Zientek, assistant vice chancellor for university outreach at the University of Michigan-Flint. And real collaboration, she notes, requires real work.

“The most successful partnerships are built on open communication, honest relationships and trust,” Zientek said. “That combination isn’t always easy to achieve, especially if folks have traditionally been on different sides of the conversation. But the potential outcomes, both for the partners and the community, make it well worth the effort.”

Charles Stewart Mott would have undoubtedly welcomed her point. He created his foundation in 1926 out of not only a deep affection for his adopted hometown of Flint, but also a clear understanding that one institution cannot solve a community’s challenges.

This set the stage for what has since become a hallmark of Mott’s grantmaking, both locally and around the world: helping people and organizations at every level come together to explore their individual concerns, find common ground and work toward shared solutions.

Supporting partnerships and collaboration is also a key thread linking the Foundation’s
four grantmaking programs, which are working jointly to help the Flint region write a new chapter in its unfolding and sometimes difficult story.

One example of that collaborative approach in 2008 was a one-year, $55,000 grant — made through Mott’s Pathways Out of Poverty program — to the Community Foundation of Greater Flint for the launch of the Genesee County Out-of-School Youth Initiative. The initiative is designed to assemble and support a local partnership aimed at strengthening educational services for area young people who have dropped out of school.

Statistics show that more than half of the young people in some Flint area schools abandon their studies before graduation. While the county’s suburban schools generally have much lower dropout rates, many are seeing their numbers increase.

As the initiative’s convening organization, the community foundation has brought together representatives from city and county schools, workforce development and child advocacy organizations, community organizing groups, local governments, and higher education institutions.

Those partners are surveying other agencies and organizations throughout the county to examine factors contributing to the dropout crisis and to assess the available resources for reconnecting area young people to educational opportunities.

The findings, says Patrick Naswell, the community foundation’s vice president of community impact, will help the group identify meaningful, long-term solutions to the problem; inform local and state policymaking on issues of dropout prevention; expand and increase the pathways to graduation and high school completion; and bring additional partners to the initiative.

"With this kind of complex, systemic challenge, there’s only so much that one agency, one school, one community can do. It’s only through partnerships that we’ll leverage the capacity to move the issue forward."

PATRICK NASWELL, COMMUNITY FOUNDATION OF GREATER FLINT
This cooperative, community-driven strategy, he says, offers perhaps the best hope for stemming the tide of the dropout crisis in Genesee County.

“With this kind of complex, systemic challenge, there’s only so much that one agency, one school, one community can do,” Naswell said. “It’s only through partnerships that we’ll leverage the capacity to move the issue forward.”

The role of collaboration in creating local change is also evident in the work of the Flint River Corridor Alliance. This group of representatives from the community’s public, private and nonprofit sectors seeks, through advocacy and direct action, the restoration and responsible redevelopment of the river in the downtown Flint area.

Mott made a one-year, $42,936 grant in 2007 through its Environment program to the UM-Flint to fund administrative activities related to the alliance. The Foundation increased that support in 2008 with a supplemental six-month, $21,000 grant.

The alliance, launched in 2005, is made up of 11 partner organizations and more than 100 community members. These include neighborhood groups; educational, health-care and governmental bodies; nonprofit and community organizations; businesses; churches; and individuals.

Zientek, who is the alliance’s chairperson, says ensuring that every stakeholder has a voice in shaping the alliance’s goals, as well as a role in seeing them through, is central to the partnership’s design.

“It’s about people with diverse perspectives coming to the table, engaging each other on the issues and developing a mutual understanding of possible solutions,” she said. “This better positions them to combine resources and turn a shared vision into reality.”

The alliance’s current projects include identifying environmentally sound uses for vacant and abandoned properties along the river; calling for the repair of aging infrastructure on the waterway; and promoting the river as a source of recreational activities, such as canoeing, kayaking and fishing.
Leveraging relationships and resources was also a highlight of the Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust (BEST) project in 2008.

The project was launched in 2003 with the collaborative support of Mott, the community foundation, the Ruth Mott Foundation and the United Way of Genesee County. The goal of BEST is to grow the capacity of the county’s nonprofit sector to better meet the community’s changing needs. This includes helping participating agencies assess their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities; obtain funding for capacity-building activities; work with consultants and technical assistance providers to strengthen their organization’s operations and structure; and access ongoing training and customized follow-up to ensure sustainable progress.

Funding for BEST in 2008 included a one-year, $275,000 grant — made through Mott’s Flint Area program — to the United Way, the fiscal sponsor for the project.

The Foundation’s Civil Society program is also supporting BEST through a 21-month, $300,000 grant made in 2007 to Washington, D.C.-based BoardSource for the Building Nonprofit Leadership Initiative in Flint and Genesee County.

The initiative — a joint project of BoardSource and BEST — was launched in early 2008 to help strengthen the capacity, participation and effectiveness of board member service at area nonprofits. A summit on issues of board governance attracted more than 300 area leaders, while BoardSource and local consultants have teamed up to help more than a dozen local nonprofits — including the alliance — explore new strategies and approaches to governance and board development. Additional agencies have completed the initiative’s board self-assessment process or participated in other governance-related trainings and workshops.

BEST Director Jennifer Acree says this collective effort to strengthen the local nonprofit sector illustrates that “while we’re not the only community in the country facing such challenges, we are one of the few taking a collaborative approach to address them.”

She also believes that, both in Genesee County and around the country, partnerships at all levels are an invaluable asset when confronting what might otherwise be overwhelming concerns.

“We should always challenge ourselves to connect with others, create a shared vision and act as stewards for our communities,” Acree said. “It needs to be part of our culture, where partnerships are valued in both the up times and the down.”
“FHEO has truly changed my life and my son’s.”

NINA HARRIS
Nina Harris remembers daydreaming as a little girl about becoming a nurse one day. After graduating from high school, the Flint resident, now 37, took jobs as an aide in local nursing and adult-care homes, eager for the chance to touch the lives of others. While she thoroughly enjoyed the work, Harris found few opportunities to advance into higher-paying jobs. By the time she gave birth to her son, Nolan, in 2005, this single parent knew she needed to secure her family’s financial future. But she also knew she couldn’t do it alone.

Today, the partnerships behind the Flint Healthcare Employment Opportunities program (FHEO) are helping Harris and other area residents chart a new course, both for themselves and the community.

The FHEO works with local partners to help participants obtain the necessary tuition, books and supplies for the study of health care, and connect with entry-level positions in the field. The program also helps students overcome barriers to employment, such as access to transportation and child care. And it is working with area employers to ensure that each graduate’s skills — as well as the sector’s own employment practices, such as job retention, promotion and compensation — meet local needs.

The FHEO partners include area hospitals and nursing-care centers, workforce development programs, and intermediate and higher education institutions. Several are Mott grantees.

The Foundation’s continuing support of the FHEO in 2008 was a six-month, $76,050 grant to the Greater Flint Health Coalition (GFHC), the program’s lead, coordinating agency.

Building community relationships is nothing new to the coalition, itself a partnership of local stakeholders working to improve the health status of county residents and the quality and cost-effectiveness of the area health-care delivery system. For example, it was part of a collaborative effort that in 2001 launched the Genesee Health Plan, which provides basic health, diagnostic and prescription drug benefits to uninsured, low-income county residents.8

And while different experiences, interests and points of view can make the collaborative process complex, says GFHC President Stephen Skorcz, such factors also can produce “more resources and energy, make the partners more connected and invested, and the outcomes more powerful.” Janie Stewart, vice president of career and corporate services at Baker College of Flint (a FHEO partner organization), agrees. In addition to skills training, Baker offers FHEO participants a number of workshops designed to help them transition to a career in health care.

Stewart says partnerships help bring people and organizations out of their comfort zone, encouraging communication and an understanding of the unique contributions each has to offer.

“Every one of us, working on our own, can make a difference,” she said. “And when we work together, we can create an ocean of change.”

That change is evident in the FHEO’s continued success. Of its 213 graduates, roughly 60 percent have obtained entry-level jobs in the health-care industry, while others have launched careers in different sectors.

But the program’s importance — and the collaborative spirit behind it — goes beyond simple economics, says Tim Srock, vice president of human resources at McLaren Regional Medical Center, another FHEO partner.

“The program is doing more than helping people get jobs,” he said. “FHEO graduates, through their caring interaction with patients and families, are also impacting the community’s spiritual, emotional and physical health. Those are the seeds for moving Genesee County forward.”

Harris looks forward to counting herself among FHEO alumni. She enrolled in 2005 and a year later was accepted into Mott Community College’s nursing program. She continues to work part-time as a nurse’s aide while completing her clinical studies, both at McLaren, and plans to graduate in May 2010 with an associate degree in nursing. She hopes to then obtain her state license as a registered nurse.

“FHEO has truly changed my life and my son’s,” Harris said. “By becoming a nurse, I hope to do the same for others.”
Fresh ideas can provide paths for change

The year 2008 was another good one for the Genesee County Land Bank. Working with the Mott Foundation and other philanthropic, federal, state, private and municipal organizations, the land bank began redeveloping the historic, but long-abandoned Durant Hotel in downtown Flint into 93 loft-style apartments, designed to appeal to students and faculty at nearby colleges and universities.

The $23-million project, which includes a $2-million grant from Mott, represents both a physical and psychological boost for the entire Flint area, which is struggling to create new pathways to reinvigorate its economy, improve the overall quality of living and “right-size” the city’s physical boundaries.

The soon-to-be-renovated hotel, symbolic of Flint’s decline for more than three decades since it closed in 1973, now is emblematic of the cooperation, planning and physical improvements that are beginning to reshape and strengthen the central city.

The decaying Durant Hotel has stood empty in downtown Flint since 1973.
“Now it serves a great connector for our community,” said Daniel Kildee, Genesee County treasurer and chairman of the land bank. The 90-year-old building sits at the center of four land-use plans for the downtown Flint area created with Mott support by Sasaki Associates Inc., of Watertown, Massachusetts. The Durant project is helping create a “university corridor” linking downtown with the city’s cultural center and three major educational institutions.

The Sasaki plans — produced from 2001 to 2003 — have helped guide decisionmaking for several major institutions that have stakes in creating a more livable, vital central city in the Foundation’s home community. They also have helped provoke conversations that buttress the connections that are beginning to occur between and among the institutions and their physical environments.

The Foundation’s interest in pursuing policies that would help its hometown transition to a post-industrial economy started more than 20 years ago, as automotive manufacturing jobs began leaving the area.

Pursuing policies that help people and communities work together to resolve complicated problems cuts to the heart of Mott’s grantmaking — in Flint and across the globe. From its earliest years, Mott has focused on policy change, initially by expanding the use of public school buildings in Flint through an extended school day. Before- and after-school programming, considered revolutionary in the 1930s, now is common in schools across the world.9

Grants that help individuals rethink their approach to a problem and develop a plan of action are just one strategy for crafting effective policy. Mott also makes grants to encourage best practices, test model programs and disseminate research. In Flint, where the Foundation has an 82-year commitment to place-based grantmaking, it has had the opportunity to encourage effective policy by making grants over long periods of time to a set of strong educational, cultural and nonprofit institutions.

The land bank is one of the most widely recognized of the Mott-supported policy reform efforts in its home community. Recipient of Harvard University’s Innovations in American Government Award in 2007, the land bank currently serves as a national model for reshaping policy and planning in distressed cities.

Mott’s support for land banking dates to 1997, when a grant was made to the Hudson Institute to develop a broad framework around urban land-use policy, which ultimately led to the development of Michigan’s Public Act 123. The legislation enabled county governments to move tax-delinquent property through the forfeiture, foreclosure and sale process within a 25-month period. Since then, the Foundation has provided more than $1 million to develop a land bank model for Michigan and other municipalities to replicate or adapt.10

Flint’s Mott Middle/Early College High School (MMEC), the first multidistrict, middle college high school in the country, is another Mott-funded project that has had local and national policy impact. “At Mott, higher education begins in high school,” said Chery Wagonlander, longtime principal of the middle college high school, a Mott grantee since 1993. “Our goal is to eliminate the gaps between high school and college.”

MMEC, located on the campus of Flint’s Mott Community College, has been pioneering the early college model for 18 years, helping to launch 16 early college high schools across the country. The school will graduate its first “13th year” class — 40 students dually enrolled in both high school and...
community college classes — in 2009. Each dual-enrolled student will graduate from high school with college credit — several with enough to earn a two-year associate’s degree.

MMEC has been selected as a model for replication by the national early college initiative and the Michigan Department of Education. Through its Center for Middle and Early College in Michigan, funded in 2008 with a multiyear, $700,000 Mott grant, the school will serve as the hub for research and implementation related to middle and early college high schools, with a focus on Michigan school districts participating in a state initiative to open 12 early colleges by 2011.

Mott also provided $199,250 in support through the Genesee Intermediate School District for the Genesee Early College on the University of Michigan-Flint campus, one of the first of the state’s new early colleges to be opened.

Across town, Kettering University is using Mott funding to build a successful future for itself and its home community.

Kettering, a Mott grantee since 1983 when its name was General Motors Institute, is using grant dollars — $2 million in 2008 — to launch a multiyear series of strategic initiatives aimed at increasing the enrollment of engineering students who will have a hand in shaping the economic future of the Midwest, including distressed communities such as Flint.

Across the country, engineering schools are competing for a diminishing number of students interested in the sciences and working to diversify the pool of existing applicants. The Mott grant will enable Kettering to institute a wide range of recruiting strategies and provide tuition merit scholarships for qualified students.

Mott stepped up its support to the university in 1982, after the school separated from General Motors Corporation. One of the top 20 undergraduate engineering schools in the country, Kettering has received more than $23 million in capital, endowment and operating support from Mott.

As the only fully co-op engineering and management university in the U.S., Kettering combines practical experience in the workplace with academic study in mechanical, electrical, computer, industrial and manufacturing systems engineering; and in applied sciences.

“We want to recover the entrepreneurial spirit that flourished along the Flint River 100 years ago.”

STANLEY R. LIBERTY, KETTERING UNIVERSITY
mathematics, environmental chemistry, computer science, applied physics and management systems. The students’ presence at their co-op placements provides Kettering with ongoing, consistent relationships with a diverse set of businesses in the automotive, plastics, bio-engineering, medical device, management, finance, chemical and metallurgy fields.

These relationships are especially important to Flint, which is not only seeking to transition from a manufacturing to a knowledge-based economy, but also striving to increase the number of locally owned businesses.

“We want to recover the entrepreneurial spirit that flourished along the Flint River 100 years ago,” said Stanley R. Liberty, Kettering’s president. The university has inaugurated a four-year initiative to train faculty to incorporate entrepreneurial skills across its curriculum.

Kettering also has created high-end laboratory, business incubation and business commercialization space within the C.S. Mott Engineering and Science Center Building — constructed in 2000 with $7 million in Mott funding. In 2006, Mott provided $541,966 in matching funds to launch Kettering’s Fuel Cells and Advanced Technologies Commercialization Incubator to help emerging businesses seeking to commercialize high-tech products and services.

Anchoring the western end of Flint’s new university corridor, Kettering also is using $251,141 in Mott funding to create a campus that is more vibrant and attractive to students. Working with the land bank, the university has acquired a number of blighted properties that have been cleared and green-spaced for future campus expansion. Ultimately, Kettering hopes to increase the density of student housing on campus with spillover down the university corridor to downtown.

Taken together, these Mott-funded initiatives illustrate the painstaking amount of time (often decades), commitment and dollars needed to help a community break from the familiar and begin to effect the policy changes that will help restructure the future.

Developing and implementing good policy is a hallmark of successful communities, but it is complicated work and holds no guarantee of success. In Flint, current conditions have created no choice but change — presenting the Foundation with an ongoing and important opportunity to determine how strategic grantmaking can help move a community forward.
Dancers attending the Joffrey Ballet’s Midwest Summer Intensive workshop use the East Kearsley Street “connector” to walk from UM-Flint to the Flint Cultural Center.
Although it’s just 1,300 feet long, the new East Kearsley Street “connector” is having a major impact on pedestrian and vehicular traffic in downtown Flint. By linking the University of Michigan-Flint campus and the central business district with the Flint Cultural Center and Mott Community College, the reopened street creates an easy route that eliminates a physical barrier between town and gown.

“It’s a very simple idea — its power comes from its symbolism — acknowledging the need to open up the university to the larger community,” said Jack Kay, who was interim chancellor of UM-Flint in 2008, when the work on the connector was begun and completed with a grant of $1,891,588 from the Mott Foundation. (Kay now is provost and executive vice president of Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti.)

For many years, Flint’s downtown — like many in the U.S. — was marginalized by the growth of suburban commerce; inferior land-use planning; and poor decisions regarding zoning, parking and traffic flow. Recognizing that the central city could have the assets to make it attractive to students and residents, the Foundation made a grant to UM-Flint to undertake a campus master plan to tie the downtown and university to the cultural center to the east and Kettering University to the west. It was one of four such plans by Sasaki Associates Inc. that Mott funded between 2001 and 2003 at a total cost of $1,074,300.

Prior to the reopening of the Kearsley Street connector, the cultural center — a 30-acre, park-like complex of seven arts and cultural institutions — existed as a separate sphere from the campus and downtown. Building off the notion of creating a “university corridor” running from Kettering through downtown and UM-Flint to the cultural center and Mott Community College, the four master plans helped cement those connections in 2008, when W. Third Avenue (another east-west connector) was rechristened University Avenue.

The new physical link went hand-in-hand with programmatic collaborations that began in 2001 among the institutions, including articulation agreements, friendly competitions and College Town, a program that has attracted more than 2,600 student memberships to the Flint Institute of Arts.

“The various physical connections underscore and validate the spirit of collaboration that was happening between the campuses, the city and the cultural center,” said Stanley R. Liberty, Kettering president.

One of the most psychologically significant boosts to downtown Flint’s regeneration was the 2008 dedication of UM-Flint’s long-anticipated First Street Residence Hall. Graced with a permanent student presence, the campus and downtown are benefiting from this new vitality.

“It’s only 300-plus beds, but the magnitude of change it has brought is stupendous,” Kay said.

Mott also supported the renovation of the Berbridge and Durant hotels — formerly blighted properties along the northern edge of downtown. Targeting young professionals and the more than 30,000 college students attending Flint’s various colleges and universities, the refurbished properties will provide more than 120 loft-style apartments as well as street-level commercial space.

In 2008, the Foundation also provided support for the purchase and renovation of another closed downtown hotel, the former Character Inn, now the Riverfront Residence Hall, which will house up to 550 students when completed.

The Foundation has supported the construction or renovation of several commercial and residential buildings along Flint’s historic, brick main street. In 2008, the new Wade Trim Building opened and the Community Foundation of Greater Flint moved into two rehabilitated buildings, bringing new life, commerce and jobs to a block of shuttered buildings.

“These physical connections — they’re symbolic of things this community has been hoping for and working on for a long time,” said Cindy Ornstein, CEO of the Flint Cultural Center Corporation. “These relationships are enabling us to move forward together.”
Several huge former General Motors manufacturing complexes in Flint and Genesee County have been leveled and are now vacant brownfields awaiting redevelopment.
The Back to the Bricks Cruise and Car Show in August has grown rapidly over five years and attracted close to 250,000 people over five days in 2009.
ENDNOTES

1 Mott’s support for Bishop International Airport, including development of its intermodal hub, has totaled $14 million through 2008.

2 Mott has been involved with the Big Brothers Big Sisters movement for decades. In 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower presented Charles Stewart Mott with the Big Brother of the Year Award. The Foundation’s support has totaled $3.8 million since 1944.

3 Mott’s support for the Flint Cultural Center Corporation and its member institutions totaled $4.2 million in 2008 and $26.7 million from 2004 through 2008.

4 From 2004 through 2008, Mott provided the Community Foundation of Greater Flint with $7.9 million in support for endowment, operations and capital projects.

5 Mott’s support for vulnerable youth in Genesee County totaled $755,000 in 2008 and $1.68 million from 2004 through 2008. This included support for Mott Middle/Early College High School.

6 Mott historically has invested $1.7 million in capital projects to improve and beautify the Flint River.

7 Mott’s support for the BEST project has totaled $1.8 million since 2003.

8 The Genesee Health Plan is a membership corporation in which local, state and federal funds are used to pay the health-care fees or premiums of enrolled members. The plan has served roughly 56,000 area residents since its launch and has been supported through a countywide millage since 2007. Mott’s support of the demonstration phase for the plan totaled $1.55 million from 2004 through 2008.

9 Mott’s support for community education dates to 1935 and has totaled $326 million, including $128 for the public/private 21st Century Community Learning Centers afterschool initiative. As part of that overall support, Mott has provided $16.4 million for the Bridges to the Future afterschool program in Genesee County since 2000.

10 Mott’s support for the Genesee Land Bank totaled $2.15 million in 2008 and $3.49 million from 2004 through 2008.
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Programs & Grants
**CIVIL SOCIETY**

**Central/Eastern Europe and Russia**

**EU New Member States**

AGORA Platform: Active Communities for Development Alternatives

Sofia, Bulgaria

$150,000 – 30 mos.

General purposes

Association for Community Relations

Cluj-Napoca, Romania

$160,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Association of Community Foundations in Bulgaria

Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

$80,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

BlueLink Foundation

Sofia, Bulgaria

$80,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Bulgarian Charities Aid Foundation

Sofia, Bulgaria

$120,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Cluj Community Foundation

Cluj-Napoca, Romania

$75,000 – 36 mos.

General purposes

Creating Effective Grassroots Alternatives

Sofia, Bulgaria

$140,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Czech Association of Community Foundations

Usit nad Labem, Czech Republic

$80,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Eastern-Hungarian Community Service Foundation

Debrecen, Hungary

$160,000 – 24 mos.

Support center development

Green Circle

Prague, Czech Republic

$75,000 – 36 mos.

General purposes

Oodorheiu Secuiesc Community Foundation

Oodorheiu Secuiesc, Romania

$75,000 – 36 mos.

General purposes

Princess Margarita of Romania Foundation - Romania

Bucharest, Romania

$200,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Slovak Donors Forum

Bratislava, Slovakia

$75,000 – 36 mos.

General purposes

Socia - Social Reform Foundation

Bratislava, Slovakia

$500,000

Endowment for sustainable future

Stefan Batory Foundation

Warsaw, Poland

$1,200,000 – 72 mos.

Regional Advocacy Fund

Trust for Civil Society in Central and Eastern Europe

Washington, DC

$100,000 increase

Bulgarian community foundations development fund

VIA Foundation

Prague, Czech Republic

$600,000

Endowment for sustainable future

Volunteer Center Foundation

Budapest, Hungary

$70,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Subtotal: $3,940,000

**Western Balkans**

Association for Civil Society Development - SMART

Rijeka, Croatia

$60,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

Association for Psychosocial Help and Development of Voluntary Work

Gracanica, Bosnia and Herzegovina

$60,000 – 24 mos.

Centre for Development and Promotion of Voluntary Work

Association "Mi"

Split, Croatia

$60,000 – 24 mos.

General purposes

**Grant Activity: $26,138,334 / 184 Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central/Eastern Europe &amp; Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU New Member States</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Balkans</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>$3,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE/Russia Regional</td>
<td>$3,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy</td>
<td>$1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights, Responsibilities and Participation</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>$1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector Effectiveness and Accountability</td>
<td>$2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy</td>
<td>$1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector Research</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Initiatives - International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy</td>
<td>$3,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$26,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar figures include Foundation-Administered Projects/Direct Charitable Activities, which are not counted as grants.
**Transitional justice**

**Justice and reconciliation in Balkans**

**International Center for General purposes**

**$40,000 – 24 mos.**

Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Schools**

**International Association “Interactive Open Court support network**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Human Rights in Republika Srpska**

**Helsinki Committee for support**

**Institutional and programmatic development**

**$70,000 – 24 mos.**

Belgrade, Serbia

**group 484**

**General purposes**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Belgrade, Serbia

**Fund for Active Citizenship**

**Podgorica, Montenegro**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Centers for Civic Initiatives - Tuza**

**Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Centre for Promotion of Civil Society**

**Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Civic Initiatives**

**Belgrade, Serbia**

**$120,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Colonnades Theatre Lab, Inc.**

**Nashville, TN**

**$420,000 – 12 mos.**

**Truth in Translation Project - Balkans Tour**

**European Stability Initiative**

**Berlin, Germany**

**$150,000 – 24 mos.**

Western Balkans cohesion initiative

**Forum of Tuza Citizens**

**Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Fund for Active Citizenship**

**Podgorica, Montenegro**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Group 484**

**Belgrade, Serbia**

**$70,000 – 24 mos.**

Institutional and programmatic development support

**Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska**

**Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

Court support network

**International Association “Interactive Open Schools”**

**Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$40,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**International Center for Transitional Justice**

**New York, NY**

**$150,000 – 24 mos.**

Justice and reconciliation in Balkans

**Interreligious Council in Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$50,000 – 24 mos.**

Interreligious dialogue and cooperation in Bosnia

**Network for the Affirmation of NGO Sector - MANS**

**Podgorica, Montenegro**

**$50,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Organization for Civil Initiatives**

**Osijek, Croatia**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Populari**

**Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$50,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Regional Foundation for Local Development Zamah**

**Zagreb, Croatia**

**$75,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Tuzla Community Foundation**

**Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**United Nations**

**New York, NY**

**$90,000 – 18 mos.**

Web site for International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia

**Vojvodanka - Regional Women's Initiative**

**Novi Sad, Serbia**

**$40,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Youth Communication Center - Banja Luka**

**Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**$60,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Subtotal:**

**Western Balkans**

**$2,535,000**

**Western Former Soviet Union**

**ANNA**

**Moscow, Russia**

**$150,000 – 24 mos.**

Mobilizing local communities to prevent domestic violence

**Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**

**Washington, DC**

**$350,000 – 36 mos.**

Carnegie Moscow Center

**Center for Philanthropy**

**Bratislava, Slovakia**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Building capacity of Belarus’ analytical community

**Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**

**Washington, DC**

**$350,000 – 36 mos.**

Carnegie Moscow Center

**Center for Philanthropy**

**Bratislava, Slovakia**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Building capacity of Belarus’ analytical community

**Sakhalin Salmon Initiative Center**

**Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Increasing private donations to Russian nonprofit sector

**Nizhni Novgorod Voluntary Service**

**Nizhni Novgorod, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Community universities

**NGO School**

**Moscow, Russia**

**$128,000 – 24 mos.**

Increasing private donations to Russian nonprofit sector

**Epstein & Fass Associates**

**New York, NY**

**$2,000,000 – 18 mos.**

Community indicators and governance improvement

**Eurasia Foundation**

**Washington, DC**

**$25,000,000 – 12 mos.**

Bill Maynes Fund for Future Leaders of Eurasia

**Europe XXI Foundation**

**Kyiv, Ukraine**

**$100,000 – 36 mos.**

General purposes

**GURT Resource Center for NGO Development**

**Kyiv, Ukraine**

**$90,000 – 36 mos.**

General purposes

**International Center for Not-for-Profit Law**

**Washington, DC**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Building enabling legal environment for Ukraine’s nonprofit sector

**ISAR**

**Washington, DC**

**$160,000 – 22 mos.**

Development of Belarusian NGO capacity in environmental protection field

**Moscow School of Political Studies**

**Moscow, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**New Eurasia Foundation**

**Moscow, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Community universities

**Polish Ukrainian Cooperation Foundation “PAUCI”**

**Kyiv, Ukraine**

**$300,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Pontis Foundation**

**Bratislava, Slovakia**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Building capacity of Belarus’ analytical community

**Sakhalin Salmon Initiative Center**

**Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Sakhalin watershed council network initiative

**Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center**

**Novosibirsk, Russia**

**$175,000 – 24 mos.**

Sakhalin Salmon Initiative Center

**Sluzhenye Association**

**Nizhny Novgorod, Russia**

**$130,000 – 24 mos.**

Nonprofit sector

**TimeBank**

**Washington, DC**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Community universities

**New Eurasia Foundation**

**Moscow, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Building enabling legal environment for Ukraine’s nonprofit sector

**Nizhni Novgorod Voluntary Service**

**Nizhni Novgorod, Russia**

**$150,000 – 24 mos.**

TimeBank

**Polish Ukrainian Cooperation Foundation “PAUCI”**

**Kyiv, Ukraine**

**$300,000 – 24 mos.**

General purposes

**Pontis Foundation**

**Bratislava, Slovakia**

**$100,000 – 24 mos.**

Building capacity of Belarus’ analytical community

**Sakhalin Salmon Initiative Center**

**Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia**

**$200,000 – 24 mos.**

Sakhalin watershed council network initiative

**Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center**

**Novosibirsk, Russia**

**$175,000 – 24 mos.**

Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center

**Sluzhenye Association**

**Nizhny Novgorod, Russia**

**$130,000 – 24 mos.**

Community development in Volga region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Center</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
<td>$150,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Step by Step Foundation</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$210,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Community development in Ukraine through community schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE/Russia Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathian Foundation International</td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
<td>$1,200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE Citizens Network</td>
<td>Banská Bystrica, Slovakia</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContinYou</td>
<td>Coventry, England</td>
<td>$280,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>International Centre of Excellence for Community Schools in Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Donors Forum</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Center for Not-for-Profit Law</td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathian Euro-region action research</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,261</td>
<td>Community education development assistance project in Central/Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Marshall Fund of the United States</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$1,000,000 increase</td>
<td>Black Sea Trust for Regional Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Network Foundation</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Central Eurasia Leadership Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian Rural Forum</td>
<td>Riga, Latvia</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Pre-accession partnerships for rural Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Platform</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>$60,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Civil society contact group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,402,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE/Russia Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,507,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka Innovators for the Public</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$60,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Citizen Base Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Policy Studies</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$75,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Investigating role of civil society in a maturing democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose South Africa</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Training for leaders of nonprofit organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Development Programme</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Institute of Business Science</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Policy, Leadership &amp; Gender Studies “Dialogue Circles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rustenburg Community Foundation</td>
<td>Rustenburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wolpe Memorial Trust</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$10,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhala Trust</td>
<td>Port Elizabeth, South Africa</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Resources Trust</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Legal support services for nonprofit organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaAfrika Tikun</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$120,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Institute for Advancement</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Governance program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiyakene Development Fund</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$63,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Nonprofit Institution building project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$245,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Partnership in philanthropy and social entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,373,000</td>
<td>Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights, Responsibilities and Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sash Trust</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$250,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Public Participation</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Local government support program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Law and Rural Development Centre</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Development Program</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$120,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Training of local government councillors and communities in KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Contemporary Research</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Links</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isandla Institute</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karoo Centre for Human Rights</td>
<td>Beaufort West, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Development Initiative</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes University</td>
<td>Grahamstown, South Africa</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Rhodes University Legal Aid Clinic in Eastern Cape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change Assistance Trust</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Community Outreach and Education</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$120,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Community engagement with local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Fort Hare</td>
<td>Alice, South Africa</td>
<td>$40,000 – 16 mos.</td>
<td>UNESCO Oliver Tambo Chair of Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Support of Fair Share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,010,000</td>
<td>Rights, Responsibilities and Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td>$4,461,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States

#### Nonprofit Sector Effectiveness and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$75,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social Justice and Civil Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Small Foundations</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFLeads</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>$50,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Oversight and regulation of charitable organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential transition project with state attorneys general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial/Ethnic Diversity

#### Arab American and Middle Eastern Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services</td>
<td>Dearborn, MI</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>$53,662 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Technical assistance on collaboration for Arab-American philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Grant Makers</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$125,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Diversity fellowship program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Michigan Foundations</td>
<td>Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Transforming philanthropy through diversity and inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Black Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Philanthropy, Inc.</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$226,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Leadership through philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Black Philanthropy</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Asian American and Pacific Islander Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New World Foundation</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Regional Association of Grantmakers</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 25 mos.</td>
<td>Diversity in Philanthropy Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity and Inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council on Foundations</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Diversity and inclusiveness program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$50,000 increase</td>
<td>Diversity in philanthropy field scan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Education Foundation</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Education Summers Youth Leadership Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race and Ethnic Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000 increase</td>
<td>Social justice program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditshwanelo CARAS</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$90,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Justice and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Kennedy Memorial</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>$50,000 – 6 mos.</td>
<td>Speak Truth to Power initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyagraha - In Pursuit of Truth</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$80,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Holocaust Foundation</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African History Archive Trust</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$60,000 – 17 mos.</td>
<td>Truth and Reconciliation Commission project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States

#### Race and Ethnic Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$90,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Justice and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Holocaust Foundation</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African History Online</td>
<td>Pretoria, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$133,920 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Biko Foundation</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umtapo Centre</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>$75,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal: $1,078,920

### United States

#### Nonprofit Sector Effectiveness and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$75,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Solopath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$150,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>GrantsFire initiative</td>
<td>Nonprofit Sector Effectiveness and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal: $2,660,000

### Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy

#### Arab American and Middle Eastern Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services</td>
<td>Dearborn, MI</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>$53,662 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Technical assistance on collaboration for Arab-American philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Associated Grant Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$125,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Diversity fellowship program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Council of Michigan Foundations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Transforming philanthropy through diversity and inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal: $75,000 – 15 mos. | Diversity in philanthropy research metrics |

### Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>$226,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Leadership through philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Center for Black Philanthropy, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$80,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Native Americans in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal: $140,000 – 24 mos. | Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy Project |

### New World Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New York Regional Association of Grantmakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 25 mos.</td>
<td>Diversity in Philanthropy Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$50,000 increase</td>
<td>Diversity in philanthropy field scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Southern Education Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Education Summers Youth Leadership Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal: $1,429,662

### Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Quarterly</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$150,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>U.S. nonprofit infrastructure study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Nonprofit Sector Research

**Aspen Institute**  
*Washington, DC*  
$25,000 increase  
Caring to Change project

**Foundation Center**  
*New York, NY*  
$120,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**Johns Hopkins University**  
*Baltimore, MD*  
$180,000 – 36 mos.  
Nonprofit Listening Post Project

Subtotal: $325,000

## Race and Ethnic Relations

**Public Interest Projects**  
*New York, NY*  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Fulfilling the Dream Fund

Subtotal: $200,000

## Special Opportunities

**State of Michigan**  
*Lansing, MI*  
$129,880 – 12 mos.  
Office of Foundation Liaison

Subtotal: $129,880

## Special Initiatives - International

**Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy**

**Bundesverband Deutscher Stiftungen**  
*Berlin, Germany*  
$180,000 – 36 mos.  
Community foundation initiative in Germany

**Capital Community Foundation**  
*London, England*  
$150,000 – 36 mos.  
Enhancing fund development for London communities

**CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation**  
*Washington, DC*  
$125,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Community Foundation Network**  
*London, England*  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**Community Foundations of Canada**  
*Ottawa, Canada*  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Transatlantic Community Foundations Network

**Compu Mentor**  
*San Francisco, CA*  
$320,000 – 24 mos.  
Increasing civil society access to emerging technology

**Council on Foundations**  
*Arlington, VA*  
$50,000 – 24 mos.  
International program

**East-West Management Institute**  
*New York, NY*  
$75,000 – 18 mos.  
Philanthropication through privatization project

**European Foundation Centre**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
$258,000 – 12 mos.  
Consolidating membership

**Foundation-Administered Projects**

**Global Fund for Community Foundations**  
*$110,000*  
Mexico community foundation study

**Dorothy Reynolds monograph series**  
*$54,055*  
Community foundation technical assistance

**International Community Foundation**  
*National City, CA*  
*$312,000 – 24 mos.*  
U.S./Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership

**Irish Youth Foundation**  
*Dublin, Ireland*  
$73,000 – 26 mos.  
Youth empowerment partnership program in Ireland

**Network of European Foundations**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
*$318,500 – 12 mos.*  
General purposes

**Philanthropy Ireland**  
*Dublin, Ireland*  
*$232,500 – 36 mos.*  
General purposes

Subtotal: $3,064,606

## Special Opportunities

**International Center for Transitional Justice**  
*New York, NY*  
*$200,000 – 24 mos.*  
General purposes

**Madariaga College of Europe Foundation**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
*$160,000 – 12 mos.*  
Citizens’ Europe program

Subtotal: $360,000

## Program Area Total: $4,744,542

## Special Initiatives - International

**Network of European Foundations**  
*Brussels, Belgium*  
*$318,500 – 12 mos.*  
General purposes

**Philanthropy Ireland**  
*Dublin, Ireland*  
*$232,500 – 36 mos.*  
General purposes

**Research Foundation of the City University of New York**  
*New York, NY*  
*$10,000 increase*  
International Community Foundation Fellows Program

**Synergos Institute**  
*New York, NY*  
*$200,000 – 24 mos.*  
Senior Fellows Program

Subtotal: $3,424,606

## Program Total: $26,138,334
Snapshot: Civil Society
To support efforts to assist in democratic institution building, strengthen communities, promote equitable access to resources, and ensure respect of rights and diversity.

CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA

GOAL: To foster societies in Central/Eastern Europe (CEE) and Russia in which people and communities respect each other's rights and engage effectively in decisionmaking to influence policies and processes that shape their lives at the local, national and/or international levels.

OBJECTIVES

- European Union (EU) NewMember States. Promote processes that strengthen public participation in the development of communities and societies, and ensure an adequate and responsive flow of resources to support these activities.
- Western Balkans. Promote processes that strengthen public participation in the development of communities and societies, and ensure an adequate and responsive flow of resources to support these activities; and promote processes and initiatives to build stable and strong inter-communal relations and reduce the likelihood of violent ethnic conflict.
- Western Former Soviet Union. Promote processes that strengthen public participation in the development of communities and societies, and ensure an adequate and responsive flow of resources to support these activities; and strengthen institutions and mechanisms that ensure people's rights are respected, and that laws and policies to protect these rights are promulgated and implemented.
- CEE/Russia Regional. Assist nonprofits from both accession and non-accession countries in maximizing the positive and mitigating the negative impacts of EU enlargement; and build the capacity of CEE/Russia nonprofits through international peer-to-peer learning and information exchange around issues relevant to the overall CEE/Russia program goal.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES – INTERNATIONAL

GOAL: To respond to unique opportunities related to the development of civil society internationally.

OBJECTIVES

- Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy. Promote a vibrant and independent nonprofit and philanthropic sector in select countries and internationally.
- Special Opportunities. Pursue unique and compelling opportunities that fall outside the scope of other areas under this program.

SOUTH AFRICA

GOAL: To support a vibrant, diverse and inclusive civil society in which nonprofit organizations work to deepen democracy, increase participation in decisionmaking, advance socioeconomic and racial equality, and promote justice and reconciliation.

OBJECTIVES

- Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy. Build a more effective and well-managed nonprofit sector that is engaged with issues of poverty and inequality and that is adequately resourced through public and private funding.
- Rights, Responsibilities and Participation. Strengthen people's engagement with local community structures and increase public participation in decisionmaking processes to ensure that people's rights are upheld, advanced and fulfilled.
- Race and Ethnic Relations. Enhance the ability of nonprofit organizations and local communities to better address racism and discrimination, and to promote justice and reconciliation.

UNITED STATES

GOAL: To support a strong enabling environment for philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in the U.S., emphasizing accountability, effectiveness and inclusiveness.

OBJECTIVES

- Nonprofit Sector Effectiveness and Accountability. Support access by philanthropic and other nonprofit-sector practitioners to learning opportunities, capacity-building assistance and policy advocacy services that enhance effectiveness and accountability.
- Nonprofit Sector Research. Support timely and reliable gathering and dissemination of data and research on philanthropy and the nonprofit sector for the benefit of the field.
ENVIRONMENT

Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems
Strengthening the Environmental Community

Alabama Rivers Alliance
Birmingham, AL
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Alliance for the Great Lakes
Chicago, IL
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Flint River Watershed Coalition
Flint, MI
$80,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Freshwater Future
Petoskey, MI
$500,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy
Traverse City, MI
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Great Lakes United
Amherst, NY
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Heart of the Lakes Center for Land Conservation Policy
Lansing, MI
$30,000 increase
General purposes

Kentucky Waterways Alliance
Greensburg, KY
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Minnesota Environmental Partnership
St. Paul, MN
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Northeast Minnesota program

netCorps
Eugene, OR
$160,000 – 24 mos.
Building capacity of freshwater ecosystem organizations

River Alliance of Wisconsin
Madison, WI
$170,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes Program

River Network
Portland, OR
$420,000 – 24 mos.
Building citizen capacity for freshwater protection

Wisconsin Wetlands Association
Madison, WI
$90,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

World Wildlife Fund
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Southeastern rivers and streams support fund

Subtotal: $2,490,000
Strengthening the Environmental Community

Grant Activity: $13,747,000 / 92 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATION OF FRESHWATER ECOSYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Environmental Community</td>
<td>$2.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policies</td>
<td>$2.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-Based Conservation</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL FINANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future</td>
<td>$3.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Regional Development and Integration</td>
<td>$1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFORM OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE AND TRADE (discontinued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Reform and Implementation</td>
<td>$0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening International Constituencies for Reform</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL INITIATIVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan</td>
<td>$0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$13,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar figures include Foundation-Administered Projects/Direct Charitable Activities, which are not counted as grants.
### Site-Based Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Environmental Action Network</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Environmental Council</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$59,281 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Environmental Advocates</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Baykeeper</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Reston, VA</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>$75,000 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast-Midwest Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club Foundation</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Environmental Law Center</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tulane Environmental Law Clinic</td>
<td>water quality and wetlands project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$10,469</td>
<td>8 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Lakes climate change adaptation workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $2,419,750

### Global Freshwater Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Information Center</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$55,000 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BankTrack</td>
<td>Nijmegen, Netherlands</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>25 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Declaration (Erklarung von Bern)</td>
<td>Zurich, Switzerland</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner House</td>
<td>Dorset, England</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURNATURA</td>
<td>Lisbon, Portugal</td>
<td>$15,000 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>15 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Greengrants Fund</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rivers</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Amis de la Terre</td>
<td>Montreuil, France</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on ADB Quezon City, Philippines</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Change International</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $2,419,750

### Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Watch</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$280,500</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asociación Civil Labor</td>
<td>Ilo, Peru</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$59,281 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$3,500 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Socio-Environmental Support</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Greengrants Fund</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>$3,500 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rivers</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$280,500</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto del Bien Común</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Latinoamericano de Servicios Legales Alternativos</td>
<td>Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>$136,750</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $3,425,000

---

**International Finance for Sustainability**

#### Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Information Center</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$55,000 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Declaration (Erklarung von Bern)</td>
<td>Zurich, Switzerland</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner House</td>
<td>Dorset, England</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURNATURA</td>
<td>Lisbon, Portugal</td>
<td>$15,000 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>15 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Greengrants Fund</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rivers</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Amis de la Terre</td>
<td>Montreuil, France</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on ADB Quezon City, Philippines</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Change International</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $3,425,000

---

**Sustainable Regional Development and Integration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Watch</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$280,500</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asociación Civil Labor</td>
<td>Ilo, Peru</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$59,281 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$3,500 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Greengrants Fund</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>$3,500 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rivers</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$280,500</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto del Bien Común</td>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Latinoamericano de Servicios Legales Alternativos</td>
<td>Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>$136,750</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Alliance of Latin American & Caribbean Communities
Chicago, IL
$275,000 – 24 mos.
Building capacity of Latino immigrants related to international financial flows
Subtotal: $1,445,750
Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

Special Opportunities
Community Partners
Los Angeles, CA
$40,000 – 24 mos.
Funders Network on Trade and Globalization mapping of global financial institutions
FERN
Moreton-in-Marsh, England
$25,000 – 3 mos.
Forest protection, trading and governance
World Resources Institute
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Strengthening forest governance
Subtotal: $215,000
Program Area Total: $5,085,750

Reform of International Finance and Trade (discontinued)
Policy Reform and Implementation
Earthjustice
Oakland, CA
$100,000 increase
International program
FERN
Moreton-in-Marsh, England
$50,000 – 12 mos.
EU campaign to reform export credit agencies
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Minneapolis, MN
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening voice of civil society in global arena
Institute for Policy Studies
Washington, DC
$180,000 – 12 mos.
Sustainable energy and alternative global economic policies
International Institute for Sustainable Development
Winnipeg, Canada
$50,000 – 24 mos.
Investment treaty news
Subtotal: $680,000
Policy Reform and Implementation

Strengthening International Constituencies for Reform
Instituto del Tercer Mundo
Montevideo, Uruguay
$100,000 – 18 mos.
Latin American monitor of international financial institutions
Third World Network Berhad
Penang, Malaysia
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Capacity building in the South on globalization and sustainable development
Subtotal: $300,000
Strengthening International Constituencies for Reform
Program Area Total: $980,000
Reform of International Finance and Trade

Special Initiatives
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan
Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes urban exchange
Community Media Workshop
Chicago, IL
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Michigan communications project
Ecology Center
Ann Arbor, MI
$52,000 – 24 mos.
Mobilizing citizens and coalitions for managed growth across Southeast Michigan
Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
Coral Gables, FL
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Land Information Access Association
Traverse City, MI
$153,500 – 36 mos.
Partnerships for change
MI*Voice
Detroit, MI
$25,000 increase
Constituency building and outreach on land use and equitable development
Michigan Suburbs Alliance
Ferndale, MI
$7,500 increase
General purposes
University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$21,000 increase
Flint River Corridor Alliance administrative management
Subtotal: $499,000
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan

Special Opportunities
Center for Health, Environment and Justice
Falls Church, VA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
San Francisco, CA
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Environmental Grantmakers Association
New York, NY
$32,500 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Subtotal: $272,500
Special Opportunities
Program Area Total: $771,500
Special Initiatives
Program Total: $13,747,000
Environment

Genesee Institute
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Technical assistance on land bank implementation

International Institute for Sustainable Development
Winnipeg, Canada
$50,000 – 24 mos.
Investment treaty news
Subtotal: $680,000
Policy Reform and Implementation

Strengthening International Constituencies for Reform
Instituto del Tercer Mundo
Montevideo, Uruguay
$100,000 – 18 mos.
Latin American monitor of international financial institutions
Third World Network Berhad
Penang, Malaysia
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Capacity building in the South on globalization and sustainable development
Subtotal: $300,000
Strengthening International Constituencies for Reform
Program Area Total: $980,000
Reform of International Finance and Trade

Special Initiatives
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan
Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Great Lakes urban exchange
Community Media Workshop
Chicago, IL
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Michigan communications project
Ecology Center
Ann Arbor, MI
$52,000 – 24 mos.
Mobilizing citizens and coalitions for managed growth across Southeast Michigan
Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
Coral Gables, FL
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Land Information Access Association
Traverse City, MI
$153,500 – 36 mos.
Partnerships for change
MI*Voice
Detroit, MI
$25,000 increase
Constituency building and outreach on land use and equitable development
Michigan Suburbs Alliance
Ferndale, MI
$7,500 increase
General purposes
University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$21,000 increase
Flint River Corridor Alliance administrative management
Subtotal: $499,000
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan

Special Opportunities
Center for Health, Environment and Justice
Falls Church, VA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
San Francisco, CA
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Environmental Grantmakers Association
New York, NY
$32,500 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Subtotal: $272,500
Special Opportunities
Program Area Total: $771,500
Special Initiatives
Program Total: $13,747,000
Environment
Snapshot: Environment
Mission: To support the efforts of an engaged citizenry working to create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies, and appropriate models of development that protect the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world.

Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems

**Goal:** To advance the conservation and restoration of freshwater ecosystems in North America, with emphasis on the Great Lakes and southeastern U.S.

**Objectives**
- **Strengthening the Environmental Community.** Establish a strong, effective and sustainable non-governmental organization (NGO) community dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- **Public Policies.** Secure well-designed and effectively implemented water-quality and water-quantity policies that advance the conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- **Site-Based Conservation.** Protect and restore selected freshwater ecosystems through place-based conservation activities.

International Finance for Sustainability

**Goal:** To shape international investment and trade to support sustainable development and reduce environmental degradation.

**Objectives**
- **Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future.** Promote infrastructure and energy investments that contribute to environmental sustainability and offer local economic opportunity.
- **Sustainable Regional Development and Integration.** Shape regional trade and investment strategies so that they contribute to local sustainable development.
- **Special Opportunities.** Respond to unique opportunities to advance sustainable development goals.

Special Initiatives

**Goal:** To respond to unique opportunities to advance environmental protection in the U.S. and internationally.

**Objectives**
- **Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan.** Cultivate informed, committed and effective leaders and organizations at the local, regional and state levels who work for policies and programs that curb sprawl, promote urban reinvestment and improve community quality.
- **Special Opportunities.** Support efforts that offer a one-time opportunity to contribute to the resolution of a significant domestic, international or global concern.
FLINT AREA

Arts, Culture and Education

Arts and Culture

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$1,010,880
Flint Institute of Arts endowment fund

Flint Area Convention & Visitors Bureau
Flint, MI
$15,000 – 10 mos.
Back to the Bricks/Bikes on the Bricks

Flint Cultural Center Corporation
Flint, MI
$1,650,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$800,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support
$84,000 – 8 mos.
Exhibitions on comic book art
$20,000 – 3 mos.
Las Artes de Mexico

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$300,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support
$146,550 – 11 mos.
Flint Youth Theater transition
$50,000 – 4 mos.
Music in the Parks
$50,000 – 4 mos.
Tapology Dance Festival for Youth
$13,350 – 15 mos.
Diversity training

Floyd McCree Theatre
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
“Graffiti Chronicles”
$30,000 – 5 mos.
McCree-ative Summer Stock Academy

Genesee Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$321,400 – 12 mos.
Red Ink Studios - Flint

Greater Flint Arts Council
Flint, MI
$120,000 – 12 mos.
Parade of Festivals

Sphinx Organization
Detroit, MI
$90,000 – 12 mos.
Partnership with Flint Institute of Music

Subtotal:
$4,751,180
Arts and Culture

Education

Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI
$100,000 – 16 mos.
GEAR UP College Day program

Flint Community Schools
Flint, MI
$54,491 – 3 mos.
Summer Tot L1d program

Genesee Intermediate School District
Flint, MI
$199,250 – 18 mos.
Genesee Early College

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$2,000,000 – 12 mos.
Strategic initiatives

Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$700,000 – 36 mos.
Mott Middle College replication
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Smart Teachers As Role Models (STAR) initiative

Partnership for Learning
Lansing, MI
$131,000 – 12 mos.
Gear Up Michigan project

Subtotal:
$5,682,741
Education

Program Area Total:
$10,433,921
Arts, Culture and Education

Community Revitalization and Economic Development

Housing and Neighborhoods

City of Flint
Flint, MI
$24,960 – 18 mos.
Code enforcement project

Genesee County Habitat for Humanity
Flint, MI
$60,000 – 12 mos.
Plan for growth and renewal in city of Flint

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$46,754 – 29 mos.
Property acquisition/demolition

Local Initiatives Support Corporation
New York, NY
$75,000 – 12 mos.
Flint and Genesee County community development project

Metro Housing Partnership
Flint, MI
$125,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Grant Activity: $29,258,467 / 78 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>$4.751</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$5.683</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>$787</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$15,228</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL INITIATIVES</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>$728</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>$141</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$251</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS
$29,258
78

Dollar figures include Foundation-Administered Projects/Direct Charitable Activities, which are not counted as grants.
Salem Housing Community Development Corporation
Flint, MI
$100,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $431,714
Housing and Neighborhoods

Workforce Development

Flint Area Specialized Employment Services, Inc.
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Flint STRIVE replication program
$29,613
Achieve temporary employment services

Greater Flint Health Coalition
Flint, MI
$76,050 – 6 mos.
Flint Healthcare Employment Opportunities Project

National Employment Law Project

New York, NY
$426,000 – 24 mos.
Technical assistance for Trade Adjustment Assistance

Subtotal: $578,050
Workforce Development

Economic Development

Bishop International Airport Authority
Flint, MI
$2,500,000 – 48 mos.
Intermodal center

Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 18 mos.
Great Lakes economic initiative

Center for Automotive Research
Ann Arbor, MI
$176,924 – 48 mos.
Program for automotive renaissance in Michigan

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$154,000 – 21 mos.
Completion of Atwood Stadium renovation

Crim Fitness Foundation
Flint, MI
$100,000 – 10 mos.
Option on Character Inn

Flint Downtown Development Authority
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Downtown security program

Foundation for the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation
Flint, MI
$5,500,000 – 14 mos.
Rowe Mixed-Use Center in downtown Flint
$69,650 – 12 mos.
Supporting operating
$90,224 – 9 mos.
Flint Farmers Market improvements

Foundation-Administered Projects
$296,136
Assessment/feasibility study of Character Inn

Subtotal: $1,257,158
Children and Families

Special Initiatives

Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector

Family Service Agency of Mid Michigan
Flint, MI
$16,132 – 4 mos.
Summer Fun Program

Catholic Charities of Shiawassee and Genesee Counties
Flint, MI
$25,000 – 12 mos.
North End Soup Kitchen

Flint Area Specialized Employment Services, Inc.
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Flint STRIVE Academy Summer Youth Project

Genesee Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$775,000 – 16 mos.
Summer Youth Initiative

Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

YWCA of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Safehouse shelter

Subtotal: $1,257,158
Children and Families

Special Opportunities

City of Flint
Flint, MI
$18,436 – 7 mos.
Police Segways

Flint Area Congregations Together
Flint, MI
$1,000,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Flint Club
Flint, MI
$15,750 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Genesee Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$50,000 – 18 mos.
Regional Leadership Council

Genesee County Historical Society
Flint, MI
$25,000 – 7 mos.
Flint General Motor 100th celebration

Subtotal: $250,936
Program Area Total: $2,377,694
Special Initiatives

Program Total: $29,258,467
Flint Area
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**ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION**

**GOAL:** To support education, arts and cultural institutions as critical forces for positive change and key determinants of the community's quality of life and economic well-being.

**OBJECTIVES**

- **Arts and Culture.** Support strong and vibrant local cultural organizations that provide diverse arts and cultural opportunities to residents of Genesee County.
- **Education.** Help build a continuum of high-quality learning opportunities that meet the needs of Flint area children, youth and adults from pre-kindergarten through college.

**COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**GOAL:** To support efforts that improve local governance, regional cooperation, community participation and the Flint area's economic vitality.

**OBJECTIVES**

- **Housing and Neighborhoods.** Support affordable housing and livable neighborhoods, with an emphasis on the city of Flint.
- **Workforce Development.** Support quality employment opportunities for Flint area residents who face multiple barriers to good jobs in the regional labor market.
- **Economic Development.** Help build a vibrant and diverse regional economy.

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

**GOAL:** To respond to critical opportunities and/or issues that have the potential to improve significantly the quality of life in the Flint area.

**OBJECTIVES**

- **Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector.** Strengthen a strong local nonprofit sector capable of meeting community needs.
- **Race Relations.** Help build a community with capacity to address issues of race and ethnicity productively.
- **Children and Families.** Support opportunities to build healthy and productive lives for Genesee County children and families.
- **Special Opportunities.** Identify critical issues, seize special opportunities and incubate new program areas.

---

**Snapshot: Flint Area**

Mission: To foster a well-functioning, connected community that is capable of meeting the economic, social and racial challenges ahead.
Improving Community Education
Community-Driven Reform

Applesesed Foundation
Washington, DC
$130,000 – 12 mos.
Research and technical assistance on No Child Left Behind Act

Austin Interfaith Sponsoring Committee
Austin, TX
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Study on education organizing and academic improvement

Brown University
Providence, RI
$320,000 – 36 mos.
Education organizing study

Community Involvement program

Eastern Pennsylvania Organizing Project
Philadelphia, PA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Flint Area Congregations Together
Flint, MI
$166,500 – 24 mos.
Improving outcomes for out-of-school youth in Michigan

Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Improving life outcomes for young black males

Indianapolis Private Industry Council
Indianapolis, IN
$100,000 – 16 mos.
Indust-REAL Project: providing career and technical education opportunities for vulnerable youth

Jobs for the Future
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 19 mos.
Expanding community efforts to raise graduation rates for disconnected youth

Parent/Teacher Home Visit Project
Sacramento, CA
$80,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Parents for Public Schools
Jackson, MS
$25,000 increase
General purposes

PICO National Network
Oakland, CA
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Louisiana Interfaith Together

Public Interest Projects
New York, NY
$231,000 – 11 mos.
Communities for Public Education Reform

Public Policy and Education Fund of New York
Albany, NY
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Alliance for Quality Education: Statewide Education Financing Reform Project

Subtotal: Community-Driven Reform $2,032,500

Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Center for Law and Social Policy
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Elevating disconnected youth as priority and policy agenda item for new administration and Congress

City Connect Detroit
Detroit, MI
$2,500 increase
Improving outcomes for out-of-school youth in Michigan

Cleveland Botanical Garden
Cleveland, OH
$125,000 – 60 mos.
Green Corps Urban Youth Program

Commonwealth Corporation
Boston, MA
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Diploma Plus

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
Washington, DC
$27,500 – 12 mos.
Youth Transition Funders Group

Community Foundation of Greater Flint
Flint, MI
$55,000 – 12 mos.
Genesee County out-of-school youth initiative

Harlem Children’s Zone
New York, NY
$300,000 – 12 mos.
Young male initiative

Grant Activity: $38,215,927 / 194 Grants

GRANT DOLLARS
(NUMBER OF GRANTS)

IMPROVING COMMUNITY EDUCATION
Community-Driven Reform $2,033 14
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth $2,325 16
Learning Beyond the Classroom $11,894 46

EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Income Security $4,032 32
Reducing Barriers to Employment $1,950 16
Retention and Wage Progression $6,566 26

BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES
Building Community Organizing Infrastructure $5,753 29

SPECIAL INITIATIVES
Transitions $2,323 9
Exploratory and Special Projects $1,340 6

TOTALS $38,216 194

Dollar figures include Foundation-Administered Projects/Direct Charitable Activities, which are not counted as grants.
Expanded Learning Time
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Boston, MA
Improving outcomes for out-of-school youth in Michigan

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$350,000 – 25 mos.
Gubernatorial leadership to transform learning day and year

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$450,000 – 24 mos.
City leaders engaged in afterschool reform and “A New Day for Learning”

New Visions for Public Schools
New York, NY
$50,000 increase
Effective school-community partnerships

MDRC
New York, NY
$300,000 – 36 mos.
Assessing the impact of the National Guard ChalleNGe Program evaluation

National Guard ChalleNGe Program
Support for impactful strategies

Michigan’s Children
Lansing, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Municipal leadership for disconnected youth

School & Main Institute
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Schools for the Future: integrating career and technical education into new alternative education models

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, GA
$200,000 – 18 mos.
Policy strategies and actions addressing needs of high school dropouts in the South

Subtotal: $2,325,000

Learning Beyond the Classroom

After School Matters
Chicago, IL
$200,000 – 18 mos.
Aligning high school afterschool with school reform

Afterschool Alliance
Washington, DC
$1,100,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Afterschool All-Stars
Los Angeles, CA
$300,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

After-School Corporation
New York, NY
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Expanded Learning Time/New York City

Arkansas State University
State University, AR
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Arkansas Statewide Afterschool Network

BELL Foundation
Dorchester, MA
$400,000 – 12 mos.
Out-of-school-time eLearning platform

Center on Education Policy
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 17 mos.
Rethinking federal aid to elementary and secondary education

Children’s Services Council of Florida
Tallahassee, FL
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Florida Statewide Afterschool Network

Citizen Schools
Boston, MA
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Expanded Learning Time

Collaborative Communications Group
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Support for Time, Learning, and Afterschool Task Force

Community Chest, Inc.
Virginia City, NV
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Nevada Statewide Afterschool Network

Cross & Jofus, LLC
Bethesda, MD
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Improved financing to support “A New Day for Learning”

Education Sector
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Next generation of accountability for out-of-school education

Finance Project
Washington, DC
$400,000 – 24 mos.
Funding strategies for statewide afterschool networks

Foundations, Inc.
Mooresville, NC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Grants for afterschool programs

Grantmakers for Education
Portland, OR
$2,500 increase
General purposes

Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
$500,000 – 24 mos.
Supporting “A New Day for Learning” evaluation and research

Illinois Center for Violence Prevention
Chicago, IL
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Illinois Statewide Afterschool Network

Institute for a Competitive Workforce
Washington, DC
$175,000 – 20 mos.
“A New Day for Learning”: connecting and supporting business partnerships

Institute for Educational Leadership
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Coalition for Community Schools

LA’s BEST
Los Angeles, CA
$300,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Marshfield Clinic Research Foundation
Marshfield, WI
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Wisconsin Statewide Afterschool Network

National Conference of State Legislatures
Denver, CO
$450,000 – 24 mos.
Informing state legislatures about afterschool policy

National Council of La Raza
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Latino family engagement and best practices in afterschool

National Governors Association
Center for Best Practices
Washington, DC
$350,000 – 25 mos.
Latino family engagement and best practices in afterschool

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$450,000 – 24 mos.
City leaders engaged in afterschool reform and “A New Day for Learning”

New Visions for Public Schools
New York, NY
$50,000 increase
Effective school-community partnerships

Ohio Statewide Afterschool Network
Columbus, OH
$250,000 – 36 mos.
Ohio Statewide Afterschool Network

PlusTime NH
Concord, NH
$225,000 – 36 mos.
New Hampshire Statewide Afterschool Network

Providence After School Alliance
Providence, RI
$500,000 – 36 mos.
Providence “A New Day for Learning” initiative

Public School Forum of North Carolina
Raleigh, NC
$225,000 – 36 mos.
North Carolina Statewide Afterschool Network

San Francisco Afterschool Alliance
San Francisco, CA
$500,000 – 36 mos.
San Francisco New Day for Learning

Save the Children
Westport, CT
$300,000 – 16 mos.
Creating lasting change for children in New Orleans

South Carolina Afterschool Alliance
Columbia, SC
$225,000 – 36 mos.
South Carolina Statewide Afterschool Network

Synergy Enterprises, Inc.
Silver Spring, MD
$300,000 – 12 mos.
21st Century Community Learning Centers Summer Institute

United Way of Rhode Island
Providence, RI
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Rhode Island Statewide Afterschool Network

University of California - Davis
Davis, CA
$225,000 – 36 mos.
California Statewide Afterschool Network

University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.
Lawrence, KS
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Kansas Statewide Afterschool Network
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Maine at Farmington</th>
<th>Farmington, ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Statewide Afterschool Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Statewide Afterschool Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Education Service District</td>
<td>Salem, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide Afterschool Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong> $11,894,195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Area Total:</strong> $16,251,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expanding Economic Opportunity

#### Income Security

- American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
  - Washington, DC
  - $55,000 – 12 mos.
  - Conference on progressive consumption taxation
- Arise Citizens’ Policy Project
  - Montgomery, AL
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Brandeis University
  - Waltham, MA
  - $344,087 – 24 mos.
  - Assets Learning Project
  - $68,362 – 5 mos.
  - Evaluation of Mott's income security strategies
- California Budget Project
  - Sacramento, CA
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Center for Law and Social Policy
  - Washington, DC
  - $50,000 – 12 mos.
  - Capacity building
- Center for Public Policy Priorities
  - Austin, TX
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - State asset coalition learning project
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
  - Washington, DC
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative · D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute
  - $75,000 – 8 mos.
  - State fiscal policy conference
- Colorado Center on Law and Policy
  - Denver, CO
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Community Action New Mexico
  - Albuquerque, NM
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - State asset coalition learning project
- CompassPoint Nonprofit Services
  - San Francisco, CA
  - $15,929 – 12 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative succession planning assistance
- Corporation for Enterprise Development
  - Washington, DC
  - $25,000 – 12 mos.
  - 2008 Assets Learning Conference
- Council of Michigan Foundations
  - Grand Haven, MI
  - $50,000 – 12 mos.
  - Michigan Individual Development Account Partnership
- Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action
  - New York, NY
  - $100,000 – 12 mos.
  - Public Works Program
- Earned Assets Resource Network
  - San Francisco, CA
  - $167,242 – 36 mos.
  - Asset policy initiative of California
- Enterprise Corporation of the Delta
  - Jackson, MS
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Fiscal Policy Institute
  - Latham, NY
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Foundation-Administered Projects
  - Flint, MI
  - $30,849
  - Fiscal opportunity project
  - $25,757
  - Asset-building capacity-building meeting
- Hatcher Group
  - Bethesda, MD
  - $220,000 – 24 mos.
  - State earned income tax credit Initiative
- Heartland Alliance for Human Needs & Human Rights
  - Chicago, IL
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - Illinois Asset Building Group
- Job Opportunities Task Force
  - Baltimore, MD
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - Maryland CASH Campaign
- Maine Center for Economic Policy
  - Augusta, ME
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center
  - Boston, MA
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- MDC
  - Chapel Hill, NC
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - North Carolina Asset Building Policy Task Force
- Michigan Future, Inc.
  - Ann Arbor, MI
  - $35,000 – 12 mos.
  - New Agenda for a New Michigan
- Michigan League for Human Services
  - Lansing, MI
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- North Carolina Justice Center
  - Raleigh, NC
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - State Fiscal Analysis Initiative
- Solid Ground Washington
  - Seattle, WA
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - Washington Asset Building Coalition
- Southern Good Faith Fund
  - Little Rock, AR
  - $150,000 – 36 mos.
  - Arkansas assets coalition
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
  - Chapel Hill, NC
  - $170,000 – 24 mos.
  - American Dream Demonstration evaluation
- Urban Institute
  - Washington, DC
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Joint Tax Policy Center
- Washington University
  - St. Louis, MO
  - $150,000 – 12 mos.
  - SEED Initiative

### Subtotal: $4,032,226

#### Reducing Barriers to Employment

- AMVETS National Service Foundation
  - Lanham, MD
  - $75,000 – 12 mos.
  - Workforce project for young veterans
- Columbia University in the City of New York
  - New York, NY
  - $75,000 – 12 mos.
  - Impact of New York state non-custodial parent earned income tax credit
- Emerge Community Development
  - Minneapolis, MN
  - $100,000 – 14 mos.
  - Alternative staffing employment and enterprise outcomes
- Fifth Avenue Committee
  - Brooklyn, NY
  - $100,000 – 14 mos.
  - Alternative staffing employment and enterprise outcomes
- Goodwill Industries International, Inc.
  - Rockville, MD
  - $173,320 – 17 mos.
  - Goodwill staffing services
- Goodwill Industries-Suncoast
  - St. Petersburg, FL
  - $100,000 – 14 mos.
  - Alternative staffing employment and enterprise outcomes
- Goodwill Temporary Services
  - Austin, TX
  - $100,000 – 14 mos.
  - Alternative staffing employment and enterprise outcomes
- Heartland Alliance for Human Needs & Human Rights
  - Chicago, IL
  - $75,000 – 12 mos.
  - National Transitional Jobs Network
- ICA Group
  - Brookline, MA
  - $197,000 – 12 mos.
  - Alternative Staffing Alliance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Recipient</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insight Center for Community Economic Development</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$55,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Temporary staffing firms and the hard-to-employ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Workforce Boards</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>-$50,000</td>
<td>Adjustment to previous grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center on Education and the Economy</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000 – 20 mos.</td>
<td>Institute for Innovation in Workforce Policy and Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Telecommuting Institute, Inc.</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$125,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Virtual call center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Ventures</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>$250,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>Gulf Coast alternative staffing project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon Programs Incorporated</td>
<td>Richmond, CA</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Workforce services model expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Boston</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$249,953 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Alternative staffing outcomes for job candidates and employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP Community Services</td>
<td>Bronx, NY</td>
<td>$75,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>First Jobs Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Wage Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,950,273</td>
<td>Reducing Barriers to Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$1,200,000 – 13 mos.</td>
<td>Building career ladders for low-income people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Roberts + Associates</td>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
<td>$225,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Sector Skills Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for a Skilled Workforce</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$225,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Building capacity of Michigan's workforce system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Care Alliance</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Harlem Employment Service, Inc.</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$20,000 – 3 mos.</td>
<td>Planning fundraising strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Education Fund</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>$450,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Replicate sectoral initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs for the Future</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$331,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Scaling up career paths for low-skilled at community colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Employment Law Project</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$60,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Federal Policy Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governors Association</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$1,000,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Accelerating state adoption of sectoral strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Community Loan Fund</td>
<td>Concord, NH</td>
<td>$125,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>State Healthcare Workforce Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>Bronx, NY</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Building communication capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prima Civitas Foundation</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Moving ideas to market initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project QUEST, Inc.</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$178,000 – 14 mos.</td>
<td>Sustaining Michigan regional skills alliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Ventures</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>$300,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>Project QUEST evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project QUEST Impact Study: Random assignment evaluation</td>
<td>$249,000 – 15 mos.</td>
<td>Sectoral Employment Impact Study: Random assignment evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project QUEST Impact Study: Random assignment evaluation</td>
<td>$50,000 – 4 mos.</td>
<td>Sectoral employment initiative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Institute of Justice</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Workforce development study of immigrant workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthBuild USA</td>
<td>Somerville, MA</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Opening career pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Organized Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,565,277</td>
<td>Retention and Wage Progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Community Organizing Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,547,776</td>
<td>Expanding Economic Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Justice</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$25,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Resources for evaluating community organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Affordable Housing Coalition</td>
<td>Jamaica Plain, MA</td>
<td>$56,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Training for HUD tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community Change</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$1,000,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>40th anniversary challenge campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centering on Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Building community-organizing field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Catalyst</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$35,000 increase</td>
<td>Community learning project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Training and Assistance Center</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$251,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Intermediary Support for Organizing Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Voices Heard</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$130,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>New York statewide organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Action and Research Training Center (DART)</td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>$56,895</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,350</td>
<td>Envisioning future of community organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Harriet Tubman Center for Recruitment and Development of Organizers
*Detroit, MI*
$103,300 – 12 mos.
General purposes

### Institute for Wisconsin’s Future
*Glendale, WI*
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Implementing Demos Public Works Program

### Interfaith Funders
*Longmont, CO*
$30,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

### Interfaith Worker Justice
*Chicago, IL*
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Training organizers for immigrant community

### InterValley Project
*West Newton, MA*
$280,000 – 24 mos.
Capacity building for InterValley network

### Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement
*Des Moines, IA*
$230,000 – 24 mos.
Capacity building and expansion

### Isaiah Institute
*New Orleans, LA*
$130,000 – 12 mos.
Organizing in African-American churches

### Jeremiah Group
*Harvey, LA*
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

### Justice Alliance Education Fund
*Tukwila, WA*
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

### Metro Industrial Areas Foundation, Inc.
*Rego Park, NY*
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Democracy, organizing and Islam

### National Council of La Raza
*Washington, DC*
$251,000 – 12 mos.
Intermediary Support for Organizing Communities

### National Employment Law Project
*New York, NY*
$70,000 – 24 mos.
Research and technical assistance to community-organizing groups

### National Training and Information Center
*Chicago, IL*
$251,000 – 12 mos.
Intermediary Support for Organizing Communities

### PICO National Network
*Oakland, CA*
$350,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

### Seventh Generation Fund
*Arcata, CA*
$150,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

### Southern Echo, Inc.
*Jackson, MS*
$251,000 – 12 mos.
Intermediary Support for Organizing Communities

### Virginia Organizing Project
*Charlottesville, VA*
$230,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

### Washington Interfaith Network
*Washington, DC*
$120,000 – 12 mos.
Joint venture development

- **Subtotal:** $5,753,245
  - Building Community
  - Organizing Infrastructure

- **Program Area Total:** $5,753,245
  - Building Organized Communities

### Special Initiatives

#### Transitions

### ACCIÓN USA
*Boston, MA*
$500,000 – 12 mos.
Increasing self-sufficiency in U.S. micro-enterprise programs

### Aspen Institute
*Washington, DC*
$500,000 – 13 mos.
Demonstrating scale in domestic micro-enterprise

### MicroTest
$225,000 – 12 mos.
Advancing sustainability in micro-enterprise

### University of New Hampshire
*Durham, NH*
$45,000 – 12 mos.
Comparative rural economy survey in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula

- **Subtotal:** $1,340,125
  - Exploratory and Special Projects

### Program Area Total: $3,663,211
- Special Initiatives
- **Program Total:** $38,215,927

---

### Exploratory and Special Projects

#### Boston University
*Boston, MA*
$30,000 – 12 mos.
“The Vanishing Middle Class” documentary

#### Brookings Institution
*Washington, DC*
$125,000 – 7 mos.
Defining poverty reduction strategies

#### Michigan Chamber Foundation
*Lansing, MI*
$42,625 – 12 mos.
Just for the Kids policy institute

#### Opportunity Finance Network
*Philadelphia, PA*
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Informing public policy

#### ShoreBank Corporation
*Chicago, IL*
$975,500 – 120 mos.
Program related investment

#### University of New Hampshire
*Durham, NH*
$45,000 – 12 mos.
Comparative rural economy survey in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula

- **Subtotal:** $1,340,125
  - Exploratory and Special Projects

### Program Area Total: $3,663,211
- Special Initiatives
- **Program Total:** $38,215,927

---

### Pathways Out of Poverty
Snapshot: Pathways Out of Poverty
Mission: To identify, test and help sustain pathways out of poverty for low-income people and communities.

**Improving Community Education**

**Goal:** To ensure that community education serves as a pathway out of poverty for children in low-income communities.

**Objectives**
- **Community-Driven Reform.** Develop effective community-driven reform strategies that increase student achievement across a school district and at the state or regional level.
- ** Vulnerable Youth.** Expand effective educational opportunities that return high school dropouts to school and prepare them for both college and careers.
- **Learning Beyond the Classroom.** Extend the learning time to maximize academic achievement and positive youth development, especially for traditionally underserved children and youth, through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers and other major national, statewide and regional afterschool initiatives. Such initiatives promote sustainable, community-driven and expanded learning opportunities.

**Expanding Economic Opportunity**

**Goal:** To expand opportunity for those in, or at risk of, persistent poverty by promoting policies and programs that increase income security, help people connect to the labor market and enable them to advance into better-quality, higher-paying jobs.

**Objectives**
- **Income Security.** Improve income security for low-income Americans by advancing policies and programs designed to increase income and assets, promote more equitable fiscal policies affecting low-income families, and build public will for a work-based safety net to assist low-wage working families.
- **Reducing Barriers to Employment.** Reduce barriers to employment through support for research, dissemination and practice that leads to a greater understanding of the problems faced by low-income people first entering the labor market.
- **Retention and Wage Progression.** Help low-income workers stay in the labor market and increase their earnings over time.

**Building Organized Communities**

**Goal:** To enhance the variety, geographic spread, power and effectiveness of the community-organizing field in order to strengthen and sustain the involvement of low-income communities in democratic processes of social engagement.

**Objective**
- **Building Infrastructure.** Improve the quality of community organizing in low-income communities by increasing resources to institutions, organizations, technical assistance providers and networks, which serve to produce, nurture or expand community-based organizations or increase awareness of their effectiveness as an anti-poverty strategy nationally.

**Special Initiatives**

**Goal:** To sustain promising practices and promote innovative and multidisciplinary approaches to reduce persistent poverty.

**Objectives**
- **Transitions.** Maintain a critical presence in the field of micro-enterprise.
- **Exploratory and Special Projects.** Identify critical issues, seize special opportunities, research issues to determine future program directions and promote cross-cutting projects.
EXPLORATORY & SPECIAL PROJECTS

Mission: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. (Proposals are by invitation only; unsolicited proposals are discouraged.)

Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities

Fisk University
Nashville, TN
$250,000 – 12 mos.
Strategic plan for financial stability and realignment of academic and administrative services

Phelps Stokes Fund
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Ralph Bunche Societies national initiative for minority leadership development

Xavier University of Louisiana
New Orleans, LA
$40,000
Norman C. Francis endowed scholarship fund

Program Area Total: $390,000
Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities

Special Projects

Committee for Economic Development
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy
New York, NY
$100,000 – 12 mos.
National Commission on Adult Literacy

Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial Project Foundation, Inc.
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Southern Center for International Studies
Atlanta, GA
$150,000 – 36 mos.
Conferences on foreign affairs

United States Institute of Peace
Washington, DC
$25,000 – 36 mos.
Founder’s Conference Room of new headquarters building

University of Massachusetts-Amherst
Amherst, MA
$10,000 – 15 mos.
Journalism That Matters

William J. Clinton Foundation
New York, NY
$50,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Program Area Total: $485,000
Special Projects

Program Total: $875,000
Exploratory and Special Projects

Grant Activity: $875,000 / 10 Grants

Historically and Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities
Special Projects

$485
7 Grants

$390
3 Grants

In millions
EMPLOYEE & TRUSTEE GRANTS

In addition to its regular grantmaking, the Foundation also encourages charitable giving by its Trustees and staff. The Foundation’s match to these contributions is included as part of its total grant budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee/Trustee Matching Grants</th>
<th>$1,266,027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Trustee Matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee-Initiated Grants</th>
<th>$900,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee-Initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Total:</td>
<td>$2,166,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Trustee Matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Trustee-Initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$110,400,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFILE: 2008

GRANTMAKING ACTIVITIES

Total: 558 Grants
(not including Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants)

- Civil Society: 184 grants (33.0%)
- Pathways Out of Poverty: 194 grants (34.7%)
- Flint Area: 78 grants (14.0%)
- Environment: 92 grants (16.5%)
- Exploratory & Special Projects: 10 grants (1.8%)

Total: $110,400,755

- Civil Society: $26.1 million (23.7%)
- Pathways Out of Poverty: $38.2 million (34.6%)
- Environment: $13.7 million (12.4%)
- Flint Area: $29.3 million (26.5%)
- Exploratory & Special Projects: $9.9 million (8.8%)

Employee/Trustee matching & Trustee-Initiated grants: $2.2 million (2.0%)

ASSET ALLOCATION 12.31.08

Total: $1,929,899,082

- Total Growth Assets: $1,026.6 million (53.2%)
- Total Risk-Reduction Assets: $566.3 million (29.3%)
- Total Inflation-Protection Assets: $318.6 million (16.5%)
- Total Other Assets: $18.4 million (1.0%)

in millions
PROFILE: 10-YEAR STATISTICS

1999-2008 Selected Financial Information (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets - Market Value</td>
<td>$3,227.7</td>
<td>$2,880.3</td>
<td>$2,458.0</td>
<td>$2,011.4</td>
<td>$2,373.2</td>
<td>$2,524.7</td>
<td>$2,477.3</td>
<td>$2,626.1</td>
<td>$2,711.5</td>
<td>$1,929.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets - 2008 Dollars</td>
<td>4,031.7</td>
<td>3,480.0</td>
<td>2,924.4</td>
<td>2,337.5</td>
<td>2,707.1</td>
<td>2,789.1</td>
<td>2,646.3</td>
<td>2,735.8</td>
<td>2,713.9</td>
<td>1,929.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Month Rolling Average Assets</td>
<td>2,649.5</td>
<td>3,243.5</td>
<td>2,542.3</td>
<td>2,153.0</td>
<td>2,133.6</td>
<td>2,361.9</td>
<td>2,407.0</td>
<td>2,507.0</td>
<td>2,707.4</td>
<td>2,380.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dividends &amp; Interest</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends &amp; Interest - 2008 Dollars</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants Awarded</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>110.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures*</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Private foundations are required to make qualifying distributions (grant payments and reasonable administrative expenses) equal to roughly 5% of their average assets each year. The basis of the 5% calculation is a rolling, or 12-month, average of the foundation's investment assets.

* Total expenditures include grant payments, foundation-administered projects, administrative expenses, excise tax and investment expenses.

1999-2008 Grants Awarded by Program (in millions)
REPORT OF INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Grant Thornton

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the “Foundation”) as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Foundation’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America as established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Foundation’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Foundation as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, and the results of its activities and its cash flows for the years then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Southfield, Michigan
July 29, 2009
## STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments, at fair value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$1,064,884,002</td>
<td>$1,747,012,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>110,689,781</td>
<td>291,995,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>81,329,586</td>
<td>104,764,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>414,398,618</td>
<td>350,706,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment deposits in transit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>240,231,068</td>
<td>134,646,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,911,533,055</td>
<td>$2,689,124,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>5,217,757</td>
<td>6,604,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>2,115,874</td>
<td>8,468,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and improvements, net</td>
<td>3,846,285</td>
<td>3,867,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>3,120,534</td>
<td>3,594,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>4,065,577</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,929,899,082</td>
<td>$2,711,459,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>$55,221,488</td>
<td>$23,096,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>30,144,257</td>
<td>15,832,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10,848,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>85,365,745</td>
<td>49,777,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,844,533,337</td>
<td>$2,661,681,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,929,899,082</td>
<td>$2,711,459,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
## STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES

Years Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and Interest</td>
<td>$ 51,447,976</td>
<td>$ 75,300,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnership income (loss)</td>
<td>(427,423)</td>
<td>17,344,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain on investments</td>
<td>16,383,158</td>
<td>265,880,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized loss on investments</td>
<td>(751,140,496)</td>
<td>(114,599,290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (expense)</td>
<td>(874,165)</td>
<td>1,081,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income:</strong></td>
<td>(684,610,950)</td>
<td>245,006,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct investment expenses</td>
<td>6,139,100</td>
<td>4,425,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for excise tax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1,081,257</td>
<td>3,550,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred benefit</td>
<td>(14,916,522)</td>
<td>(2,264,041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment expenses</strong></td>
<td>(7,694,165)</td>
<td>5,714,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net investment income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>(676,916,785)</td>
<td>239,295,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>108,707,163</td>
<td>111,819,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-administered projects</td>
<td>1,160,652</td>
<td>634,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses</td>
<td>15,186,243</td>
<td>14,392,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants and operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>125,054,058</td>
<td>126,846,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>(801,970,843)</td>
<td>112,448,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other changes in unrestricted net assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension-related changes other than net periodic pension cost</td>
<td>(14,297,880)</td>
<td>(3,530,358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postretirement health-care related changes other than net periodic benefit cost</td>
<td>(879,853)</td>
<td>(2,721,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>(817,148,576)</td>
<td>106,196,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted net assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year</td>
<td>2,661,681,913</td>
<td>2,555,485,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year</td>
<td>$ 1,844,533,337</td>
<td>$ 2,661,681,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
## STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash flows from operating activities:</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$(817,148,576)</td>
<td>$106,196,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments to reconcile change in unrestricted net assets to net cash used by operating activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain on investments</td>
<td>$(16,383,158)</td>
<td>$(265,880,245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Income) loss on limited partnerships</td>
<td>427,423</td>
<td>(17,344,323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized loss on investments</td>
<td>751,140,496</td>
<td>114,599,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess value of donated securities included with grants</td>
<td>986,421</td>
<td>2,003,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on asset retirement</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation expense</td>
<td>354,171</td>
<td>358,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>6,352,178</td>
<td>(1,840,958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in other assets</td>
<td>473,643</td>
<td>3,603,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in deferred excise tax asset</td>
<td>(4,065,577)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in grants payable</td>
<td>32,125,290</td>
<td>(23,085,269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>14,311,788</td>
<td>4,492,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>(10,848,945)</td>
<td>(2,264,041)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total adjustments                                      | 774,873,730   | (185,353,557) |

Net cash used by operating activities                  | (42,274,846)  | (79,156,649)  |

## Cash flows from investing activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sales or redemptions of investments</td>
<td>893,524,747</td>
<td>1,372,786,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of investments</td>
<td>(852,104,230)</td>
<td>(1,290,154,391)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of building improvements</td>
<td>(332,533)</td>
<td>(90,841)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net cash provided by investing activities               | 41,087,984    | 82,541,751    |

## Net increase (decrease) in cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash, beginning of year</td>
<td>6,404,619</td>
<td>3,019,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, end of year</td>
<td>$5,217,757</td>
<td>$6,404,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Supplemental schedule of noncash investing activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades payable at year end</td>
<td>$1,953,075</td>
<td>$332,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

A. Mission and Grant Programs
The Charles Stewart Mort Foundation (the “Foundation”) is a private grantmaking foundation established in 1926 in Flint, Michigan. The Foundation’s mission is “to support efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.” The Foundation’s grantmaking activity is organized into four major programs: Civil Society, Environment, Flint Area and Pathways Out of Poverty. Other grantmaking opportunities, which do not match the major programs, are investigated through the Foundation’s Exploratory and Special Projects program.

B. Accounting Policies
The following is a summary of significant accounting policies followed in the preparation of these financial statements.

ESTIMATES
The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates. The Foundation has significant amounts of investment instruments. Investment securities, in general, are exposed to various risks, such as interest rate, credit and overall market volatility. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities, it is reasonably possible that changes in the values of investment securities will occur in the near term and that such changes could materially affect the amounts reported in the financial statements.

METHOD OF ACCOUNTING
The financial statements have been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting, which includes recognition of dividends, interest, and other income and expenses as earned or incurred. Trustee and Executive Committee grant actions are recognized as expense on the date of the action. Grants by the President or Executive Committee by specific authority conferred by the Trustees are recognized as expense on the date the authority is exercised. Grant expense is net of grant refunds.

INVESTMENTS
Equity investments with readily determinable fair values, and all debt securities, are recorded on the trade date and are stated at market value based primarily on December 31 published quotations. Gains and losses from sales of securities are determined on an average cost basis.

Equity investments that do not have readily determinable fair values, representing amounts in venture capital and limited partnerships, are recorded on the trade date. These investments are stated at an estimate of fair value as determined in good faith by the general partner or fund managers. The Foundation believes the amounts recorded approximate fair value.

The Foundation’s 18.6% investment in United States Sugar Corporation (“USSC”), a nonpublicly traded security with no readily determinable fair value, is priced based on an independent valuation of the USSC stock on a non-marketable minority interest basis.

The Foundation is party to certain limited partnership agreements, whereby the Foundation is committed to invest future funds into these partnerships. As of December 31, 2008, the Foundation has $831.3 million in outstanding limited partnership commitments, including both domestic and international partnerships.
Investments in partnerships that are publicly traded and where the Foundation has no committed capital are included with equity securities and not limited partnerships for financial statement presentation.

Effective January 1, 2008, the Foundation adopted SFAS 157, “Fair Value Measurements” (“SFAS 157”), which provides a framework for measuring fair value under generally accepted accounting principles. SFAS 157 defines fair value as the exchange price that would be received for an asset paid or to transfer a liability (an exit price) in the principal or most advantageous market for the asset or liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. SFAS 157 also establishes a fair value hierarchy, which requires an entity to maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs when measuring fair value. The standard describes three levels of inputs that may be used to measure fair value:

**Level 1:** Quoted market prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities.

**Level 2:** Observable inputs other than Level 1 prices such as quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities; quoted prices in markets that are not active; or other inputs that are observable or can be corroborated by observable market data for substantially the full term of the assets or liabilities.

**Level 3:** Unobservable inputs that are supported by little or no market activity and that are significant to the fair value of the assets or liabilities.

Generally, assets held at the Foundation’s Custodian, Comerica Bank, include cash equivalents, U.S. government obligations, corporate bonds and equity securities which are publicly traded in active markets and are considered Level I assets. Equity securities purchased and held directly by the Foundation include private equities, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds.

The valuation of nonpublic investments requires significant judgment by the General Partner due to the absence of quoted market values, inherent lack of liquidity and the long-term nature of such assets. Private equity investments are valued initially based upon transaction price excluding expenses. Valuations are reviewed periodically utilizing available market and other data to determine if the carrying value of these investments should be adjusted. Such data primarily includes, but is not limited to, observations of the trading multiples of public companies considered comparable to the private companies being valued. Valuations are adjusted to account for company-specific issues, the lack of liquidity inherent in a nonpublic investment, the level of ownership in the company and the fact that comparable public companies are not identical to the companies being valued. Such valuation adjustments are necessary because in the absence of a committed buyer and completion of due diligence similar to that performed in an actual negotiated sale process, there may be company-specific issues that are not fully known that may affect value. In addition, a variety of additional factors may be considered during the valuation process, including, but not limited to, financial and sales transactions with third parties, current operating performance and future expectations of the particular investment, changes in market outlook and the third party financing environment. In determining valuation adjustments resulting from the investment review process, emphasis is placed on market participant’s assumptions and market-based information over entity specific information.

The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$766,836,787</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$298,047,215</td>
<td>$1,064,884,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>110,689,781</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>110,689,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>81,329,586</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>81,329,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>414,398,618</td>
<td>414,398,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>240,231,068</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>240,231,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,199,087,222</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$712,445,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,911,533,055</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance, December 31, 2007</td>
<td>$579,565,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>323,369,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(27,266,257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers - donated securities</td>
<td>(1,010,880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized losses</td>
<td>(850,160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized losses</td>
<td>(161,361,986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance, December 31, 2008</td>
<td>$712,445,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASH EQUIVALENTS
Cash equivalents with original maturities of three months or less are reflected at market value and include short-term notes and commercial paper, which are included with investments.

OTHER ASSETS
Included in other assets are land and buildings that were purchased by the Foundation for charitable purposes and are recorded at cost.

LAND, BUILDING AND IMPROVEMENTS
Land, building and improvements are recorded at cost. Upon sale or retirement of land, building and improvements, the cost and related accumulated depreciation are eliminated, and the resulting gain or loss is included in current income. Depreciation of building and improvements is provided over the estimated useful lives of the respective assets on a straight-line basis, ranging from 6 to 50 years. Assets with a cost basis of $19,957 and $135,792, along with related accumulated depreciation, were retired during 2008 and 2007, respectively.

Costs of office furnishings and equipment are consistently charged to expense because the Foundation does not deem such amounts to be sufficiently material to warrant capitalization and depreciation.

A summary of land, building and improvement holdings at year end is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and improvements</td>
<td>8,596,781</td>
<td>8,284,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(5,148,348)</td>
<td>(4,814,134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,846,285</td>
<td>$3,867,923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECENT ACCOUNTING PRONOUNCEMENTS
In December 2008, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issued FASB Staff Position (FSP) FIN 48-3, “Effective Date of FASB Interpretation 48 for Certain Nonpublic Enterprises.” FSP FIN 48-3 permits an entity within its scope to defer the effective date of FASB Interpretation 48 (Interpretation 48), “Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes,” to its annual financial statements for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. The Foundation has elected to defer the application of Interpretation 48 for the year ended December 31, 2008. The Foundation evaluates its uncertain tax positions using the provisions of FASB 5, “Accounting for Contingencies.” Accordingly, a loss contingency is recognized when it is probable that a liability has been incurred as of the date of the financial statements and the amount of the loss can be reasonably estimated. The amount recognized is subject to estimate and management judgment with respect to the likely outcome of each uncertain
tax position. The amount that is ultimately sustained for an individual uncertain tax position or for all uncertain tax positions in the aggregate could differ from the amount recognized.

**RECLASSIFICATIONS**

Certain amounts in the 2007 statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2008 presentation.

**C. Investments**

Investments held at December 31, 2008 and 2007, were as follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Cost Basis</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Cost Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$1,064,884</td>
<td>$1,182,304</td>
<td>$1,747,012</td>
<td>$1,260,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>110,690</td>
<td>107,124</td>
<td>291,996</td>
<td>278,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>81,329</td>
<td>83,600</td>
<td>104,764</td>
<td>103,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>414,399</td>
<td>492,220</td>
<td>350,706</td>
<td>297,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment deposits in transit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>240,231</td>
<td>240,210</td>
<td>134,646</td>
<td>134,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,911,533</td>
<td>$2,105,458</td>
<td>$2,689,124</td>
<td>$2,134,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Excise Tax and Distribution Requirements**

The Foundation is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”), but is subject to a 2% (1% if certain criteria are met) federal excise tax on net investment income, including realized gains, as defined in the IRC. The current excise tax is provided at 2% for 2008 and 1% for 2007. The deferred excise tax provision is calculated assuming a 2% rate and is based on the projected gains/losses that assume complete liquidation of all assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise tax payable (receivable)</td>
<td>$ (1,101,746)</td>
<td>$190,366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax (asset) liability</td>
<td>(4,065,577)</td>
<td>10,848,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ (5,167,323)</td>
<td>$11,039,311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excise tax payments of $2,470,000 and $3,360,000 were paid in 2008 and 2007, respectively.

IRC Section 4942 requires that a private foundation make annual minimum distributions based on the value of its non-charitable use assets or pay an excise tax for the failure to meet the minimum distribution requirements. For the year ended December 31, 2008, the Foundation made qualifying distributions less than the required minimum distribution of approximately $22.7 million. The Foundation has $36.7 million in prior year excess distributions to offset against this amount, resulting in a net accumulated overdistribution of $14.0 million to be carried forward to 2009.
E. Grants Payable

Grants payable at December 31, 2008, are expected to be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>$12,571,431</td>
<td>$2,844,000</td>
<td>$382,500</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$15,857,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6,186,480</td>
<td>916,250</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>7,202,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>9,558,469</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,875,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>16,030,565</td>
<td>4,721,049</td>
<td>1,696,250</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>22,497,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>44,706,945</td>
<td>8,998,299</td>
<td>2,128,750</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>55,993,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Unamortized discount</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>557,563</td>
<td>194,759</td>
<td>20,184</td>
<td>772,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$44,706,945</td>
<td>$8,440,736</td>
<td>$1,933,991</td>
<td>$139,816</td>
<td>$55,221,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Foundation has also approved grants that require certain conditions to be met by the grantee. Conditional grants excluded from the Foundation’s financial statements totaled $1,621,324 and $1,485,000 as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively.

Grant activity for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted grants payable, January 1</td>
<td>$23,972,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants approved</td>
<td>110,264,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134,237,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less grants paid by program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>20,530,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>9,281,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>20,473,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>25,031,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2,926,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,243,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiscounted grants payable, December 31</td>
<td>$55,993,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Exploratory, Special Projects, and Matching Gifts Program.
F. Pension and Other Postretirement Benefits

The Foundation sponsors a qualified defined benefit pension plan covering substantially all employees along with an unfunded nonqualified plan for restoration of pension benefits lost due to statutory limitations imposed upon qualified plans. In addition, the Foundation sponsors an unfunded postretirement medical plan for all eligible employees. The qualified defined benefit pension plan is funded in accordance with the minimum funding requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act.

Basic information is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in ($000)</th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit obligation at December 31</td>
<td>$(33,673)</td>
<td>$(28,821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value of plan assets at December 31</td>
<td>20,444</td>
<td>28,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded status at December 31</td>
<td>$(13,229)</td>
<td>$(736)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts recognized in the statements of financial position:

- Prepaid benefit included with other assets: $ – $ 1,786 $ – $ –
- Accrued benefit liability included with accounts payable and other liabilities: $(13,229) $(2,522) $(11,362) $(9,502)
- Net amount recognized: $(13,229) $(736) $(11,362) $(9,502)

Employer contributions: $ 2,661 $ 4,289 $ 245 $ 271

Benefit payments: $(520) $(540) $(245) $(271)

Components of net periodic benefit cost:

- Service cost: $ 1,214 $ 1,248 $ 468 $ 511
- Interest cost: 1,834 1,606 558 541
- Expected return on assets: (2,316) (1,926) – –
- Amortization of net loss: 69 94 71 105
- Amortization of prior service cost: 55 55 129 128

Net periodic benefit cost: $ 856 $ 1,077 $ 1,226 $ 1,285

**Benefit Obligations**

The accumulated benefit obligation of the nonqualified pension plan was $2,273,002 and $1,944,225 as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation of the qualified plan was $26,593,373 and $22,373,416 as of December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively.
The assumptions used in the measurement of the Foundation’s benefit obligations and net periodic benefit costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on plan assets</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of compensation increase</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For measurement purposes, an initial annual rate of 10% in the per capita cost of health care was used. The rate was assumed to decrease gradually each year to an ultimate rate of 5.00% by year 2015.

**ASSET HOLDINGS**

The investment strategy is to manage investment risk through prudent asset allocation that will produce a rate of return commensurate with the plan’s obligations. The Foundation’s expected long-term rate of return on plan assets is based upon historical and future expected returns of multiple asset classes as analyzed to develop a risk-free real rate of return for each asset class. The overall rate of return for each asset class was developed by combining a long-term inflation component, the risk-free real rate of return and the associated risk premium.

A summary of asset holdings in the pension plan as of December 31, 2008, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Percent of Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic stock</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International stock</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS**

The Foundation expects to contribute $3,213,440 to its pension plans and $306,298 to its postretirement medical plan in 2009. For the unfunded plans, contributions are deemed equal to expected benefit payments.
EXPECTED BENEFIT PAYMENTS
The Foundation expects to pay the following amounts for pension benefits, which reflect future service as appropriate, and expected postretirement benefits, before deducting the Medicare Part D subsidy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pension Plans</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Medicare Part D Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,527,440</td>
<td>$306,298</td>
<td>$22,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,596,440</td>
<td>340,400</td>
<td>23,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,986,440</td>
<td>368,595</td>
<td>19,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,023,440</td>
<td>425,715</td>
<td>20,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,126,440</td>
<td>481,138</td>
<td>27,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>12,100,200</td>
<td>3,294,500</td>
<td>257,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEFINED CONTRIBUTION 401(K) PLAN
In addition to the above, the Foundation maintains a 401(k) defined contribution retirement plan for all eligible employees. The Foundation matches employee contributions up to $3,000 per year. For the years ending December 31, 2008 and 2007, the Foundation contributed $234,204 and $227,873, respectively.
## Administration & Investment Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration Total</th>
<th>Investment Total</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$7,237,746</td>
<td>$7,333,885</td>
<td>$2,639,928</td>
<td>$1,354,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personnel costs</td>
<td>3,513,709</td>
<td>3,783,606</td>
<td>566,497</td>
<td>481,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,370,998</td>
<td>1,170,518</td>
<td>394,599</td>
<td>545,921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>1,759,770</td>
<td>964,406</td>
<td>2,407,962</td>
<td>1,993,268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and business expense</td>
<td>1,034,795</td>
<td>867,263</td>
<td>130,114</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and contract services</td>
<td>269,225</td>
<td>272,604</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$15,186,243</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,392,282</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,139,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,425,348</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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