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OUR FOUNDER

“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, as the content of this annual report makes clear.
OUR VALUES

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 that 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.
**Program Snapshot**

**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 strengthen philanthropy and the nonprofit sector as vital vehicles for increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies.

**PROGRAM AREAS:**
- Central/Eastern Europe and Russia
- South Africa
- United States
- Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

---

**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
- Economic Revitalization
- Strengthening Community
- Special Initiatives

---

**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
- International Finance for Sustainability
- 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 & SPECIAL PROJECTS**

**Mission:** To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. *(Proposals are by invitation only; unsolicited proposals are discouraged.)*
Annual Message
Focusing on the community foundation movement felt like a natural topic for this year’s annual report, what with our hometown community foundation celebrating its 25th anniversary in early 2013 and the U.S. field poised to celebrate its 100th anniversary in 2014.

Both of these milestones have given us plenty of opportunities over the course of this year to reflect on the value of community foundations: why they have endured; how they tap a natural charitable impulse in people; the benefits they bring to the communities they serve; and how and why the Mott Foundation has maintained its support for the field for some 33 years — even longer if you factor in our experiences in Flint.

Given that long-term involvement, we feel we have much to share on the subject. Through the years, we’ve implemented a number of different grantmaking strategies and approaches to fortifying both individual community foundations and the broader field. And we’ve learned some important lessons from those experiences that we think are worth sharing.

In writing this, I feel as though I may be preaching to the choir. Some readers surely are very familiar with community foundations, having funded or worked with them in some capacity over time. But others, who are new to the field or considering whether to venture into it, hopefully will find some value in reading about our experiences in the pages that follow.

We at Mott have long been impressed by the simplicity and the power that underlies the community foundation concept, which is to create a local vehicle that can empower the residents of a community to support causes close to home and close to the heart.

I first became acquainted with the community foundation idea in the 1970s when I was asked to join the board of the Flint Public Trust, which was created in 1950. In those days, the Trust had assets of less than $1 million and, as a result, a very small giving program.

Not long after I joined, I began thinking about ways to possibly honor Dr. Arthur L. Tuuri, then head of the Flint-based Mott Children’s Health Center. Among the options was to establish a special, local health fund, but, ultimately,
the Mott Foundation decided to make a $1.5 million challenge grant in 1978 to help establish the Flint Area Health Foundation.

A decade later, it was apparent that Flint actually had two small community foundations — the Trust and the health foundation — which, if combined, could be better positioned for growth and could have greater impact on the community through its grantmaking. In 1988, the two organizations merged, resulting in the creation of the Community Foundation of Greater Flint, which remains a vital entity in our community today, as well as a Mott grantee.

Recognizing that many communities around the country had the population base and the wealth to support a dynamic community foundation — yet for various reasons did not have one — in 1979, Mott launched the first of what would become several grantmaking efforts over time to support the field’s development, first nationally and, later, internationally.

Initially, our grantmaking was designed to help a limited number of struggling community foundations in the U.S. with administrative funds, support for specific projects and endowment challenge grants.

At roughly the same time, Eugene C. Struckhoff, who had played a lead role in creating the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation in 1962, was gaining a substantial reputation as an expert in community foundations. His publication, “The Handbook for Community Foundations: Their Formation, Development and Operation,” further established his expertise and became an important resource for those working in the field.

By the early 1980s, Struckhoff — or “Struck” as he was affectionately known — began working as a technical assistance provider to community foundations through the Council on Foundations (COF), while also running the Community Foundation of the Greater Baltimore Area.

And so our second program to support community foundations was launched in 1982 when we joined forces with COF to develop a technical assistance program for about 75 community foundations initially that provided one-on-one consulting with Struckhoff and other trained professionals.¹

Through the COF/Mott technical assistance program, community foundations learned how to develop staff, boards, donors, endowments, grantmaking programs and marketing strategies. That program, as well as Struckhoff’s ongoing work in

¹Among the consultants who provided technical assistance at various times were: Helen Monroe, Bill Somerville, David Huntington, R. Malcolm Salter, Jack Shakely, Stephen D. Mittenthal, Douglas Jansson and Paul Verret.

“We at Mott have long been impressed by the simplicity and the power that underlies the community foundation concept, which is to create a local vehicle that can empower the residents of a community to support causes close to home and close to the heart.”
the field, led to his becoming known as the “Johnny Appleseed of community foundations.”

His work also led him to develop a theory that community foundations just starting out or with assets under $5 million needed to conduct aggressive fundraising campaigns to attract $5 million in unrestricted funds within five years. To Struckhoff, $5 million represented the “take-off point” after which assets typically would soar.

To me, that “take-off point” seemed valid and a shorthand way of saying: Locally based institutions will be able to attract sufficient financial support if they are representative of the community; have a strong board; are knowledgeable about the community’s challenges; and are perceived as good stewards of resources. Simply put: Developing a track record of success — and trust — enables an organization to take off.

And, once it does, there are many important roles a community foundation can play. The Mott Foundation, for instance, found itself teaming up with community foundations on something called the “Neighborhood Small Grants Program” between 1984 and 1994. (Ultimately, we supported similar partnerships with other community foundations focused on the environment, violence prevention and race relations. One such example is featured later in this publication.)

Through the Neighborhood Small Grants Program, a select group of community foundations received relatively small grants from the Mott Foundation that they matched and then used for mini-grants to support resident-generated projects in low-income neighborhoods. In addition, participating foundations took part in a national network that provided a common evaluation plan, technical assistance and periodic meetings on neighborhood issues.

For Mott, the program had the benefit of allowing us to marry two of our internal interests: support for community foundations and support for neighborhood development. For the participating community foundations, it was often their first foray — and an enriching one — into working intensely with grassroots groups in their backyard.

As I look back today on the lessons from that program, it seems to me that you can end up with a really rich experience when you create a collaboration in which a national funder provides some resources — research, technical assistance, evaluation tools and so forth — and the community foundation brings its own unique perspective and skills to the table. Moreover, the odds are that if the problem being addressed continues to exist, the local funder will continue the work well into the future, even without ongoing national funding and support.

And, to me, that underscores another strength of the community foundation: It’s a permanent fixture in the community that can address local problems with local resources. I know the Mott Foundation, like a lot of other foundations, from time to time has parachuted into local communities, funded programs for a while, and departed. But, the beauty of the community foundation is that it remains.

We’ve long appreciated the “staying power” of community foundations, which is just one of the reasons we’ve embraced certain opportunities through the years to help the concept spread, including internationally.

“Hopefully, even more young people will take an interest in this work. After all, engaging young people in philanthropy is how we pass a dream on from one generation to the next.”
I am reminded, for instance, of a request we received in 1988 from Michael Brophy, then-chief executive of the Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) in the United Kingdom, to join other U.S. funders in bolstering the U.K. field with technical assistance grants.

That venture — which involved using some of the same technical assistance providers that had helped the U.S. field grow — was so successful that Mott offered a challenge to CAF in late 1990. The Foundation would provide 1 million pounds to support the development of U.K. community trusts and foundations with the expectation that CAF would match it. The resulting 2 million pounds would then be used to create a second pool of challenge funds to be divided into three grants and awarded on a competitive basis to three British community foundations. Those recipients were expected to match the award on a 2:1 basis to establish permanent endowments.

Ultimately, 10 community foundations submitted proposals and three were chosen: Tyne & Wear Foundation, Greater Bristol Foundation and the Cleveland Community (Middlesbrough) Foundation. I’m pleased to say that the Tyne & Wear Foundation, one of the first community foundations in the U.K., today has an endowment of 53 million pounds; the Greater Bristol Foundation, now known as the Quartet Foundation, has a permanent endowment of 19.5 million pounds; and the Cleveland foundation, which became the Tees Valley Community Foundation about a decade ago, has a 12 million pound endowment with expectations to reach more than 15 million pounds in the coming months.

Interestingly, one of the foundations that participated in the rigorous application process, but was not awarded a grant, found that the extensive planning and technical assistance required to apply had been so useful that leaders were emboldened to take up the endowment challenge on their own.

In a sense, one might say that we began our community foundation work in the U.K. in response to a unique window of opportunity. Similarly, when such seismic global events as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the legal end of apartheid in South Africa were occurring, it struck us that community foundations could be important vehicles for civic engagement and community improvement.

Endowment challenge grants, technical assistance, partnering with community foundations — these are only a few of the ways we've helped strengthen the field. Through the years, we've also provided grants designed to: develop and strengthen support organizations in the U.S. and around the world; conduct and share research and lessons learned; provide international fellowships and exchanges; and strengthen and expand youth grantmaking programs.

In the pages that follow — as well as on our Web site — you’ll find more about the Mott Foundation’s involvement with community foundations, including more lessons we've learned, and examples from around the world of exemplary work undertaken by both individual community foundations and support organizations working to bolster the field.
Clearly, support for community foundations has been one of our enduring funding interests. All told, we have made 781 grants totaling $150.4 million to the field through 2012. But we certainly haven’t gone it alone. Over time, there have been some outstanding foundations working with us in this effort.

Furthermore, we’ve noted with interest that the work we and others have supported across the globe is resulting in new approaches and models that are broadening the concept of a community foundation. While, historically, the Mott Foundation’s lens has been on place-based, community foundations, we recognize that there are other viable forms of community philanthropy, including giving circles, United Ways, social venture funds, online giving, religious institutions and others — many of which we have funded. The bottom line is to generate local resources for local needs.

Inevitably, there will be more changes ahead as new players enter the field in new places around the globe. And, hopefully, even more young people will take an interest in this work. After all, engaging young people in philanthropy is how we pass a dream on from one generation to the next.

Strong community foundations are much more than fiscal agents — as important as that function may be. They are an ideal place for diverse interests and different voices to come together, a place where hope can bloom.

**Governance and Administration**

In 2012, we realized a modest increase in assets, which totaled $2.3 billion on Dec. 31, 2012, compared with $2.16 billion the year before. On the following page, we have included a chart labeled “Total assets at market value & 2012 dollars,” which tracks our asset performance since 1963.

On Jan. 1, 2013, Douglas X. Patiño rejoined the Foundation’s Board of Trustees, although one could argue that his emeritus status the previous two years meant he never truly left our organization. Douglas was a trustee from 1995 through 2010 before he was elected Trustee Emeritus beginning in 2011.

Douglas brings to the board not only his wise counsel, thoughtful opinions and genial manner, but also decades of much valued experience in the public, private and nonprofit sectors, including serving as the founding President and Chief Executive Officer of the Marin County Community Foundation in his home state of California. We are delighted that Douglas is once again able to regularly participate in our meetings and deliberations.

We also have seen the retirements of three long-time employees. Eve C. Brown, our librarian of 38 years, retired on Sept. 30, 2012; Michael J. Smith, vice president of investments and chief investment...
officer, retired on Dec. 31, 2012, after 35 years with the Foundation; and Lesle Berent retired from her position as senior accountant on Feb. 15, 2013, after 33 years on our staff.

Eve, the typical quiet librarian, amazed her colleagues by routinely finding exactly the right information, despite being given the vaguest of references to go on. She had an encyclopedic knowledge of the Foundation — and the many books, papers, clippings, reports and assorted other materials contained in both our library and our archives. Hired in 1974, she was responsible for creating the Foundation’s original library and our centralized filing system. With her retirement, Glen A. Birdsall, who worked with Eve for 14 years, was promoted from Associate Librarian to Librarian.

Mike Smith joined the Foundation’s Detroit-based investment office in 1978 as an investment manager and was promoted several times over the years before assuming the top position in our investment office in 2006. Mike was responsible for helping us transition to a broadly diversified portfolio. Although his long career meant he would experience some nerve-wracking highs and lows in the financial markets, Mike maintained a quiet, calm demeanor through it all. Much appreciated for his willingness to listen and delegate, Mike was a team builder who created a supportive and collegial working environment for his staff.

Succeeding Mike as Vice President-Investments and Chief Investment Officer is Jay C. Flaherty, who joined our investment office in 2007. He was named an assistant vice president in March 2012.

We were fortunate to have an outstanding internal candidate to step into such an important leadership position. Jay was able to bring with him not only an impressive financial background, but also a valuable familiarity with the general operation of the investment office.

Finally, early in 2013, Lesle Berent left our accounting department after a long career. Lesle was one of a number of quiet, behind-the-scenes Mott employees who ensure that things run smoothly — and know how to competently put them right when they don’t.

The institutional memory that left our organization with these three employees will be impossible to replace. Still, we wish them all the best in their retirements and thank them again for their dedication and hard work through the years.

William S. White, President
Starting with a single community foundation in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1914, the community foundation field has exploded during the past 100 years, reaching some 1,750 in number worldwide today.

As the U.S. field stands ready to celebrate its centennial in 2014, now seems a fitting time to reflect on the mission, the value and the expansion of this resilient philanthropic approach, and the Mott Foundation’s contribution to it.

What is it about this concept that resonates with people from different countries, cultures and walks of life — both in a nation’s metropolitan regions and in its rural communities?
Although a community foundation was developed in Canada only seven years after the concept was birthed in 1914, signs of rapid and continuous growth outside the U.S. were not evident until the early 2000s, when the number stood at 905. Ten years later, the number had nearly doubled to 1,680 and today is approximately 1,750.

Today, there are approximately 700 community foundations in the U.S., 259 in Germany, 187 in Canada, 54 in the United Kingdom and another 550-plus elsewhere in the world for a combined total of about 1,750 community foundations globally. These local philanthropic institutions can be found on every continent except Antarctica and in more than 50 countries.
Surely part of what makes a community foundation so appealing is its simplicity. Although there are many definitions of a community foundation, at its most basic, it is an institution of the community and for the community in which a wide range of residents work together to create long-term strategies and solutions for developing vibrant, sustainable communities — and they use local resources gathered from a diverse donor base to do it.

In practical terms, that means community foundations should be quite good at: knowing their community’s strengths and challenges; leading effective responses to local issues; serving as conveners; building partnerships between disparate parties; pooling resources from inside and outside their communities; engaging a diversity of residents; engendering trust; and acting as on-the-ground “eyes and ears” for regional, national and international funders.

As the concept travels around the world, it is shaped to fit specific cultures and contexts. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. Instead, the grantmaking and day-to-day operations play out differently, whether in South Africa at the West Coast Community Foundation or in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the Tuzla Community Foundation or in the U.S. at the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region — three foundations that are featured in the pages that follow and on our Web site.

Still, what links these and all community foundations is their sense of purpose, which is to improve lives and communities.

MOTT’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FIELD

The Mott Foundation’s interest in the power and possibilities of community foundations was piqued by a series of grants beginning in the 1950s in the Foundation’s hometown of Flint, Michigan. Those grants, given to the Flint Public Trust, provided the Foundation with an opportunity to observe and learn how these institutions can serve as “a different philanthropic voice,” one that provides space for a diversity of interests and ways of thinking about a community’s strengths and challenges.

A community approach to grantmaking has been a signature strategy of the Mott Foundation, and the concept of a “people’s philanthropy” — neighbors giving to help neighbors — aligns naturally with this mission. In 1979, seven community foundations — including the Flint Public Trust — were selected to participate in Mott’s first national program of technical assistance and capacity building for small and growing community foundations.

Over time, the Foundation continued to support the national expansion of community foundations, building both the capacity and endowments of these institutions, and utilizing their knowledge of their home communities to fund national and regional programs to revitalize neighborhoods, improve race relations, prevent violence and protect the environment.

The Foundation’s first major foray into supporting community foundations internationally occurred in 1988 when the Charities Aid Foundation (CAF), a philanthropy support organization based in England, approached Mott about funding a technical assistance program for emerging community foundations in South Africa and Bosnia and Herzegovina.
the United Kingdom. On the heels of that successful effort, Mott initiated an endowment-building challenge grant program through CAF in 1990 and, by 1992, was supporting the Community Foundation Network (now known as UK Community Foundations), a membership organization created in 1991 to support the growth and stability of the field in the U.K.

Fairly quickly, the Foundation recognized that support organizations and grantmaker associations could be excellent tools for spreading and strengthening the community foundation field. And, indeed, Mott's strategies in support of community foundations began to reflect that, with grants being made to various organizations at home and abroad that could help develop and unify the field.

Mott's grantmaking to support individual community foundations as well as the field and its infrastructure is detailed in the timeline that starts at the bottom of the previous page and continues on the pages that follow. Together, the entries tell a rich story about Mott's many contributions to the field through the years — a story that by 2012 involved more than 781 grants totaling $150.4 million.

MOTT'S CURRENT FOCUS

As the community foundation field has flourished and matured over time, Mott's focus has largely shifted away from making grants to seed and strengthen individual community foundations, with a few notable exceptions such as the community foundation in Mott's hometown. It is also worth noting that, from time to time, all four of the Foundation's grantmaking areas have worked with community foundations as grantees or collaborative partners on issues related to program strategies.

Today, the Foundation's emphasis is on building the field more broadly by funding three primary areas — leadership development, national and global support organizations, and research and lessons learned. Examples from each of these areas are highlighted below.

Leadership development

Mott supports a variety of initiatives to develop community foundation leaders at home and abroad. One example is CFLeads, a U.S. national network that helps develop the leadership skills of individual community foundation staff while also building the organizational strength of community foundations by offering Webinars, conferences, print and online publications, peer-learning experiences and other services.

Additionally, the Emerging Leaders International Fellows Program at The Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society provides opportunities for community foundation practitioners from around the world to learn about the field from each other and specialists. Based at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, fellows participate in an intensive three-month program of research, seminars, conferences, mentoring and internships. Together, they study the trends and practices of indigenous, place-based giving within the global philanthropic sector. Fellows also design and pursue an individualized research project. Since its inception in 1989, the program has graduated about 200 alumni from more than 50 countries. Among others, fellows have come from Brazil, Czech Republic, India, Italy, Kenya, New Zealand, Romania and the U.S.

As the community foundation concept was taking root in Western, Eastern and Central Europe, Mott partnered with the Germany-based Bertelsmann
1990

**SEEDING THE FIELD IN RUSSIA**

Mott support to Charities Aid Foundation helps initiate community foundations in Russia. The first such institution is launched two years later in Togliatti, Flint’s sister city.

1995

**CONCEPT SPREADS TO NEW REGIONS**

Mott makes a grant to the Healthy City Community Foundation, which was established in 1994 in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. The Foundation’s support for the field in Central/Eastern Europe ultimately extends to several countries in the region. Also in 1995, Mott provides a grant to help grow the emerging fields in Australia and New Zealand.

1996

**POLAND, SOUTH AFRICA ESTABLISH COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS**

Mott makes its first grants to develop the field in South Africa and Poland. Within two years, both countries develop their first Mott-funded community foundations.

1997

**COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS AS VEHICLES FOR CHANGE**

Mott supports the Council of Michigan Foundations, working jointly with the Great Lakes Protection Fund, to create a collaborative of 21 community foundations located along the Great Lakes shoreline that support environmental grantmaking.

1998

**GLOBAL FUND FOR COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS**

Mott makes its first grants to develop the field in South Africa and Poland. Within two years, both countries develop their first Mott-funded community foundations.

Foundation to create and fund the Transatlantic Community Foundation Network. The network, which existed from 1999 to 2008, included peer-exchange visits, large annual meetings and smaller regional gatherings. It ultimately involved about four dozen practitioners from 14 countries in North America and Europe who shared experiences and expertise. Working together, practitioners developed products for the field such as marketing materials and program evaluation guidelines.

Occasionally, Mott also funds major peer-learning events such as the “Community Foundations: Symposium on a Global Movement” held in Berlin, Germany, in December 2004. It was the first global meeting on the topic; plans are under way for another in the next few years.

**Support organizations — statewide, regional, national and international**

Support organizations are often the institutions community foundations turn to for technical assistance and peer-learning opportunities. They also serve as the voice for the field. Whether their focus is statewide, regional, national or international, such organizations as the Council of Michigan Foundations, League of California Community Foundations, Community Foundation Partnership in Russia and the Global Fund for Community Foundations all help promote and professionalize the community foundation field. In part, they do this by developing, collecting and distributing resource materials, and also by advocating for an environment that is fiscally and legally supportive of the field.

Currently, and in the recent past, Mott has provided grants to support organizations that are helping develop and strengthen the field nationwide in the U.S. and in other countries, including Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Turkey, Ukraine and the U.K.

One strategic and efficient way Mott continues to support the concept’s spread internationally is through its grants to the Global Fund for Community Foundations. As its name implies, the Global Fund provides support to help start, strengthen and sustain emerging community foundations and community philanthropy organizations around the world. It is the only international organization solely dedicated to this mission, which it carries out by providing the connecting organizations; advocating for community foundations with international donor institutions; and funding emerging grassroots grantmaking institutions around the globe.

The Global Fund makes small grants ranging from $5,000 to $15,000. While some grants are used as incentives to secure matching donations to build endowments, others fund local projects, peer exchanges, conference attendance and additional activities that support organizational development. Its seed funding also can open doors for emerging institutions to secure funding from other sources. To date, the Global Fund has made grants totaling $2.2 million to 121 organizations in 41 countries.

Created in 2006 as a three-year joint initiative of the World Bank, the Mott and Ford foundations and WINGS (the Worldwide Initiative for Grantmaker Support), the Global Fund was hosted by the European Foundation Centre in Brussels during its pilot phase; it became independent in 2009 and established an office in Johannesburg, South Africa, in 2010, where it remains.

The Global Fund’s grant support enables community foundations in locations as diverse as Brazil, Jordan, Nepal, Philippines, Romania and...
Vietnam to stand on their own as vehicles of positive local change.

Most recently, the Foundation has recognized that although the community foundation concept is an excellent vehicle for community philanthropy, it is not the only one. As indigenous philanthropy develops internationally, it is taking on many forms. Consequently, Mott has partnered with the Aga Khan Foundation USA, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Global Fund and the United States Agency for International Development to launch the Global Alliance for Community Philanthropy. The Mott Foundation is supporting the Alliance by funding the Global Fund to manage the Alliance’s activities, sharing its learning and supporting its efforts to promote community philanthropy as a valuable development practice.

**Research and lessons learned**

Since its earliest days of funding community foundations, Mott has supported the sharing of research, evaluations and lessons learned about the field — a practice that continues today.

For example, Mott’s longtime grantee WINGS produces a biannual Global Status Report, which tracks the growth and development of the community foundation field internationally. The report provides field statistics and status updates on specific countries, and is used by support organizations, individual community foundations, donors and funders.

In addition, by supporting practitioners’ efforts to share lessons learned about the field, there’s less likelihood of “reinventing the wheel” and increased opportunities for cross-fertilization to occur.

Mott’s support for disseminating field information is closely tied to the Foundation’s awareness of the broader concept of community philanthropy. The 2013 publication, “The Case for Community Philanthropy: How the Practice Builds Local Assets, Capacity, and Trust — and Why It Matters,” is a primer on the vital importance of community philanthropy as a vehicle for international development and community betterment. The publication builds on “The Value of Community Philanthropy,” a Mott/Aga Khan Foundation-funded report released in 2012.
MOTT’S LESSONS LEARNED

Through more than six decades of grantmaking to help develop and strengthen the community foundation field locally, nationally and internationally, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has learned some valuable lessons that may be useful to both donors and communities. Among the most critical are:

- **Importance of local roots.** To be successful and sustainable, community foundations must be initiated by local leaders and residents and focus on a community’s assets rather than its deficits. People and organizations outside the community can offer assistance, but the real motivation must come from within.

- **More than money.** Although the size of a community foundation’s endowment remains an important measure of its success, it is not the sole measure. Increasingly, community foundations are valued for their ability to act as conveners and leaders in their communities — attributes especially valued in financially poor communities that, nonetheless, have other important resources that can be surfaced, deployed, leveraged and grown.

- **Technical assistance is crucial.** To be effective, community foundations need technical assistance early on and along the way. They need training to develop expertise in ways to interact with the community, engage board members, cultivate donors and develop policies and procedures for investing finances, evaluating grants, optimizing technology, etc. Additionally, community foundations need to ensure that the organizations they support receive sufficient technical assistance.

- **Funder and leader.** Increasingly, community foundations may find themselves needing to strike a balance between reacting to community needs and becoming a proactive local leader capable of addressing entrenched issues head-on.

- **Inclusiveness.** The most successful community foundations try to serve and involve the entire community, broadening participation in its governance, decisionmaking and activities to all kinds of residents, not just donors and community leaders. Youth involvement is especially productive and strategic.

- **Long-term process.** Nurturing the establishment and growth of community foundations takes time. While their mission — to improve communities — is seemingly simple, these institutions are complex in structure and process, requiring patience and long-term commitment. Moreover, it takes time for a community foundation to establish a track record of success in the community and become a trusted resource for the long haul.

- **Infrastructure matters.** The importance of infrastructure (support) organizations to the growth and health of the community foundation movement cannot be emphasized enough. Recent studies have shown that in places with a healthy infrastructure — membership associations, networks, councils, forums and federations — community foundations are more likely to proliferate.

- **Adaptable to unique communities.** The capacity of the field to adapt to different tax structures, laws and cultures has been clearly demonstrated in places around the globe. While there is a need to be sensitive to the cultural context of each specific community and the resources therein, the community foundation is a concept that has proved to be both versatile and adaptable.
A philanthropic approach with global appeal

The Mott Foundation’s support for community foundations grew naturally out of our traditional commitment to strengthening communities and reflected the view of founder Charles Stewart Mott, who believed that our basic strength as a nation is derived from strong, cohesive communities.

With that as the underpinning, the Foundation helped support the development and spread of the concept over more than three decades. In the following pages, we illustrate the breadth of Mott’s grantmaking to community foundations, as well as to several of the field's support organizations, on a world map featuring sites where notable achievements and significant growth have taken place.

In addition, three short features — each focusing on a different aspect of the community foundation field today — portray the powerful potential these institutions hold for local communities, for convening and collaborating to create change, and for cultivating the charitable impulse. From the local to the regional to the global, the featured initiatives include:

- **West Coast Community Foundation**
  Created “to nurture the growth of philanthropy and improve its responsiveness to the needs of ‘poor and marginalized communities’” in the Western Cape province of South Africa, the community foundation today serves as a catalyst that mobilizes and distributes resources and also provides community development training that helps local communities become self-sustaining.

- **Great Lakes Community Foundation Collaborative**
  In the late 1990s, the Great Lakes Protection Fund, jointly with the Council of Michigan Foundations, led an initiative designed to increase the number of community foundations located along the Great Lakes shoreline that would make grants to restore and protect the Great Lakes ecosystem. The result was a network of community foundations that worked on Great Lakes-wide problems and helped build endowments to ensure those problems would be addressed over the long term. Many of the 21 community foundations that participated in the collaborative remain active in environmental grantmaking.

- **Association for Community Relations**
  Established to promote and develop philanthropy in Romania, this young philanthropic support organization is driving incremental change in charitable attitudes and behavior, principally through its efforts to develop community foundations as vehicles for local giving and decisionmaking, and as funders of the work done by local non-governmental organizations.
Mott’s Grantmaking Seeds Global Growth

CANADA GROWS THE FIELD FROM COAST TO COAST
The nation’s first community foundation was created in Winnipeg in 1921. During the next 71 years, Canada added only 27 more. However, after the Community Foundations of Canada (CFC), a Mott grantee, was created in 1992, the field nearly tripled within six years. Today, the country’s 187 institutions cover 89 percent of the nation.

MEXICO POSITIONED FOR GROWTH
Since the first community foundation was created in the mid-1990s, the field has grown to 22 today. These institutions exist in 19 of Mexico’s 31 states, with more growth expected since the recent formation of a national support organization, Comunalia, a Mott sub-grantee through the Inter-American Foundation.

U.S. FIELD DEVELOPS IN DEPTH AND BREADTH
After Mott provided grants to U.S. community foundations for technical assistance and endowments, it initiated a grassroots-grantmaking program in the mid-1980s that used community foundations as vehicles to improve neighborhoods. Since then, Mott has repeated this strategy of partnering with community foundations to achieve program goals in several grantmaking areas.

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE U.K.
Although the first community foundation in the U.K. was created in Swindon in 1975, the field didn’t take off until after 1991 and the creation of the Mott-funded Community Foundations Network (now called UK Community Foundations). Today, virtually every U.K. citizen has access to a local community foundation — 54 in all.

GERMANY ADVANCES CONCEPT AND FIELD FLOURISHES
Mott worked in partnership with the Bertelsmann Foundation, beginning in 2001, to develop the field in Germany. With more than 250 community foundations nationwide in 2013, Germany ranks second globally in sheer numbers behind the U.S. Although its first community foundation was created only 15 years ago as a “foundation of citizens for citizens,” the field has grown at a fast pace with combined assets of approximately $300 million.

SOUTH AFRICA COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE
From Mott’s office in Johannesburg, South Africa, the Foundation has supported the growth of community foundations throughout the country. Today, Mott supports three community foundations: the Community Development Foundation Western Cape, Uthungulu Community Foundation and the West Coast Community Foundation. These Mott-funded foundations have helped grow the field to a total of five today.

onlineEXTRAS @ www.mott.org/AR2012
Visit our Web site for exclusive online content.
Community Foundations: A Global View

**Former Soviet Bloc Countries Create Community Foundations**

- Created in 1998, the Togliatti Community Foundation was Russia’s first such institution. Since then, Charities Aid Foundation and Community Foundation Partnership, both Mott grantees, have supported the field’s growth and development, resulting in 45 community foundations nationwide.

- The Healthy City Community Foundation in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, was established in 1992 as an operating foundation and became Eastern Europe’s first community foundation in 1994. In 2003, the Association of Slovak Community Foundations, a Mott grantee, was created and currently has eight members.

**Australia and New Zealand Develop Community Foundations**

- Australia’s first public community foundation, the Tasmanian Community Foundation, was launched in 1995. Since then, the field has grown to 36 countrywide. In nearby New Zealand, where the field is about 18 years old, there are currently 11 community foundations located throughout the nation. Each country has a support organization for the philanthropic field, Philanthropy New Zealand and Philanthropy Australia. The latter is a past Mott grantee.

The Academy for the Development of Philanthropy in Warsaw, Poland, was established in 1998. The Mott grantee serves as a national and regional support organization, and has helped create more than two dozen community foundations throughout Poland.
Local funder responds to needs and empowers residents

Simphiwe Somnqaba works at a farm cooperative in Klawer, a community north of Cape Town, South Africa, that receives financial support and business expertise from the West Coast Community Foundation to become self-sustaining.
With almost fatherly pride, Simphiwe Somnqaba grips a baby bottle of milk and encourages the little one on his lap to drink. When this kid’s belly is full, he will feed another. Caring for kids — young goats — is his job. In addition to providing Somnqaba with an income, it allows him to help his older brother, Collman, who is one of seven members of the Klawer Small Scale Cooperative.

The co-op is one of two farms currently receiving support from the West Coast Community Foundation (WCCF). Based in the Western Cape province of South Africa, the WCCF is a Mott grantee; its mission is to reduce poverty and build self-reliant communities.

“We are seeing some very positive outcomes because these farmers want to better themselves and provide for their families,” said Johanna Hendricks, CEO of the community foundation.

The goat farm is located less than a mile from the small town of Klawer, a rural community of about 6,250 residents that is 175 miles north of Cape Town. Its co-op members also raise pigs and grow vegetables. They — along with members of the Eden Commercial Organic Farms in Atlantis, a semi-urban area about 25 miles north of Cape Town — turned to the community foundation for practical guidance in operating their co-ops. Locally based, staffed and funded, WCCF is recognized as a trusted, non-political grassroots-grantmaking institution, Hendricks said.

After struggling with several major obstacles — lack of access to public land for grazing, stolen animals and insufficient funds to pay feed and water bills — each farm applied for a grant, but the foundation initially provided no money to either. Instead, staff shared a lot of their collective know-how. For example, before meeting with the foundation, co-op members in Klawer mainly worked as individual subsistence farmers. But, after learning that
co-ops function best when owners share tasks and work interdependently, they put those principles into practice and saw their operations improve, Hendricks said.

Additionally, foundation staff provided practical help for the Eden farmers. They aided them in drafting a constitution and creating the policies and procedures needed to become a registered non-governmental organization (NGO). These steps positioned the NGO to receive funding from several sources, including startup grants from the WCCF. While the foundation’s money was minuscule by most grantmaking standards ($500 annually), it meant a lot to the farmers. So did the professional guidance, Hendricks said.

“They applied for a grant,” she said. “But we asked, ‘Is that really what they need?’ We did a complete assessment of their ability to manage the business and offered training in areas where their skills were lacking.”

With both co-ops now operating as legally registered NGOs, they can access resources and expertise from local, provincial and national government programs. That aspect of the WCCF’s work is similar to other community foundations around the globe, Hendricks said. While others might not support farm co-ops, they do provide technical assistance to strengthen NGOs and offer training to develop the skills of NGOs’ staff and volunteers.

“I love this work because we witness lives changing,” Hendricks said. “We see people grow. They go from not believing they can do much of anything to discovering, ‘Hey, I can do this!’ Those are the little treasures I keep in my heart.”
Maria Isaks and other subsistence farmers in Klawer, South Africa, improved their productivity after the local community foundation discussed the benefits of sharing tasks and working interdependently.
Community foundations work together to tackle regional issues
Staff members at the Great Lakes Protection Fund (GLPF) in Chicago say their ears perked up after hearing some media buzz in summer 2013 surrounding the Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area in Michigan.

Behind that buzz was the community foundation’s announcement of its first Community Impact Grant, a board-directed $250,000 investment linking it with several public, private and nonprofit partners in a five-year, $12 million initiative called Project Clarity. The partnership aims to restore wetlands in the Lake Macatawa watershed and improve the region’s water quality.

More than a decade earlier, the Holland/Zeeland institution had joined a GLPF initiative that was created in partnership with the Council of Michigan Foundations. The project was designed to increase the number of community foundations located along the Great Lakes shoreline that made grants to restore and protect the Great Lakes ecosystem. Called the Great Lakes Community Foundation Collaborative, the project's funders included the Joyce and Charles Stewart Mott foundations.

“While you can’t draw a straight line between the earlier Great Lakes collaborative and this [new] project, you can infer that the momentum for this level of environmental grantmaking began when community foundations started looking through the environmental lens,” said J. David Rankin, GLPF vice president of programs.

“The collaborative created a network of community foundations that could begin to tackle Great Lakes-wide problems together.”

By design, program participants represented all eight states in the Great Lakes Basin — Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio,
Pennsylvania and Wisconsin — and the Canadian province of Ontario, which also is in the basin. While Mott made two grants totaling $880,000 from 1997 to 2000 for this project, it was not the first time the Foundation engaged a group of community foundations to address local issues. From 1984 to 1994, Mott supported the Neighborhood Small Grants Program through which the Foundation provided grants to community foundations that then funded local projects identified by grassroots groups. Ultimately, 25 community foundations nationwide took part in the program. For several of the participating community foundations, it was the first time they had met with neighborhood groups and made grants in response to voiced concerns.

Likewise, the Great Lakes collaborative was the first time many of the 21 participating community foundations had met with residents and discussed environmental issues related to the Great Lakes. To help ensure that these environmental challenges could be addressed for the long haul, Mott provided modest $15,000 incentive grants for endowment building to each foundation that secured matching donations. In
all, more than $4.6 million was raised for endowments during the grant period, and an additional $4.2 million was secured in government grants through 2001 for collaborative initiatives, Rankin said.

By having community foundations working on the same problem at various locations around the Great Lakes, the combined return was greater — and others took notice, he said. A network of 18 community foundations located along the Mississippi River — from Minnesota to Louisiana — replicated the coordinated approach. Created in 2006, the River Partnership of Community Foundations helps preserve, protect and restore the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Meanwhile, as a participant in the Great Lakes collaborative, the Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area has maintained its environmental interest more than a dozen years after the initiative ended, said Mike Goorhouse, vice president of donor development. Although the community foundation had created its own environment fund a few years before the collaborative started, it wasn't well known or widely supported, he said. However, after the endowment challenge was announced, new donors contributed to the environment fund, along with donors who previously had given to its other funds, Goorhouse said.

“The challenge grant gave us a voice to speak boldly about environmental issues,” he said. “Someone from outside our community was interested in Great Lakes causes and had come here with matching money for us to do something. That helped bring local attention to our environmental issues. And, as you can see, we’re continuing that work today.”
Cultivating the charitable impulse countrywide

Annual swim-a-thons like this in Cluj, Romania, offer competitive fun while raising vital monetary support for community foundations across Romania.
The many years needed by Romania to transition from decades of communism to a modern-day democracy have helped influence the country’s more long-term approach to philanthropy work.

“We have learned to celebrate incremental changes in attitudes and behavior about giving instead of expecting one dramatic transformation,” said Alina Porumb, the community foundation’s program director at the Association for Community Relations (ACR) in Cluj-Napoca, a northern Romanian city. “In the last years, however, the rhythm of change in Romanian philanthropy has picked up, and what was only hope five years ago is now reality.”

In 2001 — a dozen years after the country started shifting to a market economy, including privatizing state-owned enterprises — ACR was established with a mission to promote and develop philanthropy in Romania. Since then, it has become a national leader in developing community foundations as vehicles for local giving and societal change.

ACR staff is enthusiastic about innovative fundraising initiatives that people are using in their communities to meet local needs, says Porumb, with community foundations serving as platforms for sharing and showcasing these initiatives to inspire others.

Philanthropic behavior becomes more rooted in everyday community life, she says, as honorees at weddings and birthday parties ask friends and families to make donations to local causes or the nearest community foundation in lieu of gifts. Similarly, people use sporting events, such as swim-a-thons and soccer matches, as fundraising opportunities to collect pledges and donations for community foundations and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

“At these events, people see they can make a big impact in their community when their small amounts are added together,” Porumb said. “It is wonderful because these ideas
were totally organic, emerging from the community itself."

Donations have helped fund a variety of projects, including equipping a village kindergarten with educational toys, providing house repairs for people in need and supporting art programs for children with visual and hearing impairments.

ACR currently promotes both individual and corporate giving, although its earlier activities focused more on encouraging corporate giving to NGOs, Porumb says. While corporate giving continues to have a high rate of involvement from employees and clients, ACR has expanded its work to inspire and engage individual donors.

In addition to interacting with donors directly, ACR partners with other groups, such as the United Way Foundation Romania, to create stronger tax incentives for donations given by individuals and businesses in Romania.

ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY RELATIONS (ACR) Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Mott grants through 2012: $1.55 million

Highlight: With strong local leadership and support from ACR and its donors and partners, 12 community foundations have been established in Romania in the past six years. Today, 35 percent of Romanians have access to a community foundation. Collectively, these institutions have pooled and invested about $825,000, mostly from local donors, in more than 100 resident-identified causes.

In their own words: “The enthusiasm and creativity of community foundations is inspiring positive responses from the local people, who are ready to act to improve their own lives and communities.”

– Program Director Alina Porumb
ACR Community Foundation

Web site: http://arcromania.ro

Today, ACR’s philanthropy programs focus on the following:
• developing young grantmakers through YouthBank groups nationwide;
• building individual giving initiatives, including a national program allowing citizens to designate specific NGOs as recipients of a small portion of their tax money;
• encouraging people to pool funds to generate a greater local impact through Donor Circles;
• promoting a platform that connects NGOs with banks and mobile phone operators so people can easily make technology-based donations; and
• establishing community foundations throughout the country.

With Mott’s help, there are now 12 community foundations nationwide. These grantmaking institutions are spreading because they incorporate an inclusive style of decisionmaking that involves residents in all aspects of community projects — vastly different from how things were done under the former communist system, Porumb says.

However, she says, much public education is still needed because the community foundation concept was previously unknown in Romania. Whether making donations or providing input on local projects, residents appreciate the transparency associated with community foundations, Porumb says.

“Donors are involved in deciding what to fund and then invited to visit or otherwise learn about the completed projects,” she said. “This is accountability. It is closing the circle of giving.”
Community foundations engage young people with YouthBank-funded projects like this in Iasi, Romania, where students cleaned and painted murals in a derelict pedestrian tunnel.
The final word

As the community foundation field embraces its second century of operation, there undoubtedly will be challenges to overcome. Two come readily to mind. Although it is impossible to predict how the globalization of society or our fast-changing technology will affect people’s propensity for giving decades from now, we can easily imagine that individuals’ loyalties to a specific place may weaken as they move from place to place, or that ever newer technologies will continue to make it even easier to give directly to any cause, any place, any time.

In response, community foundations not only will need to integrate people’s new “communities of interest or identity” with the more traditional “communities of place,” but also will need to demonstrate to donors their “value added” as intermediary organizations.

We suspect they are up to the challenge.

The fact that community foundations have endured for a century is a sure sign of their value and versatility. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the community support organizations and networks now in place — or those that will succeed them — will continue to help spread the community foundation concept in the years to come into regions where seeds are only starting to sprout.

As long as the concept remains true to its core, while maintaining flexibility in light of an ever-changing world, it is quite possible the field could find itself celebrating its bicentennial 100 years from now.
Programs & Grants
Program Overview: **Civil Society**

**Mission:** To strengthen philanthropy and the nonprofit sector as vital vehicles for increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies.

**CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA**

**Goal:** To foster a civil society in which nonprofits strengthen democratic values and practices and have access to adequate and responsive resources.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Active Civic Participation.** People and nonprofits empowered to take collective action that promotes and defends democratic values.
- **Philanthropy Development.** Promote and develop a more robust culture of private giving for public good.

**SOUTH AFRICA**

**Goal:** To empower poor and marginalized communities to unlock resources and realize their development needs and aspirations.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Community Advice Office Sector.** Strong and sustainable community advice offices and related community-based organizations that assist poor and marginalized communities.
- **Philanthropy Development.** Increased philanthropy with improved responsiveness to the needs of poor and marginalized communities.
- **Special Opportunities.** Support unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

**UNITED STATES**

**Goal:** To increase the nonprofit and philanthropic sector’s responsiveness and capacity to address social and community needs.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness.** A robust infrastructure that protects and promotes a vibrant and responsive nonprofit sector and philanthropy.
- **Community Philanthropy.** Philanthropy that promotes vitality and resiliency in local communities.

**GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR**

**Goal:** To foster global platforms for philanthropy and the nonprofit sector that respond to the needs of local communities.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector.** Philanthropy and nonprofit support organizations improve their effectiveness through international collaboration and exchange of knowledge.
- **Special Opportunities.** Support unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

**Note:** The grant listings and charts within this report reflect the geographic sub-regions in which we make grants in Central/Eastern Europe and Russia.
**GRANT ACTIVITY:**

$18,931,660 / 143 GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Activity</th>
<th>Grant Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Europe</td>
<td>$5.597</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>$3.545</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE/Russia Regional</td>
<td>$.978</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advice Office Sector</td>
<td>$2.340</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy Development</td>
<td>$.575</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$.422</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>$2.185</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Philanthropy</td>
<td>$.500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy</td>
<td>$.350</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>$2.215</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$.225</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$18.932</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central/Eastern Europe and Russia

**Southeast Europe**

- **Anadolu Kultur**
  - Istanbul, Turkey
  - $150,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Association for Community Relations**
  - Cluj-Napoca, Romania
  - $120,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Balkan Community Initiatives Fund – Serbia**
  - Belgrade, Serbia
  - $500,000 – 60 mos.
  - Endowment for sustainable future
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Balkan Investigative Reporting Network**
  - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Bulgarian Center for Nonprofit Law**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $190,000 – 36 mos.
  - NGO-BG: Legitimacy through visibility, knowledge and shared resources

- **Bulgarian Charities Aid Foundation**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $75,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Bulgarian Donors’ Forum**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $10,000 – 36 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Bulgarian Environmental Partnership Foundation**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $300,000 – 36 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Bulgarian School of Politics**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Promoting philanthropic culture in Bulgaria

- **CARE USA**
  - Atlanta, GA
  - $100,000 – 12 mos.
  - Strengthening civil society in Western Balkans

- **Center for Civic Cooperation**
  - Livno, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $60,000 – 24 mos.
  - Increasing citizen participation in community life through media

- **Center for Civil Initiatives**
  - Zagreb, Croatia
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Centre for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights Osijek**
  - Osijek, Croatia
  - $22,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Centre for Research, Documentation and Publication**
  - Pristina, Kosovo
  - $70,000 – 24 mos.
  - Planning and administrative support

- **Civic Alliance**
  - Podgorica, Montenegro
  - $70,000 – 24 mos.
  - Toward enhanced civic activism and sustainable civic participation in Montenegro

- **Civic Initiatives**
  - Belgrade, Serbia
  - $150,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Civil Society Promotion Center**
  - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $70,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Community Building Mitrovica**
  - Mitrovica, Kosovo
  - $70,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Fund for Active Citizenship**
  - Podgorica, Montenegro
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Group 484**
  - Belgrade, Serbia
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Institutional and program development support

- **Heartefact Fund**
  - Belgrade, Serbia
  - $125,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Initiative for Progress**
  - Ferizaj, Kosovo
  - $80,000 – 24 mos.
  - School of activism

- **Institute for Public Environment Development**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Integra**
  - Pristina, Kosovo
  - $60,000 – 24 mos.
  - Dealing with the past – transitional justice in Kosovo

- **International Council for Cultural Centers**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Strengthening bread houses network in Bulgaria

- **Kosova Women’s Network**
  - Pristina, Kosovo
  - $50,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Mozaiq Community Development Foundation**
  - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $500,000 – 60 mos.
  - Endowment for sustainable future
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Network for the Affirmation of NGO Sector – MANS**
  - Podgorica, Montenegro
  - $75,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Organization for Civil Initiatives**
  - Osijek, Croatia
  - $60,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Populari**
  - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $60,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Regional Foundation for Local Development Zamah**
  - Zagreb, Croatia
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Truth, Justice and Memory**
  - Studies Association
  - Istanbul, Turkey
  - $125,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Tuzla Community Foundation**
  - Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **United Way Romania**
  - Bucharest, Romania
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Workshop for Civic Initiatives Foundation**
  - Sofia, Bulgaria
  - $500,000 – 48 mos.
  - Endowment for sustainable future
  - $405,000 – 36 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Youth Initiative for Human Rights – Bosnia**
  - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **YouthBuild USA**
  - Somerville, MA
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - YouthBuild in Western Balkans

**Subtotal:** $5,597,000

**Western Europe**

- **Association for International Education and Exchange**
  - Dortmund, Germany
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Encouraging development of non-governmental organizations in Belarus

- **Association of Ukrainian Human Rights Monitors on Law Enforcement**
  - Kyiv, Ukraine
  - $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - Strengthening capacity of youth to protect and restore their rights

- **Charities Aid Foundation**
  - Kent, England
  - $400,000 – 24 mos.
  - Community foundation development in Russia
  - $125,000 – 24 mos.
  - Increasing private donations to Russian nonprofit sector

- **Civic Analysis and Independent Research Center**
  - Perm, Russia
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - Civil initiatives for public benefit support service
Cloudwatcher
Moscow, Russia
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Merit Bank

Community Foundation Partnership
Togliatti, Russia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Institutional development

East Europe Foundation
Kyiv, Ukraine
$180,000 – 18 mos.
Act Now

Edannia
Kyiv, Ukraine
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation for Independent Radio Broadcasting
Moscow, Russia
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Participatory radio as means for community development in Russia

Garage Gang Kollektiv
Kyiv, Ukraine
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Generation celebration

InEcA-consulting
Novokuznetsk, Russia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Develop course on public participation for students

Moscow School of Political Studies
Moscow, Russia
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Municipal Center for Humanistic Technologies ‘AHALAR’
Chernihiv, Ukraine
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Territory of development: community mobilization in Ukraine

National Center for Prevention of Violence ‘ANNA’
Moscow, Russia
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Mobilizing local communities to prevent domestic violence

Pontis Foundation
Bratislava, Slovakia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Building capacity of Belarus’ analytical community

Russia Donors Forum
Moscow, Russia
$120,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

Sakhalin Salmon Initiative Center
Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia
$75,000
Adjustment to previous grant

Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center
Novosibirsk, Russia
$180,000 – 24 mos.
Communities of, by and for the people

Sluzhnye Association
Nizhny Novgorod, Russia
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Community development in Volga region

Step by Step Moldova
Chisinau, Moldova
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Community school development in Moldova

Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union
Kyiv, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Ukrainian Philanthropists Forum
Kyiv, Ukraine
$80,000 – 24 mos.
Institutional development

West-Ukrainian Resource Center
Kyiv, Ukraine
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Wild Salmon Center
Portland, OR
$160,000 – 24 mos.
Russian Far East public watershed council network initiative

Subtotal: $3,545,000

CEE/Russia Regional

Association for Community Relations
Cluj-Napoca, Romania
$144,380 – 18 mos.
Initiative for strategic philanthropy and intelligent resources

CEE Citizens Network
Bratislava, Slovakia
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Foundation for Northern Ireland
Belfast, Ireland
$200,000 – 24 mos.
International YouthBank support model

Environmental Partnership Association
Brisno, Czech Republic
$100,000 – 24 mos.
EPA in the European system

European Foundation Centre
Brussels, Belgium
$30,000 – 24 mos.
Grantmakers East group

Foundation-Administered Projects
$66,829
Active civic participation
$19,494
Community education development assistance project in Central/Eastern Europe and former Soviet Union
$41,991
Community foundation development
$74,891
Philanthropy development in southeast Europe

Subtotal: $977,585

Program Area Total: $10,119,585

South Africa

Community Advice Office Sector
Afrika Tikkun
Johannesburg, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Core operational support

Black Sash Trust
Cape Town, South Africa
$220,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Connections
Philippi, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Law and Rural Development Centre
Durban, South Africa
$250,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Community Organisation Resource Centre
Cape Town, South Africa
$100,000 – 27 mos.
General purposes

Eastern Cape NGO Coalition
East London, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

HIVOS – South Africa
Johannesburg, South Africa
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Multi-agency grants initiative: advice office re-granting project

Isandla Institute
Cape Town, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Good governance learning network

National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices
Cape Town, South Africa
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Community advice office sustainability project
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Support to provincial advice office forums

Rhodes University
Grahamstown, South Africa
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Rhodes University legal aid clinic: advice office project

Rural Legal Trust
Johannesburg, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Advice office program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Biko Foundation</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>27 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Fort Hare</td>
<td>Alice, South Africa</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>27 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Centre for Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Philanthropy Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Foundation Western Cape</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Elizabeth, South Africa</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa Trust</td>
<td>Midrand, South Africa</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Change4ever campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,437</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and sharing sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGS Consulting</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>$197,147</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Technical support and dialogue platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States**

**Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</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>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>LearnPhilanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Building civic capacity by nonprofit service organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>PolicyWorks for philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>Nonprofit listening post project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,336,584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Program Area Total | United States | $3,336,584 | | |

**Community Philanthropy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Community Trust</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Second century project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Community foundation centennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>C.S. Mott Foundation community philanthropy chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal | Community Philanthropy | $500,000 | | |

**Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council of Michigan Foundations</td>
<td>Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Transforming Michigan philanthropy through diversity and inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>36 mos.</td>
<td>Emerging practitioners in philanthropy project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Philanthropic initiative for racial equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal | Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Philanthropy | $350,000 | | |

**Program Area Total**

| United States | $3,035,000 | | | |
### Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector

**Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector**

**CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation**
- Washington, DC
- $120,000 – 24 mos.
  - Affinity group for national associations
- $80,000 – 12 mos.
  - General purposes

**Cleveland Foundation**
- Cleveland, OH
- $230,000 – 27 mos.
  - Community foundation
  - Global online atlas

**Council on Foundations**
- Arlington, VA
- $50,000 – 24 mos.
  - Global philanthropy program

**European Foundation Centre**
- Brussels, Belgium
- $160,000 – 12 mos.
  - General purposes

**Foundation-Administered Project**
- $47,491
  - Global community philanthropy development

**Global Fund for Community Foundations**
- Johannesburg, South Africa
- $200,000 – 12 mos.
  - Small grants and capacity-building program

**Inter-American Foundation**
- Washington, DC
- $300,000 – 36 mos.
  - Mexican community foundation development

**Johns Hopkins University**
- Baltimore, MD
  - $150,000 – 15 mos.
  - Global civil society information system
  - $50,000 – 24 mos.
  - International Society for Third-Sector Research

**Kenya Community Development Foundation**
- Nairobi, Kenya
- $50,000 – 12 mos.
  - Africa Grantmakers Network

**Keystone Accountability**
- Tacoma, WA
- $50,000 – 12 mos.
  - Constituent voice in philanthropy

**London Community Foundation**
- London, England
- $50,000 – 12 mos.
  - Developing London Community Foundation

**Network of European Foundations for Innovative Cooperation**
- Brussels, Belgium
- $28,000 – 12 mos.
  - Membership and administrative support
  - $25,000 – 12 mos.
  - Network of European foundations anniversary project

**Research Foundation of the City University of New York**
- New York, NY
- $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - International community foundation fellows program

**UK Community Foundations**
- London, England
- $100,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

**U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership**
- San Diego, CA
- $275,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

**World Affairs Council of Northern California**
- San Francisco, CA
- $50,000 – 24 mos.
  - Global philanthropy forum

### Subtotal: $2,215,491

**Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector**

**Special Opportunities**

**International Academy for Innovative Pedagogy, Psychology and Economy gGmbH**
- Berlin, Germany
- $225,000 – 12 mos.
  - Youth empowerment partnership program

### Subtotal: $225,000

**Program Area Total: $2,440,491**

**Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector**

**Program Total: $18,931,660**

**Civil Society**
Program Overview: 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, to a lesser extent, portions of the southeastern U.S.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Strengthening the Environmental Community.** A strong, effective and sustainable non-governmental organization (NGO) community dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- **Public Policies.** Well-designed and effectively implemented water-quality and water-quantity policies that advance the conservation of freshwater ecosystems.

**INTERNATIONAL FINANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

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

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future.** Infrastructure and energy investments that contribute to environmental sustainability and offer local economic opportunity.
- **Sustainable Regional Development and Integration.** Regional trade and investment strategies that contribute to local sustainable development, with an emphasis on Latin America.
- **Special Opportunities.** Unique opportunities to advance sustainable development goals and promote capacity building for NGOs.

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

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

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan.** In Michigan’s urban areas and surrounding older communities, a built environment designed to promote environmental health, economic prosperity and social equity.
- **Special Opportunities.** Support efforts that offer a one-time opportunity to contribute to the resolution of a significant domestic or global concern.
GRANT ACTIVITY:
$9,439,296 / 65 GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSERVATION OF FRESHWATER ECOSYSTEMS</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Environmental Community</td>
<td>$ 2.095</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policies</td>
<td>$ 1.200</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNATIONAL FINANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY</th>
<th>GRANT DOLLARS (in millions)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future</td>
<td>$ 2.740</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Regional Development and Integration</td>
<td>$ 2.270</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$ .039</td>
<td>–</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>Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan</td>
<td>$ .500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$ .595</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystems

**Strengthening the Environmental Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for the Great Lakes</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes water program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint River Watershed Coalition</td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater Future</td>
<td>Petoskey, MI</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy</td>
<td>Traverse City, MI</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart of the Lakes Center for Land Conservation Policy</td>
<td>Grand Ledge, MI</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust Alliance</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Strengthening land trusts and promoting collaboration to conserve freshwater ecosystems in Great Lakes basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Environmental Partnership</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Northeast Minnesota program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Reston, VA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Healing Our Waters – Great Lakes Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Environmental Council</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes ecosystem project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Alliance of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Network</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Building citizen capacity for freshwater protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Rivers Alliance</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Alabama water-management project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Rivers</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>Ensuring healthy river flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattahoochee Riverkeeper</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Georgia water policy project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia River Network</td>
<td>Athens, GA</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Protecting healthy river flows for Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Covington, GA</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Georgia comprehensive statewide water management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Commission</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>19 mos.</td>
<td>Eco-separation of Chicago-area waterway system to prevent Asian carp invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Environmental Law Center</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Water quality project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Environmental Advocates</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Water quantity protection and conservation project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Minnesota sulfide ore-mining project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Reston, VA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes water quality project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Implementation of Great Lakes Compact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $2,095,000

**Program Area Total:** $3,295,000

### 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>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Bretton Woods project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Information Center</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Declaration (Erklarung von Bern)</td>
<td>Zurich, Switzerland</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Sustainable financial relations project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERN</td>
<td>Moreton-in-Marsh, England</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>European Union campaign to reform export credit agencies and international financial flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Peoples Programme</td>
<td>Moreton-in-Marsh, England</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Promoting forest peoples’ interests in international forest policy making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Works</td>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Advancing and protecting sustainability standards in development finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Policy Studies</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Global finance for climate sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on ADB</td>
<td>Quezon City, Philippines</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Change International</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>International program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATFORM</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Reforming energy investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re:Common</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Global finance for climate sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa Development Fund</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>BASIC South Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tufts University
Medford, MA
$90,000 – 24 mos.
China in Latin America: environmental and developmental dimensions

Urgewald
Sassenberg, Germany
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Promoting environmental and social standards in financial sector

Subtotal: $2,740,000
Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future

Sustainable Regional Development and Integration
Center for Socio-Environmental Support
Cunha, Brazil
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales
Lima, Peru
$100,000 – 30 mos.
Accountability for integration and infrastructure investments in Peru

Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Lima, Peru
$250,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Eco – Ecology and Action
Campo Grande, Brazil
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring environmental impacts of financial flows for infrastructure and energy in South America

Friends of the Earth – Brazilian Amazonia
São Paulo, Brazil
$35,000 – 24 mos.
Holding Amazon megaprojects to account

Fundación Ambiental y Recursos Naturales
Buenos Aires, Argentina
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Monitoring infrastructure investments in Argentina

Indian Law Resource Center
Helena, MT
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Integration investments and indigenous peoples in South America

Instituto Latinoamericano para una Sociedad y un Derecho Alternativos
Bogotá, Colombia
$160,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening civil society engagement in regional integration and infrastructure investments in Colombia

Instituto Socioambiental
São Paulo, Brazil
$175,000 – 24 mos.
Investment impacts of Brazilian National Development Bank on regional sustainability

Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense
San Francisco, CA
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Promoting sustainability in energy and infrastructure investments in Latin America

National Alliance of Latin American & Caribbean Communities
Chicago, IL
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Building Latino immigrant capacity on regional integration

Subtotal: $2,270,000
Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

Special Opportunities
Foundation-Administered Project
$39,207
International finance for sustainability convenings

Subtotal: $39,207
Special Opportunities

Program Area Total: $5,049,207
International Finance for Sustainability

Special Initiatives
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan
Disability Advocates of Kent County
Grand Rapids, MI
$80,000 – 24 mos.
Model transportation project

Ecology Center
Ann Arbor, MI
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Model transit project

Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
Coral Gables, FL
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

MI*Voice
Detroit, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Constituency building and outreach on land use and equitable development

Michigan Environmental Council
Lansing, MI
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Michigan transportation reform partnership

Michigan Suburbs Alliance
Ferndale, MI
$35,000 – 12 mos.
Transportation reform

Subtotal: $500,000
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan

Special Opportunities
Alliance for Economic Success
Manistee, MI
$65,000 – 18 mos.
Collaborative master plan and implementation strategy

Bay Area Community Foundation
Bay City, MI
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Saginaw Bay watershed initiative network

Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
San Francisco, CA
$40,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Environmental Grantmakers Association
New York, NY
$30,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation-Administered Project
$60,089
Coordinating and networking Great Lakes grantmakers and partner organizations

Nature Conservancy
Arlington, VA
$250,000 – 36 mos.
Saginaw Bay initiative

Subtotal: $595,089
Special Opportunities

Program Area Total: $1,095,089
Special Initiatives

Program Total: $9,439,296
Environment
Program Overview: **Flint Area**

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

### 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/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Arts and Culture.** Strong, sustainable and vibrant local cultural organizations that provide diverse arts and cultural opportunities to all residents of Genesee County.
- **Education.** A continuum of high-quality learning opportunities that meets the needs of Flint-area children, youth and adults from pre-kindergarten through college.

### ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION

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

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Economic Development.** A vibrant and diverse regional economy.
- **Workforce Development.** Quality employment opportunities for Flint-area residents who face multiple barriers to good jobs in the regional labor market.

### STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY

**Goal:** To support programs that provide opportunities for children and families, improve neighborhoods and the community, and sustain a vibrant nonprofit sector.

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Children and Families.** Healthy and productive lives for Genesee County children and families.
- **Housing and Neighborhoods.** Affordable housing and livable neighborhoods, with an emphasis on the city of Flint.
- **Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector.** A strong, local nonprofit sector capable of meeting community needs.

### SPECIAL INITIATIVES

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

**OBJECTIVE/WHAT WE SEEK:**

- **Special Initiatives.** Flexibility to respond to critical needs, seize special opportunities, leverage other resources and incubate new program areas in the Flint community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grant Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts, Culture and Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>$4,642</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$10,352</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Revitalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$5,945</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>$0.299</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>$2,121</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td>$3,123</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>$1,165</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Initiatives</td>
<td>$3,911</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$31,556</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Arts, Culture and Education

#### Arts and Culture

- **Community Foundation of Greater Flint**  
  Flint, MI  
  $50,000 – 12 mos.  
  S. Jean Simi Fund for the Arts

- **Flint Cultural Center Corporation**  
  Flint, MI  
  $1,550,000 – 12 mos.  
  Operating support

- **Flint Institute of Arts**  
  Flint, MI  
  $1,549,924 – 12 mos.  
  Operating support

- **Flint Institute of Music**  
  Flint, MI  
  $50,000 – 6 mos.  
  Music in the Parks

- **Sphinx Organization**  
  Detroit, MI  
  $100,000 – 12 mos.  
  Overture program and partnership with Flint Institute of Music

#### Genesee County

- **Genesee Area Focus Fund**  
  Flint, MI  
  $20,000 – 10 mos.  
  Back to the Bricks/Bikes on the Bricks

- **Genesee Early College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $125,000 – 12 mos.  
  Flint STRIVE replication program

- **Genesee Intermediate School District**  
  Flint, MI  
  $100,000 – 12 mos.  
  Genesee Early College

- **Kettering University**  
  Flint, MI  
  $13,000 – 12 mos.  
  FIRST robotics team

- **Mott Community College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $50,000 – 12 mos.  
  Young Scientists

- **Flint Regional Science Fair**  
  Flint, MI  
  $45,000 – 36 mos.  
  General purposes

- **Genesee Area Focus Fund**  
  Flint, MI  
  $2,900,000 – 12 mos.  
  YouthQuest afterschool initiative

- **Genesee Intermediate School District**  
  Flint, MI  
  $100,000 – 10 mos.  
  Genesee Early College

- **Kettering University**  
  Flint, MI  
  $13,000 – 12 mos.  
  FIRST robotics team

- **Mott Community College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $149,803 – 12 mos.  
  Smart Teachers as Role models (STAR) initiative

- **PW Empowerment Group Inc.**  
  Flint, MI  
  $13,500 – 12 mos.  
  Champions suspension program

#### Subtotal:  
**Arts and Culture**  
$4,641,974

### Economic Revitalization

#### Education

- **Central Michigan University**  
  Mt. Pleasant, MI  
  $115,000 – 12 mos.  
  GEAR UP college day program

- **Cranbrook Educational Community**  
  Bloomfield Hills, MI  
  $200,000 – 12 mos.  
  Flint Community Schools young scientists

- **EduGuide**  
  Lansing, MI  
  $131,000 – 12 mos.  
  GEAR UP Michigan project

- **Flint Community Schools**  
  Flint, MI  
  $50,000 – 6 mos.  
  Organizational review

- **Flint Regional Science Fair**  
  Flint, MI  
  $45,000 – 36 mos.  
  General purposes

- **Genesee Area Focus Fund**  
  Flint, MI  
  $2,900,000 – 12 mos.  
  YouthQuest afterschool initiative

- **Genesee Intermediate School District**  
  Flint, MI  
  $100,000 – 10 mos.  
  Genesee Early College

- **Kettering University**  
  Flint, MI  
  $13,000 – 12 mos.  
  FIRST robotics team

- **Mott Community College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $149,803 – 12 mos.  
  Smart Teachers as Role models (STAR) initiative

- **Genesee Area Focus Fund**  
  Flint, MI  
  $20,000 – 10 mos.  
  Back to the Bricks/Bikes on the Bricks

- **Genesee Early College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $125,000 – 12 mos.  
  Flint STRIVE replication program

- **Genesee Intermediate School District**  
  Flint, MI  
  $100,000 – 12 mos.  
  Genesee Early College

- **Kettering University**  
  Flint, MI  
  $13,000 – 12 mos.  
  FIRST robotics team

- **Mott Community College**  
  Flint, MI  
  $149,803 – 12 mos.  
  Smart Teachers as Role models (STAR) initiative

#### Subtotal:  
**Arts, Culture and Education**  
$14,992,017

### Workforce Development

#### Flint Area Specialized Employment Services Inc.

- **Flint, MI**  
  $150,000 – 12 mos.  
  Flint STRIVE replication program

- **Foundation-Administered Project**  
  **Flint, MI**  
  $23,520  
  Cluster-based innovation strategy development

#### Greater Flint Health Coalition

- **Flint, MI**  
  $125,000 – 12 mos.  
  Flint health-care employment opportunities project

#### Subtotal:  
**Workforce Development**  
$298,520

#### Program Area Total:  
$6,243,966

### Strengthening Community

#### Children and Families

- **American Arab Heritage Council**  
  Flint, MI  
  $45,000 – 12 mos.  
  Immigration services

- **Boy Scouts of America – Tall Pine Council**  
  Flint, MI  
  $50,000 – 12 mos.  
  General purposes

- **Boys & Girls Club of Greater Flint**  
  Flint, MI  
  $164,139 – 12 mos.  
  General purposes

- **Catholic Charities of Shiawassee and Genesee Counties**  
  **Flint, MI**  
  $45,000 – 5 mos.  
  Holy Angels warming center

- **Catholic Outreach**  
  **Flint, MI**  
  $120,000 – 12 mos.  
  Medical transportation program

#### Fair Food Network

- **Ann Arbor, MI**  
  $120,000 – 12 mos.  
  Double Up Food Bucks project

#### Flint Area Specialized Employment Services Inc.

- **Flint, MI**  
  $81,450 – 12 mos.  
  Flint STRIVE Academy youth empowerment program

#### Food Bank of Eastern Michigan

- **Flint, MI**  
  $125,000 – 6 mos.  
  Increasing food distribution and access

- **Genesee Area Focus Fund**  
  **Flint, MI**  
  $825,000 – 12 mos.  
  Summer youth initiative

- **Genesee County Department of Human Services**  
  **Flint, MI**  
  $15,000 – 12 mos.  
  Middle school family resource centers

#### Subtotal:  
**Economic Revitalization**  
$6,243,966

---

48  
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Mott Community College  
Flint, MI  
$50,000 – 7 mos.  
Teen CEO initiative

Resource Genesee  
Flint, MI  
$60,000 – 12 mos.  
One Stop Housing Resource Center

Salvation Army of Genesee County  
Flint, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Rent and utility assistance program

Shelter of Flint Inc.  
Flint, MI  
$70,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

YWCA of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Nina’s Place

Subtotal:  
$2,120,589

Children and Families

Housing and Neighborhoods

Carriage Town Ministries  
Flint, MI  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
University Square project

Center for Community Progress  
Flint, MI  
$2,360,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

City of Flint  
Flint, MI  
$263,804 – 14 mos.  
Master plan for sustainable Flint

Genesee County Land Bank Authority  
Flint, MI  
$238,999 – 12 mos.  
Neighborhood and community planning

Metro Community Development  
Flint, MI  
$135,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Salem Housing Community  
Development Corporation  
Flint, MI  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal:  
$3,122,803

Housing and Neighborhoods

Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector

Association of Black  
Foundation Executives  
New York, NY  
$70,000 – 12 mos.  
Connecting leaders fellowship program

Community Foundation of Greater Flint  
Flint, MI  
$88,400 – 20 mos.  
National service fund

Crim Fitness Foundation  
Flint, MI  
$320,000 – 12 mos.  
Capacity building

Foundation-Administered Projects  
$4,950  
Technical assistance

$253,370  
Technical assistance and technology upgrades

United Way of Genesee County  
Flint, MI  
$138,750 – 6 mos.  
Building Excellence, Sustainability and Trust nonprofit capacity building

$250,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

$40,000 – 22 mos.  
Transition support

Subtotal:  
$1,165,470

Philanthropy/Nonprofit Sector

Program Area Total:  
$6,408,862

Strengthening Community

Special Initiatives

City of Flint  
Flint, MI  
$57,000 – 6 mos.  
City of Flint fiscal technical assistance

$1,485,520 – 12 mos.  
Flint 21st century community policing

Detroit Symphony Orchestra  
Detroit, MI  
$5,000 – 6 mos.  
Heroes gala honoring Lloyd Reuss

Flint Area Congregations Together  
Flint, MI  
$190,000 – 24 mos.  
Education and youth organizing project

$110,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Flint Downtown Development Authority  
Flint, MI  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Downtown festivals

Genesee County Parks & Recreation Commission  
Flint, MI  
$1,551,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Legal Services of Eastern Michigan  
Flint, MI  
$90,000  
Adjustment to previous grant

Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI  
$350,000 – 12 mos.  
Flint 21st century community policing technical assistance

Mount Hermon Missionary Baptist Church  
Flint, MI  
$2,500 – 6 mos.  
African-American history calendar

Subtotal:  
$3,911,020

Special Initiatives

Program Area Total:  
$3,911,020

Special Initiatives

Program Total:  
$31,555,865

Flint Area
Program Overview: **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/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Community-Driven Reform.** Effective community-driven reform strategies that increase student achievement across entire school districts and at the state or regional level.
- **Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth.** Policies and practices that ensure that vulnerable youth are prepared for college and careers.
- **Learning Beyond the Classroom.** High-quality learning beyond the classroom initiatives that increase student success by providing students with multiple ways of learning, anchored to high standards and aligned with educational resources throughout a community.

### EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

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

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Income Security.** A social safety net that augments families’ efforts to escape poverty.
- **Reducing Barriers to Employment.** Innovative strategies that enable low-skill, low-income job seekers to enter the labor market.
- **Retention and Wage Progression.** Workforce development policies and practices that help low-income workers stay in the labor market and increase their earnings over time.

### BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES

**Goal:** To enhance the power and effectiveness of the community-organizing field in order to strengthen and sustain the involvement of low-income communities in shaping their futures.

**OBJECTIVE/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Building Community Organizing Infrastructure.** Strong and effective community-organizing networks at the national, regional and state levels that foster community engagement and positive change in poor communities.

### SPECIAL INITIATIVES

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

**OBJECTIVES/WHAT WE SEEK:**
- **Transitions.** Policies and practices that strengthen microenterprise in the U.S. in order to maximize its potential as a means for low-income entrepreneurs to escape from poverty.
- **Exploratory and Special Projects.** Flexibility to identify critical issues, seize special opportunities, research issues to determine future program directions and promote cross-cutting projects.
### GRANT ACTIVITY:
$28,152,551 / 147 GRANTS

![Chart showing grant activity]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grant Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVING COMMUNITY EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Driven Reform</td>
<td>$0.155</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth</td>
<td>$2.386</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Beyond the Classroom</td>
<td>$9.519</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Security</td>
<td>$2.986</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Barriers to Employment</td>
<td>$0.776</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Wage Progression</td>
<td>$4.763</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Community Organizing Infrastructure</td>
<td>$4.876</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL INITIATIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>$1.207</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory and Special Projects</td>
<td>$1.485</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$28.153</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving Community Education

Community-Driven Reform

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Collaborative for education organizing

Institute for Wisconsin’s Future
Glendale, WI
$55,000 – 12 mos.
Opportunity to learn – Midwest

PICO National Network
Oakland, CA
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Louisiana Interfaith Together

Subtotal: $155,000

Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Career Alliance Inc.
Flint, MI
$30,000 – 12 mos.
Jobs for America’s graduates

Center for Law and Social Policy
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Reconnecting the disconnected: building systems to reconnect youth to education and jobs

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 12 mos.
Youth Transitions Funders Group

Editorial Projects in Education
Bethesda, MD
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Diplomas Count: the graduation project

Kalamazoo Community Foundation
Kalamazoo, MI
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Improving outcomes for out-of-school youth in Michigan

Lansing Community College
Lansing, MI
$150,000 – 18 mos.
High school diploma completion initiative

Michigan’s Children
Lansing, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Improving outcomes for out-of-school youth in Michigan

National League of Cities Institute
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Municipal leadership for disconnected youth

Pew Charitable Trusts
Philadelphia, PA
$75,000 – 12 mos.
Building new workforce and community college pathways in dental industry

Resource Genesee
Flint, MI
$95,000 – 12 mos.
Genesee County out-of-school youth initiative

Rutgers University Foundation
New Brunswick, NJ
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Developing and sustaining pre-college bridge programs

San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA
$150,000 – 18 mos.
Building green energy and technology pathways

School & Main Institute
Boston, MA
$225,000 – 12 mos.
Schools for the Future: developing new high school pathways and innovations for at-risk and struggling students

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, GA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Policy strategies and actions addressing needs of high school dropouts in the South

University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$415,700 – 12 mos.
Pre-college summer residential and academic year bridge program

Youth Connection Charter School
Chicago, IL
$125,000 – 12 mos.
Career pathways program

YouthBuild USA
Somerville, MA
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Developing sector strategies to position low-income youth for careers in high-demand sectors

Subtotal: $2,385,700

Learning Beyond the Classroom

Academy for Educational Development
Washington, DC
-$50,000
Adjustment to previous grant

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

After-School All-Stars
Los Angeles, CA
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

After-School Corporation
New York, NY
$50,000 – 4 mos.
International conference on education

Alliance for Excellent Education
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Digital learning in afterschool

American Institutes for Research
Washington, DC
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Exploring statewide data systems for 21st century community learning centers

Arizona Center for Afterschool Excellence
Phoenix, AZ
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Arizona statewide afterschool network

Asia Society
New York, NY
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Promising practices in afterschool: global literacy

Auburn University
Auburn, AL
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Alabama statewide afterschool network

Champlain Valley Educator Development Center
Colchester, VT
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Vermont statewide afterschool network

Child Development for Kids Inc.
Medford, MA
$225,000 – 18 mos.
Increasing literacy proficiency for Hispanic dual-language learners

Chrysalis Foundation
Des Moines, IA
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Iowa statewide afterschool network

Collaborative Communications Group
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 9 mos.
Afterschool communications project

Colgate University
Hamilton, NY
$500,000 – 24 mos.
Supporting national network of statewide afterschool networks

College of Charleston Foundation
Charleston, SC
$300,000 – 48 mos.
Afterschool and community learning network

Communities Foundation of Oklahoma
Oklahoma City, OK
$150,000 – 27 mos.
Oklahoma statewide afterschool network

Connecticut After School Network
Branford, CT
$225,000 – 36 mos.
Connecticut statewide afterschool network

Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 18 mos.
Building state capacity and supporting statewide afterschool networks

Eastern Michigan University Foundation
Ypsilanti, MI
$225,000 – 12 mos.
John W. Porter Distinguished Chair in Urban Education endowment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Project</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$350,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Funding strategies for statewide afterschool networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Project</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>$79,206</td>
<td>Afterschool technical assistance collaborative and statewide afterschool networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmakers for Education</td>
<td>Richmond, CA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Policy and messaging strategies for afterschool networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrameWorks Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$100,000 – 23 mos.</td>
<td>Communicating about expanded learning time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Coalition for community schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Afterschool Partnership</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Massachusetts statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean Hospital</td>
<td>Belmont, MA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 15 mos.</td>
<td>Increasing science, technology, engineering and math in afterschool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of State Legislatures</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>$400,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Informing state legislatures: statewide afterschool policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of La Raza</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Latino family engagement and best practices in afterschool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National League of Cities Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$350,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>City leaders engaged in afterschool reform and New Day for Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Summer Learning Association</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Building support for summer learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Child Care Resource &amp; Referral Association</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Ohio statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>~$150,000</td>
<td>Adjustment to previous grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence After School Alliance</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>$75,000 – 7 mos.</td>
<td>Providence New Day for Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco School Alliance</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$75,000 – 8 mos.</td>
<td>San Francisco New Day for Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Voices for Children</td>
<td>Sioux Falls, SD</td>
<td>$150,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>South Dakota statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy Enterprises Inc.</td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD</td>
<td>$200,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>21st Century Community Learning Centers summer institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California–Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>$60,000 – 82 mos.</td>
<td>Impact of program and practice characteristics on participant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Afterschool Network</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Utah statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University Research Corporation</td>
<td>Morgantown, WV</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>West Virginia statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean Hospital</td>
<td>Belmont, MA</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Learning Beyond the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California–Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>$60,000 – 82 mos.</td>
<td>Improving Community Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Afterschool Network</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>$225,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>Utah statewide afterschool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,519,206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,059,906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expanding Economic Opportunity

**Income Security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arise Citizens’ Policy Project</td>
<td>Montgomery, AL</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>Waltham, MA</td>
<td>$352,357 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Assets learning project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Budget Project</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center on Budget and Policy Priorities</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative – D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Economic Development Association of Michigan</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Michigan communities for financial empowerment network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Asset Resource Network Inc.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$360,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Kindergarten to college evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Policy Institute</td>
<td>Latham, NY</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,354</td>
<td>Asset-building capacity-building meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Enterprise Corporation</td>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Association of United Ways</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$100,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Michigan benefits access initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan League for Public Policy</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Justice Center</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>State fiscal analysis initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas Center for Research Inc.</td>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Assets and education initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$235,836 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>Examining role of emergency savings for family financial security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$300,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Expanding child development accounts for educational success and lifelong asset building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,986,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reducing Barriers to Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Association of Michigan</td>
<td>Pentwater, MI</td>
<td>$125,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan Inc.  
Flint, MI  
$125,628 – 12 mos.  
Mid-Michigan GoodTemp alternative staffing organization

Goodwill Industries of West Michigan  
Muskegon, MI  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
GoodTemps

Heartland Alliance for Human Needs & Human Rights  
Chicago, IL  
$87,000 – 12 mos.  
National transitional jobs network

ICA Group  
Brookline, MA  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
Alternative staffing alliance

Southwest Center for Economic Integrity  
Tucson, AZ  
$138,600 – 12 mos.  
Gulf Coast alternative staffing project

Subtotal: $776,228

Retaining and Wage Progression

American Association of Community Colleges  
Washington, DC  
$742,500 – 14 mos.  
Creating commercialization opportunity at community colleges

Aspen Institute  
Washington, DC  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Low-wage work: what can we do to improve job quality

Bipartisan Policy Center  
Washington, DC  
$130,000 – 9 mos.  
National workforce commission creation and feasibility study

Career Alliance Inc.  
Flint, MI  
$500,000 – 15 mos.  
Flint/Genesee Earn & Learn Initiative

Corporation for a Skilled Workforce  
Ann Arbor, MI  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Building capacity of Michigan’s workforce system

County of Saginaw  
Saginaw, MI  
$300,000 – 14 mos.  
Saginaw Earn & Learn Initiative

Economic Mobility Corporation  
New York, NY  
$50,000 – 19 mos.  
General purposes

Focus: HOPE  
Detroit, MI  
$750,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Insight Center for Community Economic Development  
Oakland, CA  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
Planning a southern sector initiative

Interfaith Education Fund  
Austin, TX  
$225,000 – 12 mos.  
Replicate sectoral initiatives

Jobs for the Future  
Boston, MA  
$175,000 – 12 mos.  
Expanding access and success for low-skilled adults

Per Scholars  
Bronx, NY  
$40,000 – 12 mos.  
National expansion initiative

PHI  
Bronx, NY  
$300,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Project QUEST Inc.  
San Antonio, TX  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal: $4,762,500

Program Area Total: $8,524,753

Building Organized Communities

Building Community Organizing Infrastructure

Alliance for Justice  
Washington, DC  
$52,400 – 12 mos.  
Resources for evaluating community organizing

Bend the Arc: A Jewish Partnership for Justice  
New York, NY  
$90,000 – 12 mos.  
Organizing apprenticeship program

Center for Community Change  
Washington, DC  
$340,000 – 24 mos.  
Building field of community organizing

Community Catalyst  
Boston, MA  
$120,000 – 12 mos.  
Community learning partnership

Community Training and Assistance Center  
Boston, MA  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

Community Voices Heard  
New York, NY  
$40,000 – 12 mos.  
New York statewide organizing

Direct Action and Research Training Center  
Miami, FL  
$15,000 – 24 mos.  
DART organizers institute

Education Trust Inc.  
Washington, DC  
$87,000 – 24 mos.  
Education Trust – Midwest

Foundation-Administered Project  
$31,492

Gamaliel Foundation  
Chicago, IL  
$25,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Harriet Tubman Center for Recruitment and Development of Organizers  
Detroit, MI  
$190,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Institute for Wisconsin’s Future  
Glendale, WI  
$120,000 – 24 mos.  
Implementing demos public works project

Interfaith Education Fund  
Austin, TX  
$415,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

InterValley Project  
West Newton, MA  
$220,000 – 24 mos.  
Capacity building for InterValley network

Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement  
Des Moines, IA  
$180,000 – 24 mos.  
Capacity building and expansion

Isahiah Institute  
New Orleans, LA  
$110,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

National Council of La Raza  
Washington, DC  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

National Employment Law Project  
New York, NY  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

National Housing Institute  
Montclair, NJ  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Research and writing on organizing and housing

National People’s Action  
Chicago, IL  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

National People’s Action  
Chicago, IL  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities
Neighborhood Funders Group  
*Washington, DC*  
$50,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Parent/Teacher Home Visit Project  
*Sacramento, CA*  
$140,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

PICO National Network  
*Oakland, CA*  
$360,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Southern Echo Inc.  
*Jackson, MS*  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Intermediary support for organizing communities

Virginia Organizing Inc.  
*Charlottesville, VA*  
$220,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal:  
$4,875,892  
Building Community  
Organizing Infrastructure

Program Area Total:  
$4,875,892  
Building Organized Communities

Special Initiatives

Transitions

Aspen Institute  
*Washington, DC*  
$300,000 – 13 mos.  
Demonstrating scale in domestic microenterprise

Prima Civitas Foundation  
*East Lansing, MI*  
$850,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Public/Private Ventures  
*Philadelphia, PA*  
$150,000 – 16 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal:  
$1,485,000  
Exploratory and Special Projects

Program Area Total:  
$2,692,000  
Special Initiatives

Program Total:  
$28,152,551  
Pathways Out of Poverty

Exploratory and Special Projects

Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action  
*New York, NY*  
$75,000 – 9 mos.  
Special edition on poverty

Grove Consultants International  
*San Francisco, CA*  
$210,000 – 19 mos.  
Illustrated guide to poverty in 21st century America

Harlem Children’s Zone  
*New York, NY*  
$200,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

Subtotal:  
$1,207,000  
Transitions
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.)*

**Special Projects**

- **Alliance of Religions and Conservation**
  Manchester, England
  $300,000 – 36 mos.
  Wildlife trade program

- **Drug Free America Foundation Inc.**
  St. Petersburg, FL
  $100,000 – 12 mos.
  Drug awareness educational campaign

- **Institute for Global Ethics**
  Rockport, ME
  $200,000 – 7 mos.
  Transition support

- **Journalism That Matters**
  Bellevue, WA
  $90,000 – 36 mos.
  Engaging stories that build communities: the new journalism illumination project

- **Vital Voices Global Partnership**
  Washington, DC
  $25,000 – 6 mos.
  Global leadership awards

- **William J. Clinton Foundation**
  New York, NY
  $20,000 – 12 mos.
  Clinton Global Initiative

**Program Area Total:** $735,000

**Special Projects**

**Program Total:** $735,000

**Exploratory and Special Projects**

**GRANT ACTIVITY:**

$735,000 / 7 GRANTS

---

**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.

**Employee/Trustee Matching and Trustee-Initiated**

**Employee/Trustee Matching Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area Total:</th>
<th>$1,340,760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee/Trustee Matching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trustee-Initiated Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area Total:</th>
<th>$876,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustee-Initiated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Total:</th>
<th>$2,216,760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Trustee Matching and Trustee-Initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $91,031,132
Finance
**GRANTMAKING ACTIVITIES**

**TOTAL: 439 GRANTS**
Does not include Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants

- **Pathways Out of Poverty** 147 Grants 33.5%
- **Civil Society** 143 Grants 32.6%
- **Flint Area** 77 Grants 17.5%
- **Environment** 65 Grants 14.8%
- **Exploratory & Special Projects** 7 Grants 1.6%

**TOTAL: $91,031,132**

- **Pathways Out of Poverty** $28.2 / 30.9%
- **Environment** $9.4 / 10.4%
- **Civil Society** $18.9 / 20.8%
- **Flint Area** $31.6 / 34.7%
- **Exploratory & Special Projects** $0.7 / 0.8%
- **Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants** $2.2 / 2.4%

**ASSET ALLOCATION 12.31.12**

**TOTAL: $2,301,140,574**

- **Total Growth Assets** $1,162.7 / 50.5%
- **Total Inflation-Protection Assets** $495.7 / 21.6%
- **Total Risk-Reduction Assets** $631.3 / 27.4%
- **Total Other Assets** $11.4 / 0.5%
PROFILE: 10-YEAR STATISTICS

2003–2012 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 – Fair Value</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>
<td>$2,079.9</td>
<td>$2,227.4</td>
<td>$2,159.9</td>
<td>$2,301.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets – 2012 Dollars</td>
<td>2,956.6</td>
<td>3,046.1</td>
<td>2,890.2</td>
<td>2,987.9</td>
<td>2,964.0</td>
<td>2,107.7</td>
<td>2,211.4</td>
<td>2,333.3</td>
<td>2,197.5</td>
<td>2,301.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–Month Rolling Average Assets</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>
<td>1,916.0</td>
<td>2,063.4</td>
<td>2,227.7</td>
<td>2,246.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss)</td>
<td>477.3</td>
<td>287.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>290.5</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>(684.6)</td>
<td>289.3</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>252.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Income (Loss) 2012 Dollars</td>
<td>594.6</td>
<td>347.3</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>330.5</td>
<td>267.8</td>
<td>(747.7)</td>
<td>307.6</td>
<td>288.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>252.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants Awarded</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>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures*</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>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>110.9</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.

2003–2012 Grants Awarded by Program (in millions)
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the “Foundation”), which comprise the statements of financial position as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements.

Management’s responsibility for the financial statements
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor’s responsibility
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. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the Foundation’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design 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. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion
In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, and the results of its activities and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Southfield, Michigan
June 24, 2013
## Statements of Financial Position

### Years Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</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>Public equities</td>
<td>$ 481,980,259</td>
<td>$ 478,281,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>46,558,308</td>
<td>43,510,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>135,174,976</td>
<td>153,220,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
<td>962,626,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>468,890,658</td>
<td>467,729,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
<td>19,314,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>58,160,123</td>
<td>21,571,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,289,779,153</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,146,254,813</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>4,061,550</td>
<td>4,272,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>1,697,831</td>
<td>3,247,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and improvements, net</td>
<td>3,591,587</td>
<td>3,875,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>2,010,453</td>
<td>2,208,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,301,140,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,159,860,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>$ 21,257,356</td>
<td>$ 19,217,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>28,027,909</td>
<td>27,236,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>6,942,779</td>
<td>4,137,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,228,044</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,592,341</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,244,912,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,109,267,849</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,301,140,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,159,860,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
Statements of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>$24,941,430</td>
<td>$25,972,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnership income</td>
<td>53,794,462</td>
<td>23,376,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain on investments</td>
<td>26,768,462</td>
<td>74,331,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>148,121,029</td>
<td>(63,807,684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (expense)</td>
<td>(926,163)</td>
<td>2,904,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income:</strong></td>
<td>252,699,220</td>
<td>62,777,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct investment expenses</td>
<td>5,580,611</td>
<td>5,029,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for excise tax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2,039,409</td>
<td>1,205,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred expense (income)</td>
<td>2,804,788</td>
<td>(1,110,881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment expenses:</strong></td>
<td>10,424,808</td>
<td>5,124,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net investment income</strong></td>
<td>242,274,412</td>
<td>57,653,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>86,951,982</td>
<td>88,273,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation–administered projects</td>
<td>1,274,574</td>
<td>1,086,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses</td>
<td>15,674,217</td>
<td>15,244,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants and operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td>103,900,773</td>
<td>104,604,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating income (loss):</strong></td>
<td>138,373,639</td>
<td>(46,951,074)</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>(1,035,288)</td>
<td>(7,025,326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postretirement health-care related changes other than net periodic benefit cost</td>
<td>(1,693,670)</td>
<td>(1,032,762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in unrestricted net assets:</strong></td>
<td>135,644,681</td>
<td>(55,009,162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted net assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year</td>
<td>2,109,267,849</td>
<td>2,164,277,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year</td>
<td>$2,244,912,530</td>
<td>$2,109,267,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
## Statements of Cash Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years Ended December 31,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from operating activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$ 135,644,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile change in unrestricted net assets to cash used by operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized (gain) loss on investments</td>
<td>(26,768,462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Income) loss on limited partnerships</td>
<td>(53,794,462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized (gain) loss on investments</td>
<td>(148,121,029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess value of donated securities included with grants</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation expense</td>
<td>292,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>1,550,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in other assets</td>
<td>198,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in grants payable</td>
<td>2,039,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>791,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>2,804,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adjustments</td>
<td>(221,006,693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used by operating activities</td>
<td>(85,362,012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sales or redemptions of investments</td>
<td>447,153,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of investments</td>
<td>(361,994,096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of building improvements</td>
<td>(8,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided by investing activities</td>
<td>85,151,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase (decrease) in cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, beginning of year</td>
<td>4,272,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, end of year</td>
<td>$ 4,061,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental disclosure of noncash investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable (payable) at year end, included with sales/proceeds on investments</td>
<td>$ 5,919,702</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 Mott 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.

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.

INCOME TAXES
The Foundation follows the authoritative guidance on accounting for and disclosure of uncertainty in tax positions (Financial Accounting Standards Board [FASB] — Accounting Standards Codification 740), which requires the Foundation to determine whether a tax position is more likely than not to be sustained upon examination, including resolution of any related appeals or litigation processes, based on the technical merits of the position.

The Foundation has received a favorable determination letter from the Internal Revenue Service stating that it is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in Sections 501(c)(3). However, unrelated business income is subject to taxation. There was no such tax liability in 2012 or 2011.

RECENT ACCOUNTING PRONOUNCEMENTS
In January 2010, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update No. 2010-6, “Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures (Topic 820) — Improving Disclosures about Fair Value Measurements” (ASU 2010-06). ASU 2010-06 clarified existing disclosure requirements and required (a) an entity to disclose separately the amounts of significant transfers in and out of Levels 1 and 2 fair value measurements and to describe the reasons for those transfers; (b) an entity to disclose all transfers in and out of Level 3 and the reasons for those transfers; and (c) information about purchases, sales, issuances and settlements to be presented separately (i.e., present the activity on a gross basis rather than net) in the reconciliation for fair value measurements using significant unobservable inputs (Level 3 inputs). The new disclosures and clarifications of existing disclosures were effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2009, except for the disclosure requirements related to the purchases, sales, issuances and settlements in the roll-forward activity of Level 3 fair value measurements, which were effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2010. The Foundation fully adopted the guidance as of January 1, 2011. Adoption of this guidance did not have an impact on the fair value determination of applicable investments; however, it did require additional disclosures. See Note C — Investment Securities and Note D — Fair Value Measurements for the additional disclosures related to the amended guidance.

In May 2011, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update No. 2011-04, “Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures (Topic 820) — Amendments to Achieve Common Fair Value Measurement and Disclosure Requirements in U.S. GAAP and IFRS’s” (ASU 2011-04). ASU 2011-04 clarifies the application of existing fair value measurement requirements, changes certain principles related to measuring fair value and requires additional disclosure about fair value measurements. Specifically, the guidance specifies that the concepts of highest and best use and valuation premises in a fair value measurement are only relevant when measuring the fair value of nonfinancial assets, whereas they are not relevant when measuring the fair value of financial assets and liabilities. Required disclosures are expanded under the new guidance, especially for fair value measurements that are categorized within Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy, for which quantitative information about the unobservable inputs used and a narrative description of the valuation of the
investment portfolio (see Note D) and the immateriality of the Foundation’s nonfinancial assets in regard to the “highest and best use” premise for nonfinancial assets.

**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.

**CONCENTRATION OF CREDIT RISK**

The Foundation maintains certain cash accounts, the balances of which, at times, may exceed federally insured limits. The Foundation has not experienced any losses in such accounts. Management believes the Foundation is not exposed to any significant credit risk on cash.

**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 six to 50 years.

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></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and improvements</td>
<td>9,368,035</td>
<td>9,382,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(6,174,300)</td>
<td>(5,904,897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,591,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,875,947</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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 17.9 percent investment in United States Sugar Corporation (USSC), a non-publicly 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, 2012, the Foundation has $383 million in outstanding limited partnership commitments, including both domestic and international partnerships.
Temporary 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.

**FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES**

The costs of operating the Foundation have been allocated among program-related, communications and administrative expenses (all of which are included with administration expenses on the Statement of Activities). Program-related expenses pertain principally to the direct programmatic grantmaking functions of the Foundation, such as reviewing proposals and awarding, monitoring and evaluating grants, whereas communications expenses include activities directly related to the Foundation’s external communications efforts. Administrative expenses include all other non-program and non-communications related operating expenses of the Foundation.

**RECLASSIFICATIONS**

Certain amounts in the 2011 statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2012 presentation.

**C. Investment Securities**

The following is a summary of cost and approximate fair values of the investment securities held at December 31 (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Value</td>
<td>Cost Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>$ 481,980</td>
<td>$ 409,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>46,558</td>
<td>40,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>135,175</td>
<td>120,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Partnerships</td>
<td>1,092,986</td>
<td>907,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partnerships</td>
<td>468,891</td>
<td>377,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>6,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>58,160</td>
<td>58,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,289,779</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,919,623</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments valued at Net Asset Value (NAV) as of December 31, 2012, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$ 396,492,743</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
<td>383,000,000</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments at NAV</td>
<td>$ 1,489,478,719</td>
<td>$ 383,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) This category includes investments in real estate funds, hedge funds and international equity. The NAV of the real estate funds are as provided by the fund and determined using the fair value option or depreciable cost basis of the underlying assets. The NAV of the hedge and international equity funds is as provided by the fund using various observable and unobservable market valuation techniques as allowed by the FASB. The majority of the hedge funds offer quarterly to annual liquidity options that require advance notice from 5 business days to 4 months, with various “lock-up” and “gate” provisions, while the real estate funds do not offer redemption options.

(b) This category includes investments in private equity funds, public equity funds, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds. The NAV of these funds are as provided by the general partner or fund manager using various observable and unobservable market valuation techniques as allowed by the FASB. The majority of the hedge funds offer quarterly to annual liquidity options that require advance notice from 5 business days to 4 months, with various “lock-up” and
“gate” provisions, while the private equity, real estate and energy funds do not offer redemption options. The public equity funds offer a monthly redemption frequency with 30 days’ notice.

See footnote D for additional information regarding fair value measurements.

Due to the various liquidity limitations on the above referenced funds, the Foundation maintains a significant portion of its investments in highly liquid and other Level 1 assets so as to ensure that grantmaking and administrative expense needs are covered into the foreseeable future.

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.

D. Fair Value Measurements

Fair Value is defined as the exchange price that would be received for an asset or paid 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. In accordance with the authoritative guidance on fair value measurements and disclosures under GAAP, the Foundation adopted a framework for measuring fair value under generally accepted accounting principles that 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. Level 3 assets and liabilities include financial instruments for which fair value is determined using pricing models, discounted cash-flow methodologies or similar techniques, as well as instruments for which the determination of fair value requires significant management judgment or estimation. This category generally includes certain private debt and equity instruments and alternative investments. Also included in Level 3 are investments measured using NAV per share, or its equivalent, that can never be redeemed at the NAV or for which redemption at NAV is uncertain due to lock-up periods or other investment restrictions.

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 1 assets. Equity securities purchased and held directly by the Foundation include private equities, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds.

The following discussion describes the valuation methodologies used for financial assets measured at fair value. The techniques utilized in estimating the fair values are affected by the assumptions used, including discount rates and estimates of the amount and timing of future cash flows. Care should be exercised in deriving conclusions about the Foundations’ financial position based on the fair value information of financial assets presented below.

The valuation of nonpublic or alternative investments requires significant judgment by the General Partner or Fund Manager 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. Year-end valuations are as provided by the General Partner or Fund Manager, which are tied to capital statements and/or audited financial statements when available, and are carried at NAV or its equivalent. These valuations include estimates, appraisals, assumptions and methods that are reviewed by the Foundations’ independent investment advisors and management.
The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2012:

<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>Public equities</td>
<td>$481,980,259</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$481,980,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>46,558,308</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>46,558,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>135,174,976</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>135,174,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
<td>1,092,985,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>468,890,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>6,028,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>58,160,123</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>58,160,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$727,902,519</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,561,876,634</td>
<td>$2,289,779,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2011</th>
<th>$1,430,356,221</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Purchases                   | 219,932,532    |
Sales                        | (238,328,908)  |
Realized gains               | 61,957,961     |
Unrealized gains             | 87,958,828     |
**Balance, December 31, 2012**| $1,561,876,634|

The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2011:

<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>Public equities</td>
<td>$478,281,301</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$478,281,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government obligations</td>
<td>43,510,575</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>43,510,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>153,220,440</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>153,220,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>962,626,998</td>
<td>962,626,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>467,729,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>19,314,861</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>19,314,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>21,571,415</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>21,571,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$715,898,592</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,430,356,221</td>
<td>$2,146,254,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2010</th>
<th>$1,211,357,006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Purchases                   | 313,351,127    |
Sales                       | (181,886,300)  |
Transfers – donated securities| (1,301,400)   |
Realized gains               | 30,011,776     |
Unrealized gains             | 58,824,012     |
**Balance, December 31, 2011**| $1,430,356,221|
Transfers in and out of Level 3 assets are as denoted by “Purchases” and “Sales” in the summary of Level 3 activity schedules above, whereas the funds used to make purchases of Level 3 assets are generally made from liquid (Level 1) funds and, likewise, sales or maturities of Level 3 assets are generally received as cash (Level 1) and deposited into liquid fund assets. Purchases of Level 3 assets are made in accordance with the Foundation’s investment policy to maintain targeted levels of such assets, which are balanced against the liquidity needs of the Foundation for purposes of making grants and covering operating expenses, and to achieve an overall growth in investments sufficient to meet various required distribution calculations. Sales and maturities represent a combination of pre-designated capital distributions from partnerships whose specific timing is generally determined by the partnership but that, overall, is an expected and integral part of the partnership agreement. Other sales of Level 3 assets, whereby such is not pre-designated, are based on the Foundation’s liquidity needs, maintaining targeted levels of various assets as proscribed by the investment policy and, in certain instances, where the Foundation and its investment committee decide to take funds out of a given investee due to poor performance or otherwise better opportunities deemed available with other investees.

E. 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 percent (1 percent 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 percent for 2012 and 1 percent for 2011. The deferred excise tax provision is calculated assuming a 2 percent rate and is based on the projected gains/losses that assume complete liquidation of all assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise tax payable</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$(210,128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>6,942,779</td>
<td>4,137,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 7,542,779</td>
<td>$ 3,927,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excise tax payments of $1,200,000 and $1,525,000 were paid in 2012 and 2011, 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, 2012, the Foundation made qualifying distributions less than the required minimum distribution of approximately $4.9 million. The Foundation has $83.3 million in prior year excess distributions, resulting in a net accumulated over-distribution of $78.4 million to be carried forward to 2013.

F. Grants Payable

Grants payable at December 31, 2012, are expected to be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>$ 7,689,805</td>
<td>$ 1,458,688</td>
<td>$ 42,000</td>
<td>$ 9,190,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3,269,000</td>
<td>576,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>791,845</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>806,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>5,507,967</td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>7,127,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>17,538,617</td>
<td>3,739,688</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td>21,510,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Unamortized</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>231,723</td>
<td>21,226</td>
<td>252,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$17,538,617</td>
<td>$ 3,507,965</td>
<td>$ 210,774</td>
<td>$21,257,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Exploratory, Special Projects and Matching Gifts Program.
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 $2,479,959 and $1,129,272 as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Grant activity for the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undiscounted grants payable, January 1</strong></td>
<td>$19,471,161</td>
<td>$38,420,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants approved</td>
<td>89,680,445</td>
<td>89,593,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109,151,606</td>
<td>128,013,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less grants paid by program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>15,843,636</td>
<td>23,110,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7,977,874</td>
<td>14,519,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>32,767,840</td>
<td>27,350,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Out of Poverty</td>
<td>28,360,191</td>
<td>40,538,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2,691,760</td>
<td>3,022,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87,641,301</td>
<td>108,542,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undiscounted grants payable, December 31</strong></td>
<td>$21,510,305</td>
<td>$19,471,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Exploratory, Special Projects and Matching Gifts Program.*
G. 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>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit obligation at December 31</td>
<td>(53,862)</td>
<td>(47,395)</td>
<td>(16,059)</td>
<td>(13,347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value of plan assets at December 31</td>
<td>46,209</td>
<td>38,134</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded status at December 31</td>
<td>(7,653)</td>
<td>(9,261)</td>
<td>(16,059)</td>
<td>(13,347)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts recognized in the statements of financial position:

- Prepaid benefit included with other assets: –
- Accrued benefit liability included with accounts payable and other liabilities: (7,653) (9,261) (16,059) (13,347)

Net amount recognized: (7,653) (9,261) (16,059) (13,347)

Employer contributions: 4,751 4,060 289 247

Benefit payments: (2,106) (1,057) (289) (247)

Components of net periodic benefit cost:

- Service cost: 1,375 1,098 535 401
- Interest cost: 2,080 2,148 581 619
- Expected return on assets: (2,938) (2,831) – –
- Amortization of net loss: 1,535 844 63 14
- Amortization of prior service cost: 55 362 128 129

Net periodic benefit cost: 2,107 1,621 1,307 1,163

BENEFIT OBLIGATIONS

The accumulated benefit obligation of the nonqualified pension plan was $4,502,007 and $4,589,645 as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation of the qualified plan was $43,672,995 and $38,526,279 as of December 31, 2012 and 2011, 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>Assumptions</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on plan assets</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For measurement purposes, an initial annual rate of 8 percent for Pre-65 and 6 percent for Post-65 in the per capita cost of health care was used. These rates were assumed to decrease gradually each year to an ultimate rate of 4.5 percent by year 2021.

**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, 2012, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Percent of Assets</th>
<th>Target Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic stock</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International stock</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the pension assets by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 28,607,913</td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,310,722</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,325,556</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12,964,994</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 46,209,185</td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS**

The Foundation expects to contribute $2,733,440 to its pension plans and $490,000 to its postretirement medical plan in 2013. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pension Plans</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ 2,733,440</td>
<td>$ 490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,733,440</td>
<td>530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,873,440</td>
<td>590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,843,440</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,923,440</td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–2022</td>
<td>15,197,200</td>
<td>3,640,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective 2012, the fully insured premium has been reduced for the Medicare reimbursement; therefore, the Foundation no longer receives a Medicare D subsidy.

**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, 2012 and 2011, the Foundation contributed $215,870 and $215,433, respectively.

**H. Subsequent Events**

The Foundation evaluated its December 31, 2012, financial statements for subsequent events through June 24, 2013, the date the financial statements were available to be issued. The Foundation is not aware of any subsequent events that would require recognition or disclosure in the financial statements.

**Administration and Investment Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration Total</th>
<th>Investment Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$7,494,763</td>
<td>$7,656,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personnel costs</td>
<td>4,637,724</td>
<td>4,130,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,397,871</td>
<td>1,359,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>1,044,440</td>
<td>946,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and business expenses</td>
<td>901,779</td>
<td>934,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and contract services</td>
<td>197,640</td>
<td>217,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$15,674,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,244,067</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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