

Statement of Purpose

The Hewlett Foundation was established by the late Palo Alto industrialist William R. Hewlett, his wife, Flora Lamson Hewlett, and their eldest son, Walter B. Hewlett, and was incorporated as a private foundation in the State of California in 1966. The Foundation's broad purpose, as stated in the articles of incorporation, is to promote the well-being of mankind by supporting selected activities of a charitable nature, as well as organizations or institutions engaged in such activities.

The Foundation concentrates its resources on activities in conflict resolution, education, environment, family and community development, performing arts, population, and U.S.-Latin American relations. Although the Hewlett Foundation is an international foundation, with no geographic limit stipulated in its charter, a portion of disbursable funds has been earmarked for projects in the San Francisco Bay Area.

In its grantmaking decisions as well as in its interests and activities, the Hewlett Foundation is wholly independent of the Hewlett-Packard Company and the Hewlett-Packard Company Foundation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Walter B. Hewlett
Chairman
Palo Alto, California

William R. Hewlett
(deceased, January 2001)
Chairman-Emeritus
Portola Valley, California

Paul Brest
President
Stanford, California

Robert F. Erburt
Los Angeles, California

James C. Gaither
Hillsborough, California

Eleanor H. Gimon
Greenwich, Connecticut

H. Irving Grousebeck
Portola Valley, California

Richard A. Hackborn
Meridian, Idaho
(through December 2001)

Mary H. Jaffe
Portland, Oregon

Herant Katchadourian, M.D.
Stanford, California

Richard C. Levin
New Haven, Connecticut

Jean G. Stromberg
Washington, D.C.

OFFICERS

Paul Brest
President

Laurance R. Hoagland, Jr.
Vice President and Chief
Investment Officer

Nancy Strausser
Corporate Secretary

PROGRAM STAFF

Conflict Resolution
Melanie Greenberg
Program Officer

Terry Amsler
Manager, Domestic Conflict Resolution

Stephanie Smith
Senior Consultant

Cindy Gire
Senior Consultant

Angela Jones
Program Assistant

Education

Raymond F. Bacchetti
Program Officer
(through January 2001)

Marshall (Mike) Smith
Program Officer
(effective February 2001)

Ida Oberman
Associate Program Officer

Heidi Ramirez
Program Associate

Suzanne Pondl
Program Assistant

Sally Tracy
Program Assistant

Environment

Michael L. Fischer
Program Officer

Rhea Suh
Associate Program Officer / Director, Energy Initiative

Roberta Green
Program Assistant

Anne Atkinson
Program Assistant

Family and Community Development

Alvertha Bratton Penny
Program Officer

Renu Karir
Associate Program Officer

Yvonne Yazzie
Program Assistant

Performing Arts

Melanie Beene
Program Officer
(through May 2001)

Moy Eng
Program Officer
(effective December 2001)

Andrea Faiss
Acting Co-Program Officer

Susan Duncan
Acting Co-Program Officer

Brenda MacRoberts
Program Assistant

Population

J. Joseph Speidel, M.D.
Program Officer

Wendy R. Sheldon
Associate Program Officer

Tamara Fox
Associate Program Officer

Theresa Jacobson
Program Assistant

U.S.-Latin American Relations

David E. Lorey
Program Officer

C. R. Hibbs <i>Program Associate</i>	Christine Sherry <i>Director, The Philanthropy Workshop West</i>	Celia Lonborg <i>Grants Assistant</i>
Joseph Ryan <i>Program Associate</i>	Christy Cory <i>Executive Assistant, The Philanthropy Workshop West</i>	Heather Jackson <i>Proposal Assistant</i>
Mariana Alvarado <i>Program Assistant</i>		Linda Clayton <i>Administrative Assistant</i>
Hoa Tran <i>Program Assistant</i>	Michael Wald <i>Senior Advisor to the President on Evaluation, Policy, and Children and Youth Issues</i>	Yvette Clark <i>Program Assistant</i>
FINANCE GROUP		Karen Andrews <i>Program Assistant</i>
Laurance R. Hoagland, Jr. <i>Vice President and Chief Investment Officer</i>	Paula Gann <i>Program Assistant</i>	Andres Anaya <i>Receptionist</i>
Susan Ketcham <i>Treasurer</i>	Alana Wilson <i>Director, Human Resources</i>	Shaka Dickson <i>Receptionist</i>
Diana Lieberman <i>Director, Investment Research</i>	Gregg Servis <i>Management Associate</i>	Adriana Cortez <i>Receptionist</i>
Kelly Meldrum <i>Director, Private Equity</i>	Terry Keenor <i>Director, Information Technology</i>	Tony Keller <i>Librarian</i>
N. Elizabeth Dunfield <i>Controller</i>	Sally Lee <i>IT Project Manager</i>	FELLOWS
Charlene E. Cooper <i>Accountant</i>	Harry Lim <i>Exchange Administrator</i>	Eli Cohen
Tim Reid <i>Accountant</i>	Lily Chiu <i>IT Analyst</i>	James Emerson
Mary Civitell <i>Accounting Clerk</i>	John Cho <i>Network Administrator</i>	Juliette Gimon
Ruth Gilroy <i>Executive Assistant</i>	Trinh Tran <i>IT Assistant</i>	Samantha Graff
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Susan Alexander <i>Manager, Grants Management Services</i>	Ryan MacDonnell
Nancy Strausser <i>Assistant to the President / Corporate Secretary</i>	Carolyn Provost <i>Manager, Grants Administration</i>	Tia Martinez
Susan Bell <i>Director, Strategic Planning</i>	Constance Bassett <i>Grants Administrator</i>	Smita Singh
Luisa Smith <i>Coordinator, Strategic Planning</i>	Mel Manliguis <i>Grants Administrator</i>	

President's Statement

The Hewlett Foundation seeks to promote the well-being of humanity by focusing on the most serious problems facing society, where risk capital, responsibly invested, may make a difference over time, and on sustaining and improving institutions that make positive contributions to society.

—Hewlett Foundation Guiding Principle

this essay summarizes the Hewlett Foundation's approach to philanthropy. It does not focus on the substance of the Foundation's programs, each of which would require a separate essay. Rather, it discusses the way we think about and do our work throughout the Foundation. Our approach grows out of the core principle quoted above, which was adopted by the Board of Directors several years ago in an effort to capture the spirit of the founders and the Foundation's practices in its first three decades. The guiding principle articulates three fundamental values:

- First, the Hewlett Foundation is concerned primarily with solving social and environmental problems. This requires that we define program objectives, grants, and other activities in terms of problems to be solved; identify criteria for evaluating success and indicators of progress; and be prepared to stay the course.
- Second, the solutions to serious problems are seldom known with anything close to certainty. The Foundation must therefore be prepared to experiment and take risks in its philanthropic activities. This, too, entails clear objectives and measures of success, without which we cannot know how the risk eventuated. It also requires a willingness to acknowledge and learn from failures.
- Third, a vibrant nonprofit sector is essential to a free society. Nonprofit organizations—and, in some cases, government and private entities as well—are necessary partners in achieving the Foundation's mission. These factors explain the high proportion of our grants budget allocated to general operating support. They also imply a concern both for the health of individual organizations and for the fields in which they operate.

The Foundation's Programs

Programs and Program Elements. The Foundation has seven programs: Conflict Resolution; Education; Environment; Children, Families, and Communities;* Performing Arts; Population; and U.S.–Latin American Relations. Each program includes a number of initiatives or elements with their own articulated objectives. For example, the Education Program supports work involving technology, community colleges, and educational policy and reform.

Interprogram Collaboration. Because real-world problems do not fit neatly into disciplinary or programmatic categories, the Foundation encourages interprogram collaborations. For example, the Population and Education programs jointly support work in universal basic and secondary education. The U.S.–Latin American Relations Program collaborates with the Conflict Resolution Program on issues of public security and with the Environment Program on freshwater resources at the border between Mexico and the United States. Such collaborations build on and expand the collective expertise of the program staff.

Special Projects and the Support of Philanthropy. While most grantmaking takes place in the seven program areas, the Foundation values being able to respond flexibly to unanticipated problems and opportunities. Thus, in extraordinary circumstances, we support “Special Projects” that do not come within the guidelines of a particular program. Recent examples include funding for the National Commission on Election Reform and an initiative on “Americans in the World,” intended to improve Americans’ understanding of global issues. Special Projects sometimes serve as an incubator for ideas that may become part of the regular programs. Thus, an Energy Initiative has become an integral element of the Environment Program.

A portion of the Special Projects budget is devoted to the support of philanthropy. In addition to trying to model effective philanthropy in the Foundation’s own work, we fund efforts to create and disseminate knowledge about philanthropy, encourage and edu-

* This will become the focus of what is currently the Family and Community Development Program.

cate new philanthropists, and improve social capital markets—that is, improve the flow of information and capital between funders and organizations in need of philanthropic support. A recent initiative that furthers most of these goals is the co-sponsored Global Philanthropy Forum, designed to encourage and facilitate U.S. philanthropists’ investments in organizations beyond our borders.

Long-Term Impact Through Sustained Engagement

Market forces often pressure business executives to focus on immediate results. Politicians often feel similar pressures from their constituents and may be reluctant to take risks in unexplored or controversial areas. By contrast, the independence of foundations allows them to seek long-term solutions to the problems facing society, and also to take risks that have high potential social gains.

The Presumption of General Operating Support. The goals of achieving long-term impact and improving the institutions that make positive contributions to society are, on the whole, complementary and imply a presumption in favor of providing those institutions with general operating support. Over half of the Hewlett Foundation’s annual grants budget is allocated for this purpose.

The presumption of general operating support is undergirded by several rationales. Foremost is the belief that a vibrant democratic society requires an array of strong nonprofit institutions that allow citizens to come together to express and further their various concerns and interests. At their best, these institutions have a breadth and depth of expertise that few foundations can match, and they are able to respond to changing circumstances in the areas in which they work. In addition to their individual missions, these institutions, which constitute the core of “civil society,” contribute to pluralism and polyarchy and provide important checks on the power of government and the private sector.

The presumption of general operating support responds to these considerations and also to the mundane fact that, when foundations designate funds for a particular project, they typically limit “overhead” to a percentage of the grant that falls far short of covering the actual cost of the project. Many organizations—especially

those without independent support from members or alumni—would not have the capacity to undertake projects in the absence of general operating support: Someone has to pay for staff benefits, rent, and the utility bill.

That said, a substantial portion of the Hewlett Foundation's grants budget also supports specific projects. Often, this is the result of being approached by an organization—say, a university or school district—for funding to develop or implement a particular idea. In the case of an organization with multiple missions, the organization's and Foundation's objectives may be especially strongly aligned with a specific project; or the project may have great potential benefits for the field but be sufficiently risky that the organization reasonably would not devote unrestricted funds to it. These factors are exemplified by the Foundation's support for MIT's OpenCourseware project, which seeks to make the University's course materials available free on the Internet.

Long-Term Support for High-Performing Organizations. A corollary of the presumption of general operating support is the Foundation's practice of providing grants of several years' duration and of renewing support to high-performing organizations. Long-term support permits organizations to plan with reasonable certainty. It also strengthens their capacity, self-confidence, flexibility, and ability to innovate. However, an organization's effectiveness must be continually demonstrated as new challenges appear and new institutions arise to address them. Thus, though we make a point of not succumbing to "donor fatigue" with existing grantees, we also seek out ambitious new organizations whose well-conceived strategic plans and energetic leadership can compensate for the absence of a long track record.

Support for the Fields in Which the Foundation Works. An organization does not operate in a vacuum, but is part of a field—for example, elementary education or chamber music—defined by activities and bodies of knowledge. Lasting impact often requires attention to the field as a whole—by promoting collaboration among existing organizations, occasionally creating new institutions to fill gaps, and developing knowledge of importance to the field. For example, the Hewlett Foundation has convened regular meet-

ings of U.S. western water law judges, facilitated the merger of a number of small competing conflict resolution organizations into a single entity, and supported both basic and applied research in education.

The Foundation also participates in a number of “affinity groups” that bring together funders in a field to exchange information, learn from experts, and plan future work. In addition to making grants to support research in a field, the Foundation is committed to publicly disseminating knowledge developed by program staff, consultants, and others. For example, the Foundation’s Web site, www.hewlett.org, contains substantive reports that aided our strategic planning work in the Environment and Population programs.

Sustained commitment to a field can make a difference: Through two decades of supporting organizations of practitioners and researchers, for example, the Hewlett Foundation played a major role in establishing the field of conflict resolution.

Scale. The Hewlett Foundation typically seeks impact on a large scale. For example, the Population Program seeks to improve the quality and availability of family planning services for millions of people; the Environment Program seeks to protect vast landscapes in the West and reduce global CO₂ emissions. In addition to strengthening the fields in which the Foundation works, strategies that the Foundation employs to achieve large-scale impact include demonstration or pilot projects and their replication; research and evaluation to assess the effectiveness of particular theories or strategies of change; and the dissemination of knowledge for the benefit of professionals, citizens, and policymakers.

Taking Risks. A considerable part of the Hewlett Foundation’s grants budget is devoted to relatively risky investments that have the potential for high social returns. A “risky” investment in this sense is one where the desired outcome—for example, restoring an endangered ecosystem or improving the lives of disadvantaged youth—is by no means assured. Responsible risktaking requires specifying the intended outcomes and measures of success and monitoring progress during the implementation of a grant. There are other forms of risk as well—for example, the risk to the Foundation’s rep-

utation when it supports a controversial project, or the possibility of a well-intentioned philanthropic initiative causing unintended harms—that can be mitigated only by watchfulness and good judgment.

Identifying and Strengthening Effective Organizations

The Hewlett Foundation invests in promising start-ups as well as mature organizations with strong performance histories. In either case, the due diligence process begins by identifying excellent organizations that are well aligned with the Foundation’s program objectives. We look to the quality of the organization’s strategic and business plans, the strength of its management, its inclusiveness, its capacity to innovate, and its overall effectiveness. Concomitant with the funding decision is agreement about our shared objectives and the assessment of progress during the course of the grant.

Both at the start and during the course of the relationship, the Foundation stands ready to help strengthen an organization’s capacity to carry out its activities—for example, through strategic planning and the design of management information systems. The Performing Arts and U.S.–Latin American Relations programs regularly provide such assistance to the smaller organizations in their portfolios.

Goals, Roadmaps, and Milestones

The Foundation’s aim of achieving long-term impact on social and environmental problems demands clarity of objectives and the means for achieving them. It also requires systematic assessment of progress toward those objectives and the ability to make mid-course corrections.

Causal Theory. The precondition to achieving impact is a sound causal theory, sometimes called a “theory of change” or “logic model.” This is a theory of how the grantee’s and the Foundation’s resources can be deployed to attain our shared objectives or outcomes. In its simplest form, a causal theory takes this form—

Inputs → activities and outputs → outcomes

—where *inputs* consist of the grantee’s organizational capacity, the Foundation’s financial resources, and our respective expertise; *activ-*

ties and *outputs* are what the grantee actually does or delivers; and *outcomes* are the ultimate results the Foundation and grantee plan to achieve. Here is a very simple example from the Population Program:

Many of our grants seek, as their *ultimate outcome*, the stabilization of population size in rapidly growing developing countries. This requires the *intermediate outcome* of reducing birth rates, which can be achieved through the *activities* of providing women and men with family-planning services. These services are the grantees' *outputs*. The main *inputs* consist of the Foundation's funds and the grantees' expertise about how most effectively to provide such services in a particular region.

While the process of implementation moves from inputs to activities and outputs to outcomes, the process of designing the causal theory begins with outcomes: One must first posit a desired outcome, and then determine what inputs and activities are necessary to produce it.

Degrees of Confidence in Causal Theories. The strength of the causal theory underlying an organization's pursuit of a particular objective may range from an intuitively plausible *hunch*, to a *hypothesis* based on a considered theory with some empirical basis, to a *well-established theory*. For example, the belief that carbon dioxide emissions cause global warming began as a hunch, developed into a plausible hypothesis, and, after years of modeling and empirical study, is now a widely accepted theory.

The causal theory underlying the preceding example from the Population Program is well established. However, there may be other activities that conduce to the same outcome of stabilizing population size that have additional social benefits, but are less well understood. Thus, the Foundation is also supporting research into the hypothesis that providing universal basic education in developing countries reduces birth rates.

Rationales for Supporting Hunches and Hypotheses. Philanthropy has an important role throughout the spectrum of causal theories. At the more speculative end of the spectrum, foundations can take risks that government or the private sector cannot or will

not take, with the hope of advancing knowledge and achieving impact.

A necessary corollary of such risktaking is evaluation to learn how the risks turned out. In other words, a key task of evaluation is to move from a hunch or hypothesis toward a well-established (or disproved) theory. Although hunches and hypotheses often need a period of incubation, all theories must eventually be tested. Especially in the social sciences, this can be a complex and sometimes frustrating process, requiring:

- Long-term commitment and financial support;
- Integrating quantitative measurement (e.g., experimental designs) and qualitative assessment (e.g., case studies);
- Being alert to unanticipated consequences—both positive and negative;
- The adroit use of intermediate indicators of progress; and
- Patience.

The evaluation of a causal theory tends to focus not on an individual grantee but on a particular approach to addressing a social or environmental problem. Because the Hewlett Foundation generally seeks to improve the fields in which it works, we are prepared to commit substantial resources to such knowledge-building evaluation.

Rationales for Supporting Well-Established Theories. There are many cases—population is a paradigmatic example—where theories may be well established but their implementation is not well supported by government or the private sector. Foundations have an important role to play here as well. It should be noted that we do not dispense with evaluation even with respect to well-established theories. Almost every theory needs continual testing, especially when it may be sensitive to the circumstances surrounding its application: What succeeds in Bangladesh may fail in Brazil.

Assessment of Progress Toward the Foundation’s and Grantee’s Shared Objectives. Whether a grantee organization is exploring a hunch or implementing a well-established theory, the Foundation and the organization must have a clear mutual understanding about how progress toward our objectives will be gauged. And because it

may take many years to assess ultimate outcomes—and measurement may be difficult even then—we must agree on *intermediate indicators* of progress. For example, if a population organization’s ultimate objectives are to stabilize population growth and improve reproductive health, an intermediate indicator might be couples’ increased use of contraceptives. If a community environmental group’s ultimate goal is to promote healthy ecosystems and protect biodiversity, an intermediate indicator might be the mitigation of environmental threats. Sometimes barriers will be encountered, and positive intermediate indicators will not lead to intended outcomes. Without success at the intermediate stages, however, there is little reason to expect that the desired outcomes will ever be achieved.

The primary reason for assessing progress is to provide the organization itself with ongoing feedback to facilitate mid-course corrections and improve its effectiveness. But the assessment of progress also ensures the organization’s accountability to the Foundation, improves our own grantmaking, and develops knowledge of value to the field.

There is much talk of “metrics” in the nonprofit sector these days. Though this is a healthy corrective for organizations that often have not focused on outcomes, it is important not to be obsessed with numbers. As Albert Einstein famously remarked: “Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.” While we and our grantees should strive to measure progress toward our shared objectives, perhaps the most important result of this process is clarity about what those objectives are, how they will be achieved, and how we will know if we are on the path to success.

Organizing the Foundation for Effective Philanthropy

The Foundation’s staff is charged with developing specific strategies to achieve the overall aims set by the Board of Directors. This requires articulating objectives for each program, determining which grants and other activities are most likely to achieve them,

and selecting and working with organizations to carry out our shared mission. The fact that many of our grants are designated for general operating support does not reduce the demands on program staff to plan and act strategically. On the one hand, it adds to the burdens of due diligence; on the other, it provides the Foundation with strong partners in both planning and implementation.

The Hewlett Foundation has a staff of extraordinary quality and deep expertise, whose size is relatively small compared to the size of our grants budget. Though a small staff is not an end in itself, it facilitates collegial interaction conducive to creativity and collaboration, and controls administrative expenses.

It is a rare organization, whether in the public or private sector, that can do many different things effectively. Achieving real impact requires focusing the Foundation's financial and human resources on a limited number of social and environmental problems, and scaling those resources to the nature of the problems tackled. Thus, we are moving toward having fewer and more strategically focused initiatives within the Foundation's programs.

Foundations do not operate in isolation but are linked together in networks with other funders and organizations. Although each funder must ultimately determine its own objectives and assure itself that its grant monies are spent wisely and effectively, collaboration can have advantages for all concerned. It makes possible larger aggregate investments in high-performing organizations and permits sharing the responsibilities for due diligence and knowledge building. Thus, the Hewlett Foundation has engaged in collaborative ventures—including joint funding of MIT's OpenCourseware project, mentioned earlier, with the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation—and we welcome future collaboration with other foundations.

Evaluating the Foundation's Own Performance

Earlier parts of this essay address the evaluation of the work of the organizations we support—because the Foundation's own success ultimately depends on their work. Just as the assessment of their work cannot await ultimate outcomes, we must look for interme-

diate indicators of our own performance with respect to practices such as:

- Articulating clear objectives for grantmaking and knowledge building;
- Doing effective due diligence in selecting organizations;
- Assessing progress and impact in achieving shared objectives;
- Playing an effective role in fields in which we work;
- Strengthening grantees' capacity to achieve their goals;
- Allocating resources appropriate to the problem tackled and taking appropriate risks;
- Holding ourselves and our grantees mutually accountable; and
- Acknowledging and learning from failure.

I have focused on technical or instrumental aspects of the Hewlett Foundation's approach to philanthropy—with the ultimate mission of addressing the most serious problems facing society. We could not succeed in this mission without the passion of the Foundation's Board and staff and that of the many hundreds of organizations we support. Without the capacity to move beyond passion to effective execution, however, the nonprofit sector would be left largely with well-meaning efforts that conflate intentions with effect. The processes described in this essay are designed to move the Foundation from good intentions to actual impact.

PAUL BREST
MARCH 2002

THE PROGRAM STATEMENTS that follow describe certain specific objectives of The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. Other goals are general; they underlie all the programs and all the funding choices the Foundation makes.

FIRST, the Foundation has a strong basic commitment to the voluntary, nonprofit sector that lies between industry and government. Institutions and organizations in this category serve purposes very important to our society, and their health and effectiveness are a major concern. Accordingly, the Foundation intends to assist efforts to strengthen their financial base and increase their efficiency.

SECOND, the Foundation also believes that private philanthropy is of great value to society. Support from individuals, businesses, or foundations can supplement government funding and, in some important cases, can provide a benign and fruitful alternative. The Foundation considers the nation's habits of philanthropy, individual and corporate, less healthy than they could be, and therefore will be particularly receptive to proposals that show promise of stimulating private philanthropy.

A GREAT MANY excellent organizations meet both the general criteria suggested here and the specifications set forth in the statements that follow. Competition for the available funds is intense. The Foundation can respond favorably to only a small portion of the worthwhile proposals it receives.

Conflict Resolution

The Conflict Resolution Program supports work in a wide variety of settings. The Foundation favors general support grants intended to strengthen the institutional capacity of conflict resolution organizations and research centers. Grants were made in the following six categories, with exploratory sub-categories of international grants in the areas of democratization, civil society building, and the intersection of human rights and conflict resolution.

Theory Development. The Foundation is particularly interested in university-based centers that demonstrate both a strong commitment to systematic, interdisciplinary research on conflict resolution and an ability to contribute to the improvement of conflict resolution practice. The Foundation also supports collaborations of institutions and scholars in extended research undertakings of relevance to practitioners and policymakers.

Practitioner Organizations. The Foundation provides institutional support to leading conflict resolution practitioner organizations that serve a national audience. The Foundation accords preference to organizations that serve low-income communities and people of color, or that leverage federal or state policy initiatives to advance conflict resolution concepts widely. The Foundation does not support local groups, with some exceptions involving collaborative grants with other Foundation programs.

Promotion of the Field. The Foundation supports organizations that (1) educate potential users about conflict resolution techniques; (2) serve the training and support needs of professionals and volunteers in the field of conflict resolution; and / or (3) promote the field as a whole.

Consensus Building, Public Participation, and Policymaking. Recognizing that the origins of conflict can often be traced to defects in methods of communication and participation in policymaking, the Foundation assists organizations that demonstrate means of

Program Description

improving the process of decisionmaking on issues of major public importance. The Foundation's interest is focused primarily on facilitating and convening organizations that explore new ways of approaching contentious public policy issues through collaborative action that addresses the legitimate interests of stakeholders.

International Conflict Resolution. The Foundation supports a limited number of organizations that are working on both the international application of conflict resolution methods and the development of practice-relevant theory related to ethnic, ideological, religious, racial, and other intergroup conflict around the world. Applicants in this area are expected to show significant field-level involvement with conflicts having international ramifications. This is the only category of the Conflict Resolution Program in which overseas initiatives are considered.

Emerging Issues. Each year the Foundation considers a small number of proposals addressed to emerging issues in the conflict resolution field. Grants support short-term projects responsive to such critical concerns as evaluation and professional standards. Applicants must demonstrate multiparty involvement in the work plan and project governance as well as compelling evidence of likely impact on the field at large.

Theory Development

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
New York, New York

For the Dispute Resolution Consortium

\$250,000

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, CONFLICT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM
Boulder, Colorado

For the Intractable Conflict Knowledge Base project

750,000

GEOGETOWN UNIVERSITY, LAW CENTER
Washington, D.C.

For a program on problem solving and conflict resolution in legal education

300,000

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW
Cambridge, Massachusetts

For the Harvard Negotiation Research Project

25,000

For the Fellowship Program on Law and Negotiation

250,000

**PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN CONFLICT
AND NEGOTIATION**

University Park, Pennsylvania

*For the Inter-University Consortium on the Framing of Intractable
Environmental Disputes: Phase II*

300,000

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
New Brunswick, New Jersey

For the Center for Negotiation and Conflict Resolution

120,000

Practitioner Organizations

**CALIFORNIA FOUNDATION FOR IMPROVEMENT OF EMPLOYER-
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

Sacramento, California

*For a merger with the Workplace Institute and to provide general
support for the new organization*

500,000

DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTER OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN
Lansing, Michigan

For the Community Dispute Resolution Association of Michigan

175,000

MARYLAND ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMISSION
Towson, Maryland

For general support

300,000

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MEDIATION PROGRAMS AND PRACTITIONERS
Rockland, Massachusetts

For the Conflict Intervention Team project

120,000

STATE OF NEW MEXICO, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ON THE COURTS
Santa Fe, New Mexico

For an alternative dispute resolution office

75,000

OREGON DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMISSION
Salem, Oregon

For the Hispanic / Latino Community-Based Dispute Resolution project

250,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
PUBLIC CONVERSATIONS PROJECT Watertown, Massachusetts <i>For planning and for sustaining prior organizational and program development</i>	300,000
REDWOOD EMPIRE CONFLICT RESOLUTION SERVICES Santa Rosa, California <i>For the North Bay Consensus Council project</i>	150,000
STATE OF UTAH, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR Salt Lake City, Utah <i>For a statewide mediation program for all of Utah's state agencies</i>	75,000
<i>Promotion of the Field</i>	
CREATIVE RESPONSE TO CONFLICT Nyack, New York <i>For general support</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUND Washington, D.C. <i>For the Center for Alternative Dispute Resolution's Mediators of Color Alliance Network</i>	70,000
FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION, RESEARCH DIVISION Washington, D.C. <i>For dispute resolution programs in the federal courts</i>	275,000
MEDIATION CENTER OF THE NORTH VALLEY Chico, California <i>For Project 17, a rural counties mediation project</i>	275,000
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Saint Paul, Minnesota <i>For the Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation</i>	525,000
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY MEDIATION Washington, D.C. <i>For expanding and assessing regranting program and developing evaluation design for the community mediation field</i>	250,000
THE NETWORK Belmont, Massachusetts <i>For production and national distribution of public radio programs about conflict resolution</i>	60,000
WESTERN JUSTICE CENTER FOUNDATION Pasadena, California <i>For general support</i>	175,000
WORKPLACE SOLUTIONS Red Hook, New York <i>For general support</i>	100,000

Consensus Building, Public Participation, and Policy Making

AMERICASPEAKS Washington, D.C. <i>For the Next Stages for National Deliberative Democracy project</i>	175,000
ANDRUS CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY Boise, Idaho <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF HUMAN RELATIONS ORGANIZATIONS San Francisco, California <i>For the planning of an institute for interveners who respond to intergroup tensions and conflict</i>	75,000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR PUBLIC DISPUTE RESOLUTION Sacramento, California <i>For the California Center for Public Dispute Resolution</i>	750,000
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW New York, New York <i>For the Project on Public Problem Solving (Collaboration with Education, Environment, and Special Projects)</i>	250,000
COMMUNITY PARTNERS Los Angeles, California <i>For the C2K Network Partners program</i>	550,000
EAST BAY COMMUNITY FOUNDATION Oakland, California <i>For the Fremont Community Foundation's Fremont Afghan Dialog project</i>	25,000
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING Tallahassee, Florida <i>For a collaborative project with Georgia Institute of Technology entitled Societal Effects of Collaborative Decision-making in Florida: The Impact of Environmental Conflict Resolution Institutions and Practice on Public Choice, Civic Culture, and Environmental Management Systems</i>	75,000
GREAT VALLEY CENTER Modesto, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	200,000
STATE OF HAWAII, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the Center for Alternative Dispute Resolution in Education</i>	225,000
INFORMATION RENAISSANCE Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania <i>For National Dialogue on Public Participation, an online public comment process for the Environmental Protection Agency</i>	50,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Alexandria, Virginia <i>For general support</i>	156,000
NATIONAL CIVIC LEAGUE Washington, D.C. <i>For the Research and Action Agenda project</i>	165,000
NORTHERN PLAINS RESOURCE COUNCIL Billings, Montana <i>For the Stillwater Good Neighbor Agreement project (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
POLICY CONSENSUS INITIATIVE Santa Fe, New Mexico <i>For general support</i>	800,000
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For the Growth, Land Use, and Environment Survey Series conducted in collaboration with the Hewlett, Irvine, and Packard foundations (Collaboration with Environment and Population)</i>	0
RESOLVE Denver, Colorado <i>For work with the California State Senate Select Committee on Palliative Care to hold mediated dialogues on end-of-life issues</i>	74,000
SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION La Jolla, California <i>For the San Diego Dialogue project</i>	400,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Resources for Community Collaboration project (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	500,000
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL NEGOTIATION Charlottesville, Virginia <i>For the Community-based Collaborative Research Consortium Project (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	375,000
WESTERN CONSENSUS COUNCIL Helena, Montana <i>For evaluating community-based collaboration</i>	70,000

International Conflict Resolution

ASIA FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Conflict Management and Democratic Governance in Asia program</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER Berkeley, California <i>For the Intrastate Conflict and Social Reconstruction program</i>	200,000

**Conflict Resolution:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

**CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW, MCGILL CENTER FOR CREATIVE
PROBLEM SOLVING**

San Diego, California

*For a program on judicial reform in Latin America
(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)*

150,000

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Washington, D.C.

For the democracy and rule of law project

500,000

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Washington, D.C.

For the Post-Conflict Reconstruction project

300,000

For the Preventive Diplomacy Program

150,000

For the Americas Program

(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)

150,000

CENTER FOR THE RESEARCH OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

Ankara, Turkey

For the Democratic Leadership and Effective Citizenship Training program

225,000

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DOCENCIA ECONÓMICAS

Delegación Alvaro Obregón, Mexico

*For a collaborative project with the Stanford Program in International
Legal Studies*

(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)

200,000

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

Belfast, United Kingdom

*For a project entitled Creating Partners: Understanding the Dynamics
of Reconciliation in Northern Ireland*

400,000

CONCILIATION RESOURCES

London, England

For general support

100,000

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT GROUP

Cambridge, Massachusetts

For general support

200,000

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

New York, New York

For the Center for Democracy and Free Markets

300,000

CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION

New York, New York

For a strategic planning initiative

75,000

CRIMES OF WAR EDUCATION PROJECT

Washington, D.C.

For general support

75,000

**EASTERN MENNONITE UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR CONFLICT STUDIES
AND PEACE BUILDING**

Harrisonburg, Virginia

For the Conflict Transformation program

250,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
FRIENDS OF THE ISRAEL PALESTINE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND INFORMATION Jerusalem, Israel <i>For the Peace Education program</i>	70,000
FUNDACIÓN PARA EL CAMBIO DEMOCRÁTICO, PARTNERS-ARGENTINA Buenos Aires, Argentina <i>For a program entitled Promoting Citizen Participation and Public Policy Implementation in Argentina (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Project on Justice in Times of Transition</i>	500,000
HENRY L. STIMSON CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For the Rethinking Influence project</i>	100,000
HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	200,000
INITIATIVE FOR SOCIAL ACTION AND RENEWAL IN EURASIA Washington, D.C. <i>For regranting activities in the Russian Far East (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	500,000
INSTITUTE FOR EASTWEST STUDIES New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	250,000
INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL DEMOCRACY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Institute for Global Democracy</i>	300,000
INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDIATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION Washington, D.C. <i>To fund the positions of development officer, academic coordinator, and program assistant</i>	134,000
INSTITUTE FOR MULTI-TRACK DIPLOMACY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Peacebuilders Partnership, a joint program with the National Peace Foundation</i>	300,000
INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i> <i>For development of a business plan for the Applied Conflict Resolution Organizations Network</i>	200,000 75,000
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, PAUL H. NITZE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the Processes of International Negotiation program</i>	250,000

**Conflict Resolution:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

KING'S COLLEGE, CENTRE FOR DEFENCE STUDIES NORTH-SOUTH DEFENCE AND SECURITY PROGRAMME London, England <i>For the International Centre for Peace Initiatives</i>	200,000
LAWYERS ALLIANCE FOR WORLD SECURITY Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	100,000
LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS New York, New York <i>For programs in refugee rights, international justice, workers rights, and policing</i>	200,000
MANHATTAN INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN POLICY STUDIES New York, New York <i>For work on public security in Latin American cities (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	0
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND College Park, Maryland <i>For the Center for International Development and Conflict Management</i>	750,000
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY Washington, D.C. <i>For the World Movement for Democracy</i>	500,000
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION New York, New York <i>For the Project on International Courts and Tribunals</i>	400,000
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW New York, New York <i>For the East European Constitutional Review</i>	75,000
PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES CENTER Oakland, California <i>For a regranting program to leading conservation organizations in Asian Russia (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	500,000
PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	250,000
PLOUGHSHARES FUND San Francisco, California <i>For the Peace and Security Funders Group</i>	50,000
PROJECT ON ETHNIC RELATIONS Princeton, New Jersey <i>For general support</i>	750,000
RELATIONSHIPS FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL Cambridge, England <i>For the Sudan Consultation program, a joint project with the African Renaissance Institute</i>	300,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL New York, New York <i>For the Program on Global Security and Cooperation</i>	300,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND COOPERATION Stanford, California <i>For the Conflict Prevention and Management Research training program</i>	350,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, LAW SCHOOL Stanford, California <i>For the Program in International Legal Studies (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	200,000
SWISS PEACE FOUNDATION Bern, Switzerland <i>For the Afghan Civil Society Conference</i>	75,000
SYNERGOS INSTITUTE New York, New York <i>For the Bridging Leadership program</i>	75,000
UNITED NATIONS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL New York, New York <i>For a strategic planning meeting to establish priorities for the future of the United Nations</i>	75,000
UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For activities of the United Nation's Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict</i>	500,000
UNIVERSIDAD ALBERTO HURTADO, INSTITUTO LATINOAMERICANO DE DOCTRINAS Y ESTUDIOS SOCIALES Santiago, Chile <i>For a studies and exchange program with San Diego State University (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE TEMUCO Temuco, Chile <i>For Proyecto Acceso (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDADE CANDIDO MENDES Centro Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <i>For the Centro de Estudos de Segurança e Cidadania (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS, CENTER FOR STUDIES OF CRIME AND PUBLIC SECURITY Belo Horizonte, Brazil <i>For general support (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000

**Conflict Resolution:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA Charlottesville, Virginia <i>For the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction</i>	300,000
WASHINGTON OFFICE ON LATIN AMERICA Washington, D.C. <i>For general support, with emphasis on public security (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS, LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM Washington, D.C. <i>For programs on public security in Latin America (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	250,000
YALE UNIVERSITY, CHILD STUDY CENTER New Haven, Connecticut <i>For the International Child Mental Health program</i>	250,000

Emerging Issues

CDR ASSOCIATES Boulder, Colorado <i>For development and delivery of an Advanced Training Institute for Mediators</i>	50,000
GEOGETOWN UNIVERSITY, LAW CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For a conference on democratic experimentalism</i>	15,000
INDIANA UNIVERSITY, INDIANA CONFLICT RESOLUTION INSTITUTE Bloomington, Indiana <i>For the National Center for Evaluating Dispute Resolution Programs</i>	225,000
PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE San Francisco, California <i>For the Partners—United States initiative (Collaboration with Family and Community Development)</i>	155,000
TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE Fairbanks, Alaska <i>For training and workshops on negotiation skills (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	160,000

Other

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES Evanston, Illinois <i>For completion of a research project on the techniques and strategies used by mediators who responded to community conflicts during the Civil Rights Era</i>	25,000
---	--------

Education

Program Description

grants in the Education Program should promote long-term institutional or field development, reform, or knowledge development in the program areas described below. Strong preference is given to grant activities that develop knowledge that is applicable beyond the boundaries of the grant and focused on improving opportunities for those most in need in society. During 2002, the Education Program will be carrying out a comprehensive planning effort. Consequently, the program's priorities may be somewhat different in 2002 and beyond from those described below. Guidelines are available on the Foundation's website (www.hewlett.org). Applicants are asked to submit a brief letter of inquiry for review before preparing a complete proposal. Grants are awarded on the basis of merit, educational importance, relevance to program goals, and cost-effectiveness.

Higher Education

Grantmaking in this program has focused on higher education in the United States. The Foundation gives priority to inquiries that address the following issues. Other than in exceptional circumstances, the Foundation does not provide grants for endowment, scholarships, or fellowships.

Pluralism and Unity. Colleges and universities play a significant role in fostering appreciation for both diversity and the common good in our society. The Foundation has supported such efforts and seeks to nurture ideas and programs that unify individuals and groups while respecting the differences between and among them. Institutions must demonstrate a commitment to these twin goals of pluralism and unity in their own policies, practices, and aspirations.

Liberal Arts Institutions. The Foundation has supported private liberal arts colleges and small to mid-sized comprehensive private universities that engage in self-assessment, planning, and program development to enhance the teaching-learning relationship, with emphasis on programs that strengthen the connection among liberal learning, students' career potential and goals, responsible citizenship, and personal development. This program favors but is not limited to institutions in California, Oregon, and Washington.

General Education in Research Universities. The Foundation has supported initiatives in research universities to rethink and improve the general education of lower-division undergraduates. Proposals that focus on student outcomes, faculty incentives, teaching innovations, and especially the general education curriculum taken as a whole have been favored over those concerned only with curriculum design.

California Community Colleges. Over the next few years, California is expected to experience a dramatic expansion of community college enrollment. The Foundation is interested in funding creative responses to this expansion that maximize opportunities for California's diverse population.

Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities. In partnership with the Bush Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation supports an ongoing program of grants for capital needs and faculty development at private black colleges and universities. This program is administered by the Bush Foundation.

Knowledge Development. The Foundation supports research, evaluations, and other approaches that lead to the systematic accumulation of knowledge and produce more effective ways to address educational problems.

Using Technology Effectively. The Foundation supports innovative, technology-based projects that explore ways of substantially increasing the effectiveness and quality of content and instruction, both on campus and via distance learning.

Opportunity Grants. The Foundation will consider especially meritorious proposals that are consistent with the overall aims of the Education Program but that fit none of the formal categories.

Elementary and Secondary Education

Proposals are expected to advance the quality and equality of education practice. The Foundation does not support supplementary or compensatory programs, electing instead to focus on institutional and policy changes that have promise of improving the quality of schooling on a system-wide basis and for a sustained period of time.

Bay Area Regional Support. The Foundation supports organizations and programs that develop capacity and provide support for public school reform and improvement in the San Francisco Bay Area. In 1995, the Hewlett and Annenberg foundations jointly awarded a \$50 million, five-year matching challenge grant to the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative (BASRC) for public school reform in the counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Marin. In 2000, the two foundations extended their grants to BASRC for another five years. Priority will be given to proposals that reinforce the reform objectives of BASRC.

Education Policy and Reform. The Foundation funds organizations and efforts that promise to contribute significantly to our understanding of how to improve public elementary and secondary schools in California and nationally. The Foundation is particularly interested in proposals that address urban education issues and educational issues of Latino and African-American students.

Knowledge Development. The Foundation supports research, evaluations, and other approaches that lead to the systematic accumulation of knowledge and produce more effective ways to address education problems.

Using Technology Effectively. The Foundation supports projects that extend our understanding of how to use technology effectively to provide all students with high-quality content and instruction, within classrooms and through distance learning.

Opportunity Grants. The Foundation will consider especially meritorious proposals that are consistent with the overall aims of the Education Program but that fit none of the formal categories.

Higher Education

Pluralism and Unity

To support pluralism and unity programs at colleges and universities

BROWN UNIVERSITY Providence, Rhode Island	\$150,000
DUKE UNIVERSITY Durham, North Carolina	150,000
FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE Rindge, New Hampshire	150,000
HAMILTON COLLEGE Clinton, New York	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Ann Arbor, Michigan	150,000
RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE Troy, New York	150,000
WHEATON COLLEGE Norton, Massachusetts	150,000

Liberal Arts Institutions

To support liberal arts institutions programs

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING Menlo Park, California	
<i>For a collaboration to build practical understanding of and commitment to the liberal arts and diversity in American higher education</i>	2,400,000
COUNCIL FOR AID TO EDUCATION New York, New York	
<i>For a quality assessment of the outcomes of liberal arts and sciences undergraduate education in the United States</i>	500,000
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY Fairfield, Connecticut	140,000
HENDRIX COLLEGE Conway, Arkansas	95,000
NAZARETH COLLEGE OF ROCHESTER, FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE Rochester, New York	150,000
OBERLIN COLLEGE Oberlin, Ohio	150,000
PACIFIC UNIVERSITY Forest Grove, Oregon	95,000
SAINT LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY Canton, New York	150,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY Seattle, Washington	150,000
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE Swarthmore, Pennsylvania	105,000
UNION COLLEGE Schenectady, New York	150,000
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY Middletown, Connecticut	150,000

Research Universities: General Education

To support programs in general education

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, DEPARTMENT OF PLANETARY SCIENCES Tucson, Arizona	150,000
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE Hanover, New Hampshire	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS Davis, California	150,000
GEOGETOWN UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR NEW DESIGNS IN LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP Washington, D.C.	150,000
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY Washington, D.C.	150,000
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR INTEGRATIVE STUDIES East Lansing, Michigan	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA Columbia, South Carolina	130,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, STANFORD LEARNING LABORATORY Stanford, California	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT Burlington, Vermont	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON Seattle, Washington	150,000

Technology

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT NORTHRIDGE, DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY Northridge, California <i>For the Heritage Conservation in Baja California Sur project in collaboration with the Universidad Autonoma de Baja California Sur (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	100,000
--	---------

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania <i>For the Latin American Technology Educational Network, a collaborative project with the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	300,000
COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES Washington, D.C. <i>For a project entitled Technological Change and the Transformation of the Liberal Arts College Library</i>	75,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY, VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico <i>For development of Community Learning Centers (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	300,000
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the OpenCourseWare@MIT project</i>	5,500,000
WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION Boulder, Colorado <i>For a program to develop tools that the higher education community needs to integrate online learning and the World Wide Web into teaching and learning</i>	1,500,000
UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR, DEPARTAMENTO DE GEOLOGÍA MARINA La Paz, Baja, California Sur, Mexico <i>For the Heritage Conservation in Baja California Sur project in collaboration with California State University, Northridge (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000

Knowledge Development

BOSTON COLLEGE Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts <i>For a study on the impact of American Rhodes Scholars since World War II</i>	75,000
SOCIAL POLICY AND HEALTH ECONOMICS RESEARCH AND EVALUATION INSTITUTE Burlingame, California <i>For assessing the impact of financial aid on college access</i>	30,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Stanford, California <i>For the Philosophy Discovery Institute</i>	15,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stanford, California <i>For a research project to test the effect of racial diversity on critical thinking in college students</i>	75,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
---	---------------------------------------

Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities

BUSH FOUNDATION

Saint Paul, Minnesota

For the support of historically black private colleges and universities

900,000

Opportunity Grants

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Washington, D.C.

For strategic planning efforts

75,000

BROWN UNIVERSITY, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Providence, Rhode Island

For the post-doctoral fellowship program on educational reform

300,000

JOHN F. KENNEDY UNIVERSITY

Orinda, California

For the capital campaign to develop a new campus

3,300,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Stanford, California

For the U.S.-Russia Student Leadership Summit, a conference focused on fostering student leadership and public service training

30,000

Elementary and Secondary Education

Reform in the Bay Area

BAY AREA SCHOOL REFORM COLLABORATIVE

San Francisco, California

For the Hewlett-Annenberg Challenge for school reform in the Bay Area

(Awarded in 2000 for \$25,000,000)

5,000,000

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES OF SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco, California

For the Revitalizing Education and Learning project

(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)

125,000

EVERY CHILD CAN LEARN FOUNDATION

San Francisco, California

For Linking San Francisco, a program to make service-learning sustainable in grades K-12 in San Francisco schools

(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)

50,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Berkeley, California

For the Career Academy Support Network

250,000

**Education:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

JULIA MORGAN CENTER FOR THE ARTS

Berkeley, California

*For a Northern California pilot of a Lincoln Center Institute-affiliated program for training teachers and teaching artists
(Collaboration with Performing Arts)*

75,000

MANPOWER DEMONSTRATION RESEARCH CORPORATION

New York, New York

*For Phase Two of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative evaluation
For the planning and design of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Phase Two evaluation*

2,000,000
50,000

PUBLIC / PRIVATE VENTURES

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

For an analysis of the condition of college access programs in California

75,000

ROCKMAN ET CETERA

San Francisco, California

For a research project on Bay Area informal learning institutions to be conducted by Design Worlds for Learning, Inc.

12,000

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM OF THE CENTRAL COAST

Capitola, California

For the National Board Certified Teachers Collaborative

10,000

SUNNYVALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Sunnyvale, California

For the Full Option Science System project, to be managed by the Coalition for Excellence in Science Education

30,000

WESTED

San Francisco, California

For the Strategic Literacy Initiative

40,000

For the Western Assessment Collaborative program

490,000

For the Strategic Literacy Initiative

450,000

Technology

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Palo Alto, California

For expansion of the study on Internet-based distance learning

250,000

For research and development to expand access to challenging high school curricula via Internet-based distance learning

75,000

EDITORIAL PROJECTS IN EDUCATION

Bethesda, Maryland

For Technology Counts, Education Week's annual report on school technology

1,410,000

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS FUND

Washington, D.C.

For the Learning Federation Roadmapping project for learning technologies

75,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA Gainesville, Florida <i>For Partnership in Global Learning (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, CENTER FOR EDUCATION Washington, D.C. <i>For a workshop on technology and assessment</i>	75,000
<i>Knowledge Development</i>	
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, DEPARTMENT OF POLICY STUDIES AND ECONOMICS Los Angeles, California <i>For a project entitled Designing Incentives for School Accountability Systems</i>	57,000
CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING Menlo Park, California <i>For the Advancement of Teaching to support work on an ecological approach to school reform</i>	75,000
CORPORATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF POLICY EVALUATION Washington, D.C. <i>For an evaluation of the Teach for America program, in collaboration with Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.</i> <i>For an assessment of the performance of experimental designs</i>	501,700 150,000
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI OF COLUMBIA, PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT Columbia, Missouri <i>For the creation of a Center for Research Synthesis Methodology</i>	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For the Systematic Review Applications in Education project</i>	150,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stanford, California <i>For a study entitled Exploring New Opportunities for Teacher Learning at the Intersections of Research and Practice</i>	75,000
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON, WISCONSIN CENTER FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH Madison, Wisconsin <i>For the development of infrastructure to support research on teaching and learning</i>	10,000
<i>National and State Reform and Policy</i>	
ACHIEVE Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For a project entitled Defining the Twenty-first Century New Basic Skills—Aligning the New Economy High Skill Needs with High School Academic Standards</i>	2,400,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
ASPEN INSTITUTE, PROGRAM ON EDUCATION New York, New York <i>For the Urban High School project</i>	465,000
CENTER ON EDUCATION POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For an invitational conference on distance learning</i>	55,000
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW New York, New York <i>For the Project on Public Problem Solving (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution, Environment, and Special Projects)</i>	250,000
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES Denver, Colorado <i>For the development of 10th Amendment guidelines</i>	75,000
GREATSCHOOLS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	450,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Civil Rights Project</i>	500,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Boston Public Schools Data project entitled Using Assessment Data to Improve Student Learning</i>	355,000
KCET, COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA Los Angeles, California <i>For School: The Story of American Public Education, a PBS documentary series by Stone Lantern Films</i>	50,000
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For a study on the long-term effects of large-scale reforms in New York City's District Two</i>	75,000
PUBLIC EDUCATION NETWORK Washington, D.C. <i>For the Partnership for Public Education program</i>	1,000,000
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For research to help the California Joint Legislative Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education program</i>	1,100,000
RAND CORPORATION Santa Monica, California <i>For analytic assistance to the Los Angeles public school system</i>	50,000
SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION, SAN DIEGO DIALOGUE La Jolla, California <i>For a community engagement initiative for San Diego City schools</i>	75,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION San Diego, California <i>For reform initiatives in the San Diego Unified School District</i>	7,500,000
WOODROW WILSON NATIONAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION Princeton, New Jersey <i>For expansion of the Schools and Scholars initiative</i>	300,000

Universal Basic Education

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Washington, D.C. <i>For basic education advocacy activities in developing countries (Collaboration with Population)</i>	200,000
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Universal Basic and Secondary Education project (Collaboration with Population)</i>	300,000
BROOKINGS INSTITUTION Washington, D.C. <i>For the Universal Education Forum and Book project (Collaboration with Population)</i>	500,000
EQUAL ACCESS San Francisco, California <i>For information and education services to displaced persons in Pakistan and Afghanistan</i>	75,000
STATE OF THE WORLD FORUM San Francisco, California <i>For the distance learning project managed by Equal Access</i>	75,000

Opportunity Grants

CAPITAL OF TEXAS PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL Austin, Texas <i>For a documentary entitled Do You Speak American? (Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	125,000
SMITH COLLEGE, PROJECT ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL CHANGE Northampton, Massachusetts <i>For outreach activities for the Hewlett-supported film entitled Only a Teacher</i>	35,000

Environment

The Hewlett Foundation's longstanding commitment to protecting the environment was continued in 2001, with support largely going to organizations devoted to the protection and restoration of the natural resources of the tri-national North American West. Among the Environment Program's 2001 highlights were:

- Strong collaborative grantmaking with the U.S.–Latin American Relations Program dedicated to building the capacity of organizations working on U.S.–Mexico border issues;
- New or expanded investments in our environmental journalism category, with grants going to organizations working on a daily basis with editors, producers, and reporters to help expand the amount, the depth, and the salience of the coverage of environmental issues;
- Smart-growth grants aimed at helping select regions to establish metropolitan plans that better manage the tensions between the growth of human settlements and the need to preserve open space; and
- Exploratory grantmaking in the Russian Far East.

In addition, the Foundation launched an Energy Initiative in response to California's electricity crisis and growing national attention on energy issues. Our grantmaking focused on three key areas: California's electricity crisis, Intermountain West oil and gas development issues, and national energy policy. Among the Energy Initiative's 2001 highlights were:

- A California research grant package designed to bolster the analytical underpinnings for long-term energy policy reform;
- Grants to Latino community groups and to a consortium of religious organizations to help build in-house expertise on the inter-relationships between poverty and energy/environmental concerns and to provide direct services for low-income families dealing with rising energy costs;
- Support for the RAND Corporation to conduct a comprehensive analysis of existing data (taking into account available development, extraction, and transport technologies; economics of

Program Description

extraction and transport; transportation infrastructure; and environmental factors) to develop a reliable estimate of the oil, gas, and coal reserves found on federal lands in the Intermountain West;

- Support for an analysis of coal-bed methane development by the Natural Resources Law Center at the University of Colorado at Boulder, to provide a more detailed understanding of the impacts, the regulatory structure, and the technologies associated with this form of energy production; and
- Grants to support the Energy Foundation's work on national energy policy, including its efforts to increase support for clean-energy research and development.

The Environment Program at the Hewlett Foundation is in the midst of an assessment of opportunities in the field aimed at building a long-term strategic plan. We expect to publish new guidelines for the entire program on the Foundation's Web site, www.hewlett.org, by the end of 2002.

Journalism and Education

AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS FOUNDATION

Mill Valley, California

For the ACFnewsouce project

\$350,000

ENVIRONMENT HAWAII

Hilo, Hawaii

For general support

200,000

HIGH COUNTRY FOUNDATION

Paonia, Colorado

For general support

300,000

INSTITUTES FOR JOURNALISM AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Missoula, Montana

For the Wallace Stegner Initiative

900,000

RADIO AND TELEVISION NEWS DIRECTORS FOUNDATION

Washington, D.C.

For the Environmental Journalism Center

200,000

Environmental Sciences, Economics, and Policy

ANDRUS CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Boise, Idaho

For general support

(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)

200,000

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, CONSORTIUM ON NORTH AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION COLLABORATION

Tucson, Arizona

For the Border Partners in ACTion program

(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)

300,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO

La Jolla, California

For the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies

(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)

100,000

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, SCHOOL OF LAW

Boulder, Colorado

For the Natural Resources Law Center

325,000

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW

New York, New York

For the Project on Public Problem Solving

(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution, Education, and Special Projects)

250,000

EL COLEGIO DE LA FRONTERA NORTE

El Paso, Texas

For the Paso del Norte Border Studies Working Group

(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)

100,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For a research, publication, and outreach program designed to address the precarious state of environmental law in the federal courts</i>	75,000
HAWAII COMMUNITY FOUNDATION Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the Natural Resources Conservation program</i>	1,000,000
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION Sacramento, California <i>For general support</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA Missoula, Montana <i>For the Center for the Rocky Mountain West</i>	300,000
NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION Washington, D.C. <i>For the Options Analysis and Transition Planning of the Business Plan Initiative</i>	75,000
NORTHERN PLAINS RESOURCE COUNCIL Billings, Montana <i>For the Stillwater Good Neighbor Agreement project (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	300,000
PLANNING AND CONSERVATION LEAGUE Sacramento, California <i>For the California Environmental Dialogue</i>	300,000
PRONATURA A.C. Mexico City, Mexico <i>For the integration of Pronatura's activities in Sonora, Sinaloa, and Baja California into a single chapter of Pronatura Noroeste/Mar de Cortes (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	350,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR ECONOMIC POLICY RESEARCH Stanford, California <i>For the Research Initiative on the Environment, Economy, and Sustainable Welfare</i>	1,500,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES Stanford, California <i>For the Center for Conservation Biology (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	300,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For Centro Internacional de Desarrollo Rural Sustentable / International Center for Sustainable Rural Development (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations) For the Resources for Community Collaboration project (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	100,000 0

**Environment:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL NEGOTIATION
Charlottesville, Virginia

*For the Community-based Collaborative Research Consortium project
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*

0

WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE

Washington, D.C.

*For general support
(Collaboration with Population)*

0

Environmental Management in Rural Communities

AGRICULTURAL LAND-BASED TRAINING ASSOCIATION

Salinas, California

*For general support
(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)*

100,000

AMERICAN FARMLAND TRUST

Washington, D.C.

For field activities in the Rocky Mountain region

150,000

CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION

Bethesda, Maryland

*For the National Rural Funders Collaborative
(Collaboration with Family and Community Development
and U.S.-Latin American Relations)*

100,000

CENTER FOR HOLISTIC RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Albuquerque, New Mexico

For general support

250,000

COMMUNITY ALLIANCE WITH FAMILY FARMERS

Davis, California

For general support

100,000

ECOTRUST

Portland, Oregon

For general support

250,000

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE

New York, New York

*For protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay-Delta and the
Colorado River ecosystems*

400,000

GREAT VALLEY CENTER

Modesto, California

*For general support
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*

800,000

HUMBOLDT AREA FOUNDATION

Bayside, California

*For the Native Performance Fund
(Collaboration with Performing Arts)*

0

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
INITIATIVE FOR SOCIAL ACTION AND RENEWAL IN EURASIA Washington, D.C. <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	500,000
INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY Redway, California <i>For general support</i>	50,000
NATIVE AMERICAN RIGHTS FUND Boulder, Colorado <i>For the research and writing of the book entitled <i>The Modern Indian Movement: Tribal Action and the Revival of Native Homelands</i></i>	30,000
NATURE CONSERVANCY Arlington, Virginia <i>For conservation initiatives involving the Western, Pacific Northwest, and Rocky Mountain divisions</i>	500,000
NATURE CONSERVANCY OF HAWAI'I Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the community-based Ahupua'a Stewardship project at Pu'uwa'awa'a on the island of Hawaii</i>	200,000
PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES CENTER Oakland, California <i>For a regranting program to leading conservation organizations in Asian Russia (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	500,000
PACIFIC FOREST TRUST Santa Rosa, California <i>For general support</i>	250,000
SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE South Lake Tahoe, California <i>For general support</i>	100,000
SONORAN INSTITUTE Tucson, Arizona <i>For the Western Roundup and Western Gathering</i>	13,000
SUSTAINABLE CONSERVATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	350,000
SUSTAINABLE NORTHWEST Portland, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	50,000
TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE Fairbanks, Alaska <i>For training and workshops on negotiation skills (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	0
WATERSHED RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTER Hayfork, California <i>For general support</i>	50,000

**Environment:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

WESTERN FOLKLIFE CENTER

Elko, Nevada

*For general support
(Collaboration with Performing Arts)*

45,000

Growth Management in Metropolitan Areas

COALITION FOR UTAH'S FUTURE

Salt Lake City, Utah

For the Envision Utah project

3,000,000

COMMUNITY CONSERVANCY INTERNATIONAL

Los Angeles, California

For the Baldwin Hills Regional Park project

100,000

ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE

Los Angeles, California

For general support

300,000

GEORGIA STRAIT ALLIANCE

Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada

For general support

300,000

GREENBELT ALLIANCE

San Francisco, California

For general support

200,000

METROPOLITAN AREA RESEARCH CORPORATION

Minneapolis, Minnesota

*For California Metropatterns, a study of social separation, fiscal capacity,
and regional growth in California's largest regions*

(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)

50,000

NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENT WATCH

Seattle, Washington

For general support

300,000

ONE THOUSAND FRIENDS OF WASHINGTON

Seattle, Washington

For general support

300,000

PEOPLE FOR PUGET SOUND

Seattle, Washington

For general support

200,000

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

San Francisco, California

*For the Growth, Land Use, and Environment Survey Series conducted
in collaboration with the Hewlett, Irvine, and Packard foundations
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution and Population)*

250,000

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION POLICY PROJECT

Washington, D.C.

For Smart Growth America

300,000

For the California Transportation Education Campaign

300,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the California Futures Network</i>	500,000
WESTERN CONSENSUS COUNCIL Helena, Montana <i>For the Western Regionalism project</i>	20,000
Freshwater Management	
BAY INSTITUTE OF SAN FRANCISCO San Rafael, California <i>For general support</i>	250,000
FUNDACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE LA COMUNIDAD Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico <i>For community-based sustainable environment programs (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	500,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY, CENTRO DE CALIDAD AMBIENTAL Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico <i>For a collaborative assessment of the water resources of the Rio Grande basin (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	100,000
LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES Boulder, Colorado <i>For the Smart Water project</i>	75,000
MASCAREÑAS FOUNDATION El Paso, Texas <i>For regional regranting programs (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	500,000
NATURAL HERITAGE INSTITUTE Berkeley, California <i>For a physical assessment of the water resources of the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Basin (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	235,000
NATURE CONSERVANCY Arlington, Virginia <i>For the Freshwater Initiative</i>	1,000,000
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE Las Cruces, New Mexico <i>To develop a regional geographic information system (GIS) to support regional water planning in the Paso del Norte region (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	40,000
PRO ESTEROS LAGUNAS Y MARISMAS DE LAS CALIFORNIAS Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico <i>For general support (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
RESOURCE RENEWAL INSTITUTE San Francisco, California <i>For research and writing on global freshwater resources and international dams</i>	75,000
RIVER NETWORK Portland, Oregon <i>For expansion of the grassroots river and watershed movement in the West</i>	300,000
SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the John Krautkraemer Memorial Fund</i>	200,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For Project del Rio (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	0
 <i>Energy Initiative</i>	
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY Tempe, Arizona <i>For a joint study of energy conservation via social norms with California State University at San Marcos</i>	270,000
CALIFORNIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES Sacramento, California <i>For the California Interfaith Energy Assistance project</i>	750,000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT SAN MARCOS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY San Marcos, California <i>For a joint study of energy conservation via social norms with Arizona State University</i>	320,000
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, CENTER OF THE AMERICAN WEST Boulder, Colorado <i>For a project to examine energy from a historical viewpoint</i>	60,000
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, SCHOOL OF LAW Boulder, Colorado <i>For the Natural Resources Law Center's project to conduct an analysis of coal-bed methane development</i>	180,000
ENERGY FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For work on energy and western lands issues</i>	2,235,000
<i>For work on the Hewlett Foundation's Energy Initiative</i>	4,020,000
LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES Boulder, Colorado <i>For development of a clean electric energy plan</i>	200,000
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION Sacramento, California <i>For development of a sustainable, institutional structure for local energy programs in California</i>	23,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL New York, New York <i>For the Joint Energy Initiative of the NRDC's energy, land, and water program</i>	600,000
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL San Francisco, California <i>For the NRDC/Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group partnership in their work on energy efficiency in the high tech sector</i>	100,000
RAND CORPORATION Santa Monica, California <i>For an analysis of the energy resource base in the Intermountain West and to examine the opportunities and constraints on development</i>	450,000
ROCKY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTE Snowmass, Colorado <i>For the National Energy Policy Initiative, a collaborative project with the Consensus Building Institute</i>	180,000
WILDERNESS SOCIETY Denver, Colorado <i>For an expert peer review of energy plans on public lands in the West</i>	172,000
<i>Other</i>	
ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For a retreat for emerging leaders in environmental philanthropy</i>	25,000
LAND INSTITUTE Salina, Kansas <i>For general support</i>	300,000
NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION Washington, D.C. <i>For the Enhancing Diversity Initiative</i>	500,000
PLANNING AND CONSERVATION LEAGUE Sacramento, California <i>For the Diversity Initiative</i>	150,000
ROCKEFELLER FAMILY FUND New York, New York <i>For the Environmental Grantmakers Association</i>	100,000
ROCKY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTE Snowmass, Colorado <i>For general support</i>	500,000

Family and Community Development

Through its work in the Family and Community Development Program, the Foundation seeks to improve the functioning of low-income families and the livability of distressed neighborhoods in the San Francisco Bay Area. To this end, the Foundation supports local and regional organizations that serve Bay Area communities and a limited number of national organizations whose work directly benefits local and regional efforts. Grants are made in the following areas.

Neighborhood Improvement. The Foundation supports multi-year, comprehensive, cross-disciplinary efforts of community-based partnerships aimed at improving the human, economic, and physical conditions in selected neighborhoods. Proposals are considered on an invitation-only basis.

Community Service. The Foundation supports school- and community-based K-12 and a limited number of higher education service learning programs. In addition, it provides support to locally sponsored national service activities that involve young people in strengthening the ability of neighborhoods to respond to critical human development, public safety, and environmental issues.

Responsible Fatherhood and Male Involvement. The Foundation supports programs that enable fathers to participate actively in the emotional and financial support of the family and that promote adult male involvement in the lives of children and youth from father-absent environments.

Transition to Work. The Foundation supports comprehensive programs that respond to the employment, education and training, child care, and other needs of families who require assistance in making the transition from public benefit programs to self-sufficiency.

Employment Development. The Foundation supports partnerships among industry, government, job-training programs, educational institutions, and community-based organizations that expand job and wage opportunities for low-skilled, low-wage workers through strategies that target growth sectors of the economy.

Program Description

Emerging Opportunities. The Foundation supports efforts that explore emerging practice and policy innovation in new domains and that reflect intersections of interest between and among various program areas.

Transition to Work

CALIFORNIA BUDGET PROJECT Sacramento, California <i>For the Welfare Reform Monitoring project</i>	\$100,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, CALIFORNIA POLICY RESEARCH CENTER Berkeley, California <i>For the Welfare Policy Research project</i>	665,000
CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For efforts to inform national welfare and workforce development policy</i>	500,000
FINANCE PROJECT Washington, D.C. <i>For the Welfare Information Network</i>	500,000
GOODWILL INDUSTRIES San Francisco, California <i>For the Career Advancement Center</i>	300,000
JEWISH VOCATIONAL AND CAREER COUNSELING SERVICE San Francisco, California <i>For the Gateway to Health Care Careers program</i>	300,000
JUMA VENTURES San Francisco, California <i>For the Job Network program</i>	300,000
LOW-INCOME FAMILIES' EMPOWERMENT THROUGH EDUCATION Oakland, California <i>For the Bay Area Empowerment and Education Retention project</i>	170,000
PROJECT TRANSITION Oakland, California <i>For the Corporate Training program</i>	225,000
SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Bay Area Works project</i>	300,000
SPANISH SPEAKING UNITY COUNCIL Oakland, California <i>For the Comprehensive Integrated Resources for CalWORKS Limited English Speakers employment program</i>	220,000
WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN Washington, D.C. <i>For the California State Organizing Project for Family Economic Self-Sufficiency</i>	300,000

Employment Development

CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE ASSOCIATION

Sacramento, California

For programs to educate California State Legislators on critical workforce development issues

200,000

CATHOLIC CHARITIES OF THE EAST BAY

Oakland, California

For the training of working-poor clients for employment as computer technicians

200,000

MANPOWER DEMONSTRATION RESEARCH CORPORATION

Oakland, California

For a study of community college access to and retention of low-wage working parents and for a study on creating work support centers in California

450,000

WORKFORCE STRATEGY CENTER

Brooklyn, New York

For the Community College–Community Based Organization Best Practices study

124,000

Community Service

CITY YEAR

San Jose, California

For the San Jose/Silicon Valley office

200,000

COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES OF SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco, California

*For the Revitalizing Education and Learning project
(Collaboration with Education)*

125,000

EAST BAY CONSERVATION CORPS

Oakland, California

For Project YES

80,000

EVERY CHILD CAN LEARN FOUNDATION

San Francisco, California

*For Linking San Francisco, a program to make service-learning sustainable in grades K-12 in San Francisco schools
(Collaboration with Education)*

50,000

MID-PENINSULA YWCA

Palo Alto, California

For the Youth Community Service program

75,000

PUBLIC ALLIES

San Jose, California

For general support

90,000

**Family and Community Development:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

San Francisco, California

For the Office of Community Service Learning

155,000

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN SERVICE PROJECT

San Francisco, California

For general support

75,000

SAN JOSE MERCURY NEWS WISH BOOK FUND

San Jose, California

For general support

25,000

VOLUNTEER CENTER OF ALAMEDA COUNTY

Oakland, California

For efforts to increase youth volunteerism and civic engagement by providing membership services and structured volunteer projects

58,000

YOUTH SERVICE CALIFORNIA

Oakland, California

For general support and for the Service Learning 2000 Center

400,000

Neighborhood Improvement

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SILICON VALLEY

San Jose, California

For the Mayfair Improvement Initiative

1,356,000

PENINSULA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

San Mateo, California

For the One East Palo Alto Neighborhood Improvement Initiative

1,442,000

SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION

San Francisco, California

For the Seventh Street/McClymonds Corridor Improvement Initiative

1,266,000

Responsible Fatherhood and Male Involvement

**ALAMEDA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, VOLUNTEER LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION**

Oakland, California

For the Family Law project

350,000

BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS OF SILICON VALLEY

San Jose, California

For the Passport to Manhood program

70,000

CALIFORNIA PARENTING INSTITUTE

Santa Rosa, California

For the Father Link project

150,000

**Family and Community Development:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

CENTERS ON FATHERS, FAMILIES AND PUBLIC POLICY Madison, Wisconsin <i>For technical assistance and training to community-based organizations serving low-income fathers in Northern California</i>	30,000
COMMUNITY BUILDING INSTITUTE East Palo Alto, California <i>For the Responsible Fatherhood program</i>	50,000
FAMILY LAW CENTER San Rafael, California <i>For the Fatherhood Development and Rights program</i>	75,000
FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY OF SAN FRANCISCO San Francisco, California <i>For the Together Taking Care of Business program</i>	75,000
FAMILY STRESS CENTER Concord, California <i>For the Proud Fathers program</i>	55,000
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES Baltimore, Maryland <i>For the Responsible Fatherhood management information system project</i>	1,400,000
LEGAL ACTION CENTER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK New York, New York <i>For the National Center to Promote the Employment of Ex-Offenders</i>	200,000
MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICES AGENCY San Jose, California <i>For the Male Involvement program</i>	75,000
MOVE San Francisco, California <i>For fatherhood and parenting activities</i>	65,000
NATIONAL COALITION OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS FOR YOUTH Basehor, Kansas <i>For the Fathers Matter program</i>	200,000
PRO BONO PROJECT OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY San Jose, California <i>For the Family Law Advocates program</i>	350,000
PUBLIC / PRIVATE VENTURES Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For an analysis of San Francisco Bay Area fatherhood programs</i>	96,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Social Policy Action Network program</i>	50,000

Emerging Opportunities

CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION

Bethesda, Maryland

For the National Rural Funders Collaborative

(Collaboration with Environment and U.S.–Latin American Relations)

150,000

COMPASSPOINT NONPROFIT SERVICES

San Francisco, California

For the Bay Area Space Study

(Collaboration with Performing Arts)

328,000

MANCHESTER-BIDWELL CORPORATION

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

For the Bayview Hunters Point Center for Arts and Technology

(Collaboration with Performing Arts)

100,000

METROPOLITAN AREA RESEARCH CORPORATION

Minneapolis, Minnesota

*For California Metropatterns, a study of social separation, fiscal capacity,
and regional growth in California's largest regions*

(Collaboration with Environment)

195,000

PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE

San Francisco, California

For the Partners–United States initiative

(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)

0

PENINSULA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION, CENTER FOR VENTURE PHILANTHROPY

San Mateo, California

For the Assets for All Alliance program

600,000

VILLAGE FOUNDATION

Alexandria, Virginia

For the Team 2000 program

25,000

Other

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA CRUZ, CENTER FOR JUSTICE,
TOLERANCE AND COMMUNITY**

Santa Cruz, California

For the Connecting for the Common Good program

210,000

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF NONPROFITS

Los Angeles, California

For the 2001 annual conference

10,000

CHRONICLE SEASON OF SHARING FUND

San Francisco, California

For general support

70,000

Family and Community Development: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
--	---------------------------------------

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SILICON VALLEY San Jose, California <i>For the Palo Alto Weekly Holiday Fund</i>	40,000
COUNCIL FOR ADULT AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING Chicago, Illinois <i>For the Lifelong Learning Accounts program</i>	40,000
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS San Francisco, California <i>For the Summer Youth Project</i>	75,000
PENINSULA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION San Mateo, California <i>For the 2001–2002 Holiday Fund</i>	40,000
<i>For the 2000–2001 Holiday Fund</i>	35,000

Performing Arts

The Foundation's Performing Arts Program entertains applications from professional dance, music, opera, musical theater, and theater companies as well as organizations that present the performing arts. In addition, the Foundation supports arts councils that serve San Francisco Bay Area communities and service organizations that assist performing arts organizations in all disciplines. It also makes grants to support Bay Area nonprofit film and video service organizations.

The focus of Foundation support is on long-term artistic development and managerial stability, which is achieved primarily through a strategy of multi-year general operating support to organizations of programmatic merit that operate without incurring annual deficits. Where appropriate, the Foundation may recommend a matching requirement and, additionally, that a portion of matching funds be applied to endowments or cash reserves to help ensure the long-term financial stability of the grantee.

The Foundation gives preference to independent nonprofit Bay Area organizations with an established record of artistic achievement, audience support, managerial capacity, and realistic planning for artistic and organizational development. Artistic training programs, particularly those focused on young people, continue to be of interest to the Foundation.

The Foundation does not support one-time events, such as seminars, conferences, festivals, or touring costs for performing companies. It regrets that it cannot currently consider requests from individual artists or from organizations in the following areas: the visual or literary arts; radio, film, or video production; the humanities; elementary or secondary school programs; college or university proposals; community art classes; recreational, therapeutic, and social service arts programs; and cultural foreign exchange programs.

Program Description

Music

ALI AKBAR COLLEGE OF MUSIC

San Rafael, California

For general support

\$120,000

AMERICAN BACH SOLOISTS

San Francisco, California

For general support

30,000

BERKELEY SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Berkeley, California

For working capital and long-range planning

55,000

CALIFORNIA SUMMER MUSIC

San Francisco, California

For general support

25,000

CALIFORNIA SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Pleasant Hill, California

For general support

210,000

CAZADERO PERFORMING ARTS CAMP

Berkeley, California

For general support

90,000

CROSSPULSE

Berkeley, California

For general support

30,000

DANCE PALACE

Point Reyes Station, California

For general support

45,000

EARPLAY

San Francisco, California

For general support

15,000

FREMONT SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Fremont, California

For general support

80,000

HOLY NAMES COLLEGE

Oakland, California

For the Kodály program

25,000

IVES STRING QUARTET

Palo Alto, California

For general support

10,000

LOS CENZONTLES MEXICAN ARTS CENTER

San Pablo, California

For general support

60,000

**Performing Arts:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

MAGNIFICAT! San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	60,000
MARIN SYMPHONY ASSOCIATION San Rafael, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
MIDSUMMER MOZART San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	25,000
MONTEREY JAZZ FESTIVAL Monterey, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
MUSICAL TRADITIONS San Francisco, California <i>For general support and commissioning</i>	165,000
NAPA VALLEY SYMPHONY ASSOCIATION Napa, California <i>For general support</i>	50,000
NEW CENTURY CHAMBER ORCHESTRA San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	100,000
OAKLAND EAST BAY SYMPHONY Oakland, California <i>For general support and strategic planning</i>	75,000
OAKLAND INTERFAITH GOSPEL CHOIR Oakland, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
OAKLAND YOUTH CHORUS Oakland, California <i>For general support</i>	100,000
OTHER MINDS San Francisco, California <i>For general support and acquiring and preserving the music archives of KPFA Radio</i>	75,000
PALO ALTO CHAMBER ORCHESTRA Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
RHYTHMIC CONCEPTS Oakland, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
ROVA:ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support and commissioning</i>	20,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
SAN DOMENICO SCHOOL San Anselmo, California <i>For the Virtuoso program</i>	120,000
SAN FRANCISCO EARLY MUSIC SOCIETY Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
SAN FRANCISCO GIRLS CHORUS San Francisco, California <i>For general support and commissioning</i>	160,000
SAN FRANCISCO LIVE ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	10,000
SANTA ROSA SYMPHONY Santa Rosa, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
STANFORD JAZZ WORKSHOP Stanford, California <i>For general support</i>	120,000
WOMEN'S PHILHARMONIC San Francisco, California <i>For planning</i>	20,000
<i>Theater</i>	
A TRAVELING JEWISH THEATRE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
AURORA THEATRE COMPANY Berkeley, California <i>For matching funds to be applied to debt reduction and costs of opening a new theater</i>	70,000
BRAVA! FOR WOMEN IN THE ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
DELL' ARTE Blue Lake, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
EXIT THEATRE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
MAGIC THEATRE San Francisco, California <i>For augmented general support</i>	50,000

**Performing Arts:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

MAKE*A*CIRCUS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	60,000
PLAYWRIGHTS FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	45,000
SAN FRANCISCO MIME TROUPE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	180,000
SAN JOSE MULTICULTURAL ARTISTS GUILD San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	40,000
SAN JOSE STAGE COMPANY San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
THEATRE BAY AREA San Francisco, California <i>For general support and for the regranting program</i>	375,000
THEATREWORKS Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	375,000

Opera and Music Theater

FESTIVAL OPERA ASSOCIATION Walnut Creek, California <i>For general support</i>	145,000
OPERA SAN JOSÉ San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	300,000
SAN FRANCISCO OPERA ASSOCIATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	750,000
WEST BAY OPERA ASSOCIATION Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000

Dance

ABHINAYA DANCE COMPANY OF SAN JOSE San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	60,000
---	--------

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
--	------------------------------

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION Berkeley, California <i>For conversion of a University gymnasium in San Francisco into a dance research and development facility</i>	100,000
DANCERS' GROUP San Francisco, California <i>For Bay Area Celebrates National Dance Week 2001 and 2002</i>	20,000
<i>For the Stephen Pelton Dance Theater</i>	36,000
JUNE WATANABE IN COMPANY San Rafael, California <i>For general support</i>	36,000
NA LEI HULU I KA WEKIU HULA HALAU San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	45,000
PENINSULA BALLET THEATRE San Mateo, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF CIRCUS ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
SAN JOSE CLEVELAND BALLET San Jose, California <i>For one-time acquisition costs</i>	250,000

Film and Video

BAY AREA VIDEO COALITION San Francisco, California <i>For general support and for planning</i>	280,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY Berkeley, California <i>For the Pacific Film Archive</i>	150,000
FILM ARTS FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
KQED San Francisco, California <i>For Spark, a collaborative project with the Bay Area Video Coalition</i>	1,500,000
SAN FRANCISCO CINEMATHEQUE San Francisco, California <i>For general support and strategic planning</i>	107,000

Supporting Services

AMERICAN COMPOSERS FORUM

Saint Paul, Minnesota

For general support and for Composers Datebook

200,000

AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LEAGUE

New York, New York

For general support

100,000

ARTS COUNCIL SILICON VALLEY

San Jose, California

For general support and for the Collaborative Marketing Initiative

375,000

ASSOCIATION OF PERFORMING ARTS PRESENTERS

Washington, D.C.

For general support including a San Francisco Bay Area initiative

150,000

BERNARD OSHER MARIN JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

San Rafael, California

For the CenterStage program

105,000

CALIFORNIA LAWYERS FOR THE ARTS

San Francisco, California

For general support

60,000

CHAMBER MUSIC AMERICA

New York, New York

For general support directed toward services in California

40,000

CHORUS AMERICA

Washington, D.C.

For general support directed toward initiatives in the San Francisco Bay Area

90,000

COMPASSPOINT NONPROFIT SERVICES

San Francisco, California

For the Bay Area Space Study

(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)

0

DIABLO REGIONAL ARTS ASSOCIATION

Walnut Creek, California

For development of a strategic plan

20,000

DJERASSI RESIDENT ARTISTS PROGRAM

Woodside, California

For general support

50,000

FORT MASON FOUNDATION

San Francisco, California

For Cowell Theater's In Performance Series

75,000

GRACE CATHEDRAL

San Francisco, California

For the Music at Grace Cathedral program

45,000

**Performing Arts:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

HEADLANDS CENTER FOR THE ARTS

Sausalito, California

For general support 50,000

INTERSECTION FOR THE ARTS

San Francisco, California

For general support 105,000

MEET THE COMPOSER

New York, New York

For general support of San Francisco Bay Area initiatives 150,000

MINNESOTA PUBLIC RADIO

Saint Paul, Minnesota

For a classical music demonstration project on radio and the Web 400,000

MONTALVO ASSOCIATION

Saratoga, California

For general support 300,000

OPERA AMERICA

Washington, D.C.

For general support with emphasis on the San Francisco Bay Area Initiative 150,000

PATAPHYSICAL BROADCASTING FOUNDATION

Santa Cruz, California

For the Remote Broadcast Series 65,000

SAN JOSE MUSEUM OF ART

San Jose, California

For performing arts programming 10,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Stanford, California

For Lively Arts at Stanford 160,000

STERN GROVE FESTIVAL ASSOCIATION

San Francisco, California

For general support 20,000

THEATRE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP

New York, New York

For general support 60,000

YERBA BUENA CENTER FOR THE ARTS

San Francisco, California

For general support and commissioning 330,000

Other

BOSTON SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Boston, Massachusetts

*For a symposium entitled The 21st Century Music Director:
Role, Image, Activities, Training* 25,000

**Performing Arts:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

CLASSICS FOR KIDS FOUNDATION

Bozeman, Montana

For general support

75,000

FRIENDS OF PHOTOGRAPHY

San Francisco, California

For the Ansel Adams Center

50,000

HUMBOLDT AREA FOUNDATION

Bayside, California

*For the Native Performance Fund
(Collaboration with Environment)*

300,000

JULIA MORGAN CENTER FOR THE ARTS

Berkeley, California

*For a Northern California pilot of a Lincoln Center Institute-affiliated program for training teachers and teaching artists
(Collaboration with Education)*

75,000

MANCHESTER-BIDWELL CORPORATION

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

*For the Bayview Hunters Point Center for Arts and Technology
(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)*

100,000

MEM ASSOCIATES

New York, New York

For a direct-marketing test for a proposed Chronicle of the Arts

50,000

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS

San Francisco, California

For the Arts Loan Fund

45,000

PALO ALTO CHAMBER ORCHESTRA

Palo Alto, California

In memory of the founder and music director, William Whitson

10,000

SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION COMMUNITY INITIATIVE FUNDS

San Francisco, California

For San Francisco Classical Voice

10,000

WESTERN FOLKLIFE CENTER

Elko, Nevada

*For general support
(Collaboration with Environment)*

105,000

YALE UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND LIBRARY

New Haven, Connecticut

For an ongoing program to create an archive of audio and videotaped interviews of living composers

75,000

ZELLERBACH FAMILY FUND

San Francisco, California

For the Community Arts Distribution Committee

300,000

ZEUM

San Francisco, California

For general support

50,000

Population

Papid population growth continues to be a significant worldwide problem, despite the impact that organized family planning programs have had in reducing fertility. The Foundation has three primary goals in this area: (1) to increase the involvement of the public and private sectors, the media, and educational institutions in population issues; (2) to improve the delivery of family planning and related reproductive health services; and (3) to evaluate and help replicate the impact of educational and economic development activities on fertility. U.S. population issues are also of concern but represent a small proportion of the Foundation's annual program budget.

Within these three priorities, the Foundation supports a range of activities. Specific interests include the following areas:

- Policy-oriented research and educational activities that inform policymakers both in the United States and abroad about the importance of population issues and the relevance of demographic change to other aspects of human welfare. The Foundation emphasizes efforts to expand the availability of financial resources and, through training, human resources to address population issues.
- Programs that address neglected issues, such as services for young people, and programs that develop and disseminate the knowledge and techniques needed to improve the quality and effectiveness of family planning activities. Support is also provided to evaluate the cost and practicality of service programs that address broader reproductive health concerns in conjunction with family planning.
- The study of human development activities and interventions that affect fertility, such as programs that enhance women's economic and educational opportunities, improve their legal rights, diminish gender inequities, and foster female self-determination. Preference will be given to programs that include assessment of the cost and practicality of larger scale replication and evaluation of their impact on fertility behavior. Research on migration is also supported.

Program Description

- Carefully selected research and development activities with the purpose of developing new and improved fertility control methods. The applied research and field testing needed to speed the development and availability of promising methods of fertility regulation is supported, rather than basic research.

There are no geographic limitations on support for research, family planning projects, or training. Although the focus of such activities will be on developing countries, selected U.S. organizations that engage in highly leveraged domestic family planning activities are eligible for support.

The Foundation generally provides organizational (rather than project) support, and it favors those organizations that seek to bridge the gap between research, policy formulation, and program implementation.

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
---	------------------------------

Increasing Commitment to Address Population Issues

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Washington, D.C.

*For basic education advocacy activities in developing countries
(Collaboration with Education)*

\$1,200,000

ACTION CANADA FOR POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

For general support

900,000

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Washington, D.C.

For development of a digital version of the Atlas of Population and Environment

65,000

ASIAN FORUM OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Bangkok, Thailand

For general support

1,000,000

ASPEN INSTITUTE, DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP PROGRAM

Washington, D.C.

For the Global Interdependence Initiative

75,000

ASSOCIAÇÃO PARA O PLANEAMENTO DA FAMÍLIA

Lisbon, Portugal

For general support

200,000

ASSOCIATION OF CENTERS FOR FAMILY PLANNING AND SEX EDUCATION

Gent, Belgium

For general support

360,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS

Berkeley, California

For the Second World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists

35,000

CATHOLICS FOR A FREE CHOICE

Washington, D.C.

For general support

900,000

CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE LAW AND POLICY

New York, New York

For general support

2,000,000

CHILD TRENDS

Washington, D.C.

For general support

450,000

CHOICE U.S.A.

Washington, D.C.

For general support

300,000

COALITION FOR WOMEN'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GLOBAL EQUALITY

Washington, D.C.

For general support

225,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
EARTH POLICY INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	375,000
EQUILIBRES & POPULATIONS Paris, France <i>For general support</i>	900,000
FACING THE FUTURE: PEOPLE AND THE PLANET Lopez Island, Washington <i>For general support</i>	75,000
FILM MAKERS COLLABORATIVE, LINDA HARRAR PRODUCTIONS Boston, Massachusetts <i>For production of the PBS miniseries World in the Balance</i>	75,000
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	300,000
JAPANESE ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN FAMILY PLANNING Tokyo, Japan <i>For the Asia-Pacific Alliance for Advancing the Goals of the International Conference on Population and Development</i>	300,000
MEDICAL STUDENTS FOR CHOICE Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	600,000
NARAL FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	900,000
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL Washington, D.C. <i>For the Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change for a workshop and for a related published volume entitled New Research on Population and the Environment</i>	75,000
NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR WOMEN AND FAMILIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the Women's Health Initiative</i>	75,000
NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL Washington, D.C. <i>For population initiatives within the Environmental Health Center</i>	450,000
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Albuquerque, New Mexico <i>For a project entitled Learning from Experience: Accounts and Documents from Population Pioneers</i>	300,000
PHYSICIANS FOR REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE AND HEALTH New York, New York <i>For the National Family Planning Initiative</i>	300,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
PLANET 21 London, England <i>To update and maintain the Web site</i>	200,000
POPULATION RESOURCE CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	500,000
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For the Growth, Land Use, and Environment Survey Series conducted in collaboration with the Hewlett, Irvine, and Packard foundations (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution and Environment)</i>	0
SCENARIOS USA New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	150,000
SELF RELIANCE FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	200,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Africa Grantmakers Affinity Group</i> 50,000 <i>For the Center for Environment and Population</i> 75,000	
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, FACULTY OF LAW Toronto, Ontario, Canada <i>For the International Programme on Reproductive and Sexual Health Law</i>	400,000
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE Toronto, Ontario, Canada <i>For the Ingenuity Gap project</i>	10,000
UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For the United Nations Population Fund</i>	1,000,000
UNITED STATES COMMITTEE FOR UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	600,000
WOMEN'S LINK WORLDWIDE Montpelier, Vermont <i>For general support</i>	70,000
WOMEN'S POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	200,000
WORLD POPULATION FOUNDATION Hilversum, The Netherlands <i>For general support</i>	800,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	750,000
ZERO POPULATION GROWTH Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	900,000
 <i>International Family Planning and Reproductive Health</i>	
BRIDGING THE GAP FOUNDATION Dawsonville, Georgia <i>For the Spanish translation and distribution of a book entitled A Personal Guide to Managing Contraception for Women and Men</i>	200,000
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, MAILMAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH New York, New York <i>For the Mother-to-Child-Transmission Plus Initiative</i>	1,000,000
FRONTERAS UNIDAS PRO SALUD ASOCIACIÓN CIVIL Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico <i>For general support</i>	300,000
INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION London, England <i>For general support</i>	1,000,000
INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION, WESTERN HEMISPHERE REGION New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	1,500,000
IPAS Chapel Hill, North Carolina <i>For general support</i>	3,000,000
MANAGEMENT SCIENCES FOR HEALTH Boston, Massachusetts <i>For reproductive health programs in sub-Saharan Africa</i>	400,000
MARIE STOPES INTERNATIONAL London, England <i>For general support</i>	1,000,000
PATH Seattle, Washington <i>For general support</i>	1,100,000
POPULATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	3,500,000
SAVE THE CHILDREN Westport, Connecticut <i>For population activities</i>	500,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
---	------------------------------

Domestic Family Planning Activities

ADVOCATES FOR YOUTH Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	1,000,000
ASSOCIATION OF REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH PROFESSIONALS Washington, D.C. <i>For the Emergency Contraception Hotline and Web site</i>	75,000
NATIONAL ABORTION FEDERATION Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	650,000
PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	3,600,000
PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF MINNESOTA / SOUTH DAKOTA Saint Paul, Minnesota <i>For community organizing and public affairs work</i>	75,000

Population Research and Training

AFRICAN POPULATION AND HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER Nairobi, Kenya <i>For general support</i>	500,000
ALAN GUTTMACHER INSTITUTE New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	1,400,000
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Universal Basic and Secondary Education project (Collaboration with Education)</i>	500,000
BRAZILIAN POPULATION ASSOCIATION, CEDEPLAR / UFMG Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil <i>For the XXIVth General Population Conference in Salvador, Bahia, Brazil (Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	75,000
BROOKINGS INSTITUTION Washington, D.C. <i>For the Universal Education Forum and Book project (Collaboration with Education)</i>	100,000
CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the Population and Health Studies program</i>	500,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, POPULATION RESEARCH Chicago, Illinois <i>For interdisciplinary training in international population research</i>	450,000
COMMONWEALTH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TRUST London, England <i>For reproductive health activities in developing countries</i>	200,000
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY Baltimore, Maryland <i>For the Hopkins Population Center</i>	500,000
JSI RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE Arlington, Virginia <i>For the Empowerment of Women research program</i>	350,000
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL Chapel Hill, North Carolina <i>For the Carolina Population Center</i>	400,000
PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S HEALTH Los Angeles, California <i>For general support</i>	600,000
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For the Population Studies Center</i>	500,000
POPULATION COUNCIL, OFFICE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	650,000
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY Princeton, New Jersey <i>For the Office of Population Research</i>	700,000
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON Seattle, Washington <i>For the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON, CENTER FOR DEMOGRAPHY AND ECOLOGY Madison, Wisconsin <i>For research and training programs</i>	450,000
WORLD BANK INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For the Adapting to Change Program on Population, Reproductive Health, and Health Sector Reform</i>	400,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
---	------------------------------

Contraceptive Development

ALLIANCE FOR MICROBicide DEVELOPMENT Silver Spring, Maryland <i>For general support</i>	175,000
<hr/>	
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN FRANCISCO, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS, GYNECOLOGY, AND REPRODUCTIVE SCIENCES San Francisco, California <i>For the Center for Reproductive Health Research and Policy</i>	900,000

Migration Studies

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES Y ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES EN ANTROPOLOGIA Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	270,000
<hr/>	
MIGRATION DIALOGUE Davis, California <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)</i>	200,000
<hr/>	
REFUGEES INTERNATIONAL Washington, D.C. <i>For advocacy on behalf of refugee and internally displaced women</i>	75,000

Special Projects

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
Philanthropy	
ASPEN INSTITUTE New York, New York <i>For the Initiative for Social Innovation Through Business program</i>	\$100,000
THE BRIDGESSPAN GROUP Boston, Massachusetts <i>For Social Capital Market programs</i>	145,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Project on Good Work</i>	750,000
LA PIANA ASSOCIATES Piedmont, California <i>For the Strategic Solutions project</i>	200,000
PENINSULA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION San Mateo, California <i>For the Foundation Incubator project</i>	400,000
PHILANTHROPIC RESEARCH Williamsburg, Virginia <i>For GuideStar, a nonprofit information service</i>	1,000,000
THE ROBERTS FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the documentation and distribution of the Ongoing Assessment of Social Impact project</i>	52,000
SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For Social Venture Partners Bay Area start-up activities</i>	25,000
SEATTLE FOUNDATION Seattle, Washington <i>For the Social Venture Partners Cities Plan</i>	215,000
SUSTAINABILITY INSTITUTE Hartland Four Corners, Vermont <i>For the International Sustainability Indicators Network project</i>	50,000
THE TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the New Visions project</i>	125,000
URBAN INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy</i>	2,000,000

WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

San Francisco, California

For the Global Philanthropy Forum Conference: Giving Without Borders

100,000

Other

ADVANCEMENT PROJECT

Los Angeles, California

For funding of an internship position

75,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, UCLA CENTER FOR HEALTHIER CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES

Los Angeles, California

For an international research and technical assistance conference and follow-up program

25,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT MERCED

Merced, California

For acquisition of land and habitat to develop the University of California Merced campus

2,000,000

CAPITAL OF TEXAS PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL

Austin, Texas

*For a documentary entitled Do You Speak American?
(Collaboration with Education)*

125,000

CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

Washington, D.C.

For policy work on behalf of low-income, unemployed workers and their families

60,000

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Washington, D.C.

For public education initiatives

60,000

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW

New York, New York

For the Labor Study Tour 2002

124,000

For the Project on Public Problem Solving

250,000

(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution, Education, and Environment)

ELLA BAKER CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

San Francisco, California

For direct mail fundraising

5,000

FUND FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BROOKLYN AND STATEN ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Staten Island, New York

For support to the Brooklyn and Staten Island School District in helping children deal with the terrorist attacks of September 11 by implementing the Sera Learning Programs

6,000

FUND FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Long Island City, New York

For programs to help children deal with the terrorist attacks of September 11 by implementing the Sera Learning Programs

19,000

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
GEOGETOWN UNIVERSITY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Constitution Project, an election reform initiative</i>	437,500
GEOGETOWN UNIVERSITY, LAW CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For the Madison Society for Law and Policy</i>	75,000
GREATER WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, MACNEIL /LEHRER PRODUCTIONS Arlington, Virginia <i>For underwriting the broadcast of The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer</i>	1,600,000
HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH New York, New York <i>For a program to address hate crimes against Arab-Americans and other minority groups</i>	75,000
INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTER Herzliya, Israel <i>For the publication of an English version of the book Critical Thinking</i>	180,000
ISSUES TV Bedford Hills, New York <i>For a PBS special on election reform</i>	75,000
LINK SERVICES San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF ROCKLAND COUNTY, YOUTH BUREAU New City, New York <i>For the County of Rockland's Do the Math III: The Poverty Equation symposium</i>	5,000
MILLER CENTER FOUNDATION Charlottesville, Virginia <i>For the National Commission on Federal Election Reform, a collaborative project with the Century Foundation</i>	650,000
OREGON SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL Ashland, Oregon <i>For general support in recognition of Ray Bacchetti's service to the Foundation</i>	50,000
PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION New York, New York <i>For the Program Development Fund</i>	250,000
SAFE HORIZON New York, New York <i>For programs to benefit the victims and survivors of the World Trade Center tragedy</i>	25,000
SALZBURG SEMINAR Middlebury, Vermont <i>For the Universities project</i>	750,000

**Special Projects:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

STAND FOR CHILDREN

Washington, D.C.

For general support

75,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Stanford, California

*For the School of Humanities and Sciences and for undergraduate
education programs*

400,000,000

THEATREWORKS

Palo Alto, California

For general support in recognition of Ray Bacchetti's service to the Foundation

50,000

THE TIDES CENTER

San Francisco, California

For the Youth Transition Funders Group

10,000

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY INITIATIVE

Washington, D.C.

For distribution of a documentary film entitled John Gardner: Uncommon American

50,000

YELLOW BARN MUSIC SCHOOL AND FESTIVAL

Putney, Vermont

For general support

15,000

TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS (EXCLUDING GIFTS) FOR 2001

\$212,005,200

U.S.–Latin American Relations

T

he U.S.–Latin American Relations Program seeks to strengthen U.S. and Latin American institutions—and foster cooperation among them—in order to address a specific set of common challenges facing the Americas.

This mission is built upon two central premises. First, continuing hemispheric economic and social integration is highly likely and desirable. Second, the shape that future integration takes is anything but preordained. The program seeks to help develop the institutional capacity, the human resources, and the information that will shape and improve hemispheric relations into the future.

The program conceives of U.S.–Latin American relations broadly: relations in the Americas are those among institutions and communities of interest as well as among nation-states. The program thus does not focus narrowly on diplomatic or “strategic” relations. Rather, it includes within its focus environmental issues, political and institutional consolidation, and economic and social policy.

Currently, the program makes grants to organizations in Latin America and the United States in three areas:

Environment. Freshwater management, environmental policy, and corporate social responsibility.

Democratic Governance. Public security, judicial reform, and innovations in legal education in Latin America.

Equitable Economic Growth. Education, migration, and applied economic- and social-policy research.

The program also funds a small number of policy-focused area studies programs in Latin American countries, fellowship programs, and support organizations. (For more detailed information on these areas and a listing of sample grants in these components, see the Foundation Web site.)

The program focuses on redressing four infrastructural problems in these areas:

- Institutions in Latin America are not optimally robust, and civil society remains weak;
- The work of institutions is generally poorly coordinated, particularly across national borders;

Program Description

- Human resources remain underdeveloped; and
- Essential information is poor or nonexistent.

The U.S.–Latin American Relations Program thus supports institutions that:

- Train qualified people;
- Create new knowledge;
- Bring well-qualified people together so that they can effectively influence public policy;
- Put knowledge to work; and
- Link communities of interest in the United States and Latin America in order to address hemispheric challenges.

The program emphasizes collaboration among institutions—most important, between U.S. and Latin American institutions, but also among Latin American institutions—with the aim of strengthening the institutional grassroots of current and future inter-American relations.

The program works in close affinity with other Foundation programs, actively collaborating on grantmaking with the programs in Environment, Education, Conflict Resolution, and Population.

- With the Environment Program, the U.S.–Latin American Relations Program funds environmental work in the U.S.–Mexican border region with a focus on freshwater issues;
- With the Education Program, the U.S.–Latin American Relations Program is developing an initiative in the use of distance-education technologies in Mexico;
- With the Conflict Resolution Program, the U.S.–Latin American Relations Program has initiated a series of grants in the areas of judicial reform, legal-curriculum development, public security, and police reform; and
- With the Population Program, the U.S.–Latin American Relations Program supports a dozen programs in Mexican migration to the United States, U.S. immigration policy, and comparative migration studies.

Priority countries and regions are Mexico, the U.S.–Mexican border, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina. Strengthening Latin American institutions in these regions is the principal focus of Foundation support.

Full proposals are considered on an invitation-only basis. Two-page letters of inquiry are always welcome. In assessing requests for support, strong preference is accorded

- Latin American organizations;
- Programs of research, outreach, and exchange that are designed to yield significant and permanent enhancements of institutional strengths;
- Programs that involve the active participation of policymakers, opinion leaders, and representatives of stakeholder communities; and
- Initiatives that conduct activities in collaboration with other institutions.

Environment

ACRE GROUP FOR AGROFORESTRY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION Rio Branco, Acre, Brazil <i>For general support</i>	\$300,000
AGRICULTURAL LAND-BASED TRAINING ASSOCIATION Salinas, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, CONSORTIUM ON NORTH AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION COLLABORATION Tucson, Arizona <i>For the Border Partners in ACTion program (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	300,000
BUSINESS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY San Francisco, California <i>For the EMPRESA initiative</i>	335,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO La Jolla, California <i>For the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	200,000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT NORTHRIDGE, DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY Northridge, California <i>For the Heritage Conservation in Baja California Sur project in collaboration with the Universidad Autonoma de Baja California Sur (Collaboration with Education)</i>	100,000
CENTRO BRASILEIRO DE ANÁLISE E PLANEJAMENTO São Paulo, Brazil <i>For environment programs</i>	200,000
CENTRO MEXICANO DE DERECHO AMBIENTAL Mexico City, Mexico <i>For general support</i>	300,000
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, AMERICAS CENTER ON SCIENCE AND SOCIETY New York, New York <i>For comparative studies on estuaries in the Americas</i>	300,000
EL COLEGIO DE LA FRONTERA NORTE El Paso, Texas <i>For the Paso del Norte Border Studies Working Group (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
EL COLEGIO DE MÉXICO, CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS ECONÓMICOS Mexico City, Mexico <i>For the Science, Technology, and Development Program, a collaborative project with Tufts University</i>	200,000

**U.S.-Latin American Relations:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

ETHOS INSTITUTE OF BUSINESS AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	
São Paulo, Brazil	
<i>For general support</i>	200,000
FONDO MEXICANO PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE LA NATURALEZA	
Mexico City, Mexico	
<i>For general support</i>	300,000
FUNDACIÓN AMBIENTE Y RECURSOS NATURALES	
Buenos Aires, Argentina	
<i>For general support</i>	300,000
FUNDACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE LA COMUNIDAD	
Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico	
<i>For community-based sustainable environment programs (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	500,000
FUNDACIÓN MARGARITA MIRANDA DE MASCAREÑAS	
Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico	
<i>For the Heritage Project in Ciudad Juarez</i>	100,000
FUNDACIÓN TERRAM	
Santiago, Chile	
<i>For general support</i>	600,000
GENERACIÓN EMPRESARIAL	
Santiago, Chile	
<i>For general support</i>	200,000
INSTITUTO DO HOMEM E MEIO AMBIENTE DA AMAZÔNIA	
Ananindeua, Para, Brazil	
<i>For environmental programs</i>	200,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY, CENTRO DE CALIDAD AMBIENTAL	
Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico	
<i>For a collaborative assessment of the water resources of the Rio Grande basin (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
MASCAREÑAS FOUNDATION	
El Paso, Texas	
<i>For regional regranting programs (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	500,000
NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL	
Lander, Wyoming	
<i>For the NOLS Patagonia and the NOLS Mexico programs</i>	400,000
NATURAL HERITAGE INSTITUTE	
Berkeley, California	
<i>For a physical assessment of the water resources of the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Basin (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	40,000

**U.S.-Latin American Relations:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Las Cruces, New Mexico

*To develop a regional geographic information system (GIS) to support
regional water planning in the Paso del Norte region
(Collaboration with Environment)*

35,000

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

For general support

200,000

PRO ESTEROS LAGUNAS Y MARISMAS DE LAS CALIFORNIAS
Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico

*For general support
(Collaboration with Environment)*

150,000

PRONATURA A.C.
Mexico City, Mexico

*For the integration of Pronatura's activities in Sonora, Sinoloa, and Baja California
into a single chapter of Pronatura Noroeste/Mar de Cortes
(Collaboration with Environment)*

250,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Stanford, California

*For the Center for Conservation Biology
(Collaboration with Environment)*

0

THE TIDES CENTER
San Francisco, California

*For Centro Internacional de Desarrollo Rural Sustentable/International Center
for Sustainable Rural Development
(Collaboration with Environment)*

100,000

*For Project del Rio
(Collaboration with Environment)*

300,000

**UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR,
DEPARTAMENTO DE GEOLOGÍA MARINA**
La Paz, Baja, California Sur, Mexico

*For the Heritage Conservation in Baja California Sur project in collaboration
with California State University, Northridge
(Collaboration with Education)*

150,000

Democratic Governance

**CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW, MCGILL CENTER FOR CREATIVE PROBLEM
SOLVING**

San Diego, California

*For a program on judicial reform in Latin America
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*

150,000

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN PARA EL DESARROLLO
Mexico City, Mexico

For a project on public security in Mexico

200,000

**U.S.-Latin American Relations:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DOCENCIA ECONÓMICAS Delegación Alvaro Obregón, Mexico		
<i>For a project on public security in Mexico in comparative perspective</i>	200,000	
<i>For a collaborative project with the Stanford Program in International Legal Studies (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000	
FUNDAÇÃO GETULIO VARGAS, CENTER FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNMENT São Paulo, Brazil		
<i>For public management and citizenship programs</i>	300,000	
FUNDACIÓN PARA EL CAMBIO DEMOCRÁTICO, PARTNERS-ARGENTINA Buenos Aires, Argentina		
<i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000	
INSTITUTO DE DESARROLLO ECONÓMICO Y SOCIAL Buenos Aires, Argentina		
<i>For general support</i>	400,000	
INTER-AMERICAN DIALOGUE Washington, D.C.		
<i>For general support</i>	300,000	
MANHATTAN INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN POLICY STUDIES New York, New York		
<i>For work on public security in Latin American cities (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	300,000	
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, LAW SCHOOL Stanford, California		
<i>For the Program in International Legal Studies (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000	
UNIVERSIDAD ALBERTO HURTADO, INSTITUTO LATINOAMERICANO DE DOCTRINAS Y ESTUDIOS SOCIALES Santiago, Chile		
<i>For a studies and exchange program with San Diego State University (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000	
UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE TEMUCO Temuco, Chile		
<i>For Proyecto Acceso (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000	
UNIVERSIDADE CANDIDO MENDES Centro Rio de Janeiro, Brazil		
<i>For the Centro de Estudos de Segurança e Cidadania (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000	
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS, CENTER FOR STUDIES OF CRIME AND PUBLIC SECURITY Belo Horizonte, Brazil		
<i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000	

U.S.-Latin American Relations: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2001
---	---------------------------------------

WASHINGTON OFFICE ON LATIN AMERICA

Washington, D.C.

*For general support, with emphasis on public security
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*

150,000

**WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS,
LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM**

Washington, D.C.

For the Mexico program

50,000

*For programs on public security in Latin America
(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*

50,000

Equitable Economic Growth

ACCION INTERNATIONAL

Somerville, Massachusetts

For general support

300,000

CARE-BRAZIL

Atlanta, Georgia

For general support

200,000

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

*For the Latin American Technology Educational Network, a collaborative project
with the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey*

200,000

*For the Latin American Technology Educational Network, a collaborative project
with the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey
(Collaboration with Education)*

300,000

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DOCENCIA ECONÓMICAS

Delegación Alvaro Obregón, Mexico

For a comparative studies program on Latin American economic issues

200,000

FACULTAD LATINOAMERICANA DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, ARGENTINA

Buenos Aires, Argentina

For general support

300,000

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Gainesville, Florida

*For Partnership in Global Learning
(Collaboration with Education)*

150,000

**INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY,
VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY**

Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico

*For development of Community Learning Centers
(Collaboration with Education)*

300,000

**JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, PAUL H. NITZE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

Washington, D.C.

For the Western Hemisphere program

400,000

**U.S.-Latin American Relations:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION,
CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS DE LA REALIDAD ECONÓMICA Y SOCIAL
Montevideo, Uruguay

For the Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association's 2001 conference

75,000

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY OF
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
East Lansing, Michigan

*For a conference on the role of social capital in poverty-alleviation policies
in Latin America*

75,000

OXFORD UNIVERSITY, LATIN AMERICAN CENTRE
Oxford, England

For a database on twentieth-century economic indicators for Latin America

75,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SOCIAL SCIENCE HISTORY INSTITUTE
Stanford, California

*For a collaborative research program with the Center for Research
on Economic Development and Policy Reform*

400,000

UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, DEPARTAMENTO DE INGENIERÍA INDUSTRIAL
Santiago, Chile

For the Centro de Economía Aplicada

400,000

UNIVERSIDAD TORCUATO DI TELLA
Buenos Aires, Argentina

For a volume on Argentine economic history

50,000

Migration

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES Y ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES EN ANTROPOLOGIA
Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico

*For general support of migration programs
(Collaboration with Population)*

0

MIGRATION DIALOGUE
Davis, California

*For general support
(Collaboration with Population)*

100,000

Policy-Focused Area Studies

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, LATIN AMERICAN AREA CENTER
Tucson, Arizona

For the Oaxacan Summer Institute and the Latin American Area Center

300,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN
STUDIES

Berkeley, California

For general support

400,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, LATIN AMERICAN CENTER
Los Angeles, California

For general support

100,000

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	
Washington, D.C.	
For the Americas Program (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)	150,000
<hr/>	
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, BILDNER CENTER FOR WESTERN HEMISPHERE STUDIES	
New York, New York	
For general support	100,000
<hr/>	
EL COLEGIO DE MÉXICO, CENTRO DE RELACIONES INTERNACIONALES	
Mexico City, Mexico	
For general support	200,000
<hr/>	
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STUDIES	
Storrs, Connecticut	
For the Latin American Studies Consortium of New England	200,000
<hr/>	
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, DAVID ROCKEFELLER CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES	
Cambridge, Massachusetts	
For development of a program of policy research, convenings, and dissemination that will result in the two-volume Cambridge Economic History of Latin America	50,000
<hr/>	
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES	
Stanford, California	
For general support	200,000
<hr/>	
UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS AMÉRICAS—PUEBLA	
Cholula, Puebla, Mexico	
For the North American master's degree program	400,000
<hr/>	
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES SOBRE AMÉRICA DEL NORTE (CISAN)	
Mexico City, Mexico	
For general support	200,000

Other/Opportunity

BRAZILIAN POPULATION ASSOCIATION, CEDEPLAR / UFMG	
Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil	
For the XXIVth General Population Conference in Salvador, Bahia, Brazil (Collaboration with Population)	0
<hr/>	
CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION	
Bethesda, Maryland	
For the National Rural Funders Collaborative (Collaboration with Environment and Family and Community Development)	0
<hr/>	
EL PASO COMMUNITY FOUNDATION	
El Paso, Texas	
For the Border Heritage project	100,000

**U.S.-Latin American Relations:
Organizations
(by Category)**

**Grants
Authorized
2001**

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

New York, New York

*For the Mexico fellowship program jointly funded by the Hewlett, Ford,
and MacArthur foundations*

950,000

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

For the September 2001 congress

75,000

PAN AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CALIFORNIA

San Francisco, California

For general support

100,000

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Austin, Texas

For Latino USA

400,000

Advice to Applicants

because programs are under continuing review, the most efficient means of initial contact with the Hewlett Foundation is a letter of inquiry, addressed to the Proposal Administrator. The Foundation prefers to receive letters of inquiry and proposals as documents in Microsoft Word format, attached to electronic mail messages (loi@hewlett.org).

The letter should contain a brief statement of the applicant's need for funds and enough factual information to enable the staff to determine whether or not the application falls within the Foundation's areas of preferred interest or warrants consideration as a special project. There is no fixed minimum or maximum with respect to the size of grants; applicants should provide a straightforward statement of their needs and aspirations for support, taking into account other possible sources of funding.

Letters of application will be acknowledged upon their receipt, but because the Foundation prefers to operate with a small staff, a more detailed response may in some cases be delayed. Applicants who have not had a substantive reply after a reasonable period of time should feel free to make a follow-up inquiry.

The Foundation recognizes that significant programs require time to demonstrate their value. It is therefore willing to consider proposals covering several years of support. While the Foundation will entertain specific projects in its areas of interest and will on occasion provide general support for organizations of special interest, it expects to work primarily through organizations active in its main programs. Like most foundations, the Hewlett Foundation is unwilling to assume responsibility for the long-term support of any organization or activity.

All inquiries are reviewed first by the relevant program director. He or she will either (1) in consultation with the president, decline a request that seems unlikely to result in a project the Foundation can support; (2) request further information if a decision cannot be made on the basis of the initial inquiry; or (3) present the request to the rest of the staff for discussion.

Applicants who receive a favorable response to their initial inquiry will be invited to submit a formal proposal. Special supporting materials may be requested in some cases, but normally the proposal should include:

- A concise statement of the purpose of the request, its significance or uniqueness in relation to other work being done in the field, and the results sought.
- A budget for the program; an indication of other prospective funding sources and the amount requested of each; and a statement of the sponsoring organization's total budget and financial position. Applicants should indicate how they would continue a successful program once support from the Hewlett Foundation ceases.
- The identity and qualifications of the key personnel to be involved.
- A list of members of the governing body.
- Evidence of tax-exempt status.
- A statement to the effect that the proposal has been reviewed by the applicant's governing body and specifically approved for submission to The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Normally the Foundation will not consider grants for basic research, capital construction funds, grants in the medical or health-related fields, or general fundraising drives. It will not make grants or loans to individuals or grants intended directly or indirectly to support candidates for political office or to influence legislation.

Grants must be approved by the Board of Directors, which meets quarterly. Meeting dates are available upon request, but applicants should realize that even proposals that are to be recommended for Board approval cannot, in every case, be reviewed at the first meeting following their receipt. All inquiries and proposals are reported to the Board, including those declined at the staff level.

Financial Statements

THE WILLIAM AND FLORA HEWLETT FOUNDATION

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS

*To the Board of Directors of
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation*

In our opinion, the accompanying statements of financial position and the related statements of activities and changes in net assets and of cash flows present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation ("the Foundation") at December 31, 2001 and 2000, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Foundation's management; our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits of these statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 7, 2002

*Statements of Financial Position
(Dollars in Thousands)*

	December 31	
	2001	2000
ASSETS		
Investments, at fair value		
Hewlett-Packard and Agilent common stock	\$ 985,973	\$ 475,973
Other public domestic equities	1,241,666	1,248,879
Public international equities	483,121	480,416
Private equities	567,437	805,420
Fixed income	707,971	747,242
Cash equivalents	160,511	48,369
Receivables for interest and dividends	9,081	8,185
Net due to brokers	(152,663)	(151,299)
Total investments	<u>4,003,097</u>	<u>3,663,185</u>
Cash	939	26
Federal excise tax refundable	1,705	8,255
Prepaid expenses and other assets	597	189
Distribution receivable from Hewlett Trust (<i>Note 4</i>)	1,913,143	-0-
Fixed assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization	26,325	12,378
	<u>\$ 5,945,806</u>	<u>\$ 3,684,033</u>
LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS		
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	\$ 5,743	\$ 2,688
Grants payable	143,586	54,483
Gift payable, net of discount (<i>Note 7</i>)	336,928	-0-
Deferred federal excise tax	-0-	8,223
Total liabilities	<u>486,257</u>	<u>65,394</u>
Commitments (<i>Note 3</i>)		
Unrestricted net assets	3,546,406	3,618,639
Temporarily restricted net assets (<i>Note 4</i>)	1,913,143	-0-
	<u>5,459,549</u>	<u>3,618,639</u>
	<u>\$ 5,945,806</u>	<u>\$ 3,684,033</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 84–89.

*Statements of Activities and
Changes in Net Assets
(Dollars in Thousands)*

	Year Ended December 31	
	2001	2000
Net investment revenues and (losses) gains:		
Interest, dividends and others	\$ 76,442	\$ 77,916
(Loss) gain on investment portfolio	(768,338)	628,041
Investment management expense	(8,879)	(8,213)
Net investment (loss) income	<u>(700,775)</u>	<u>697,744</u>
Net federal excise tax benefit (expense) on net investment income	<u>7,328</u>	<u>(5,552)</u>
Net investment revenues and gains	<u>(693,477)</u>	<u>692,192</u>
Expenses:		
Grants authorized, net of cancellations	(209,356)	(136,518)
Gift authorized, net of discount (<i>Note 7</i>)	(336,928)	-0-
Administrative expenses	<u>(12,213)</u>	<u>(8,023)</u>
(Deficit) Excess of income over expenses before contribution	<u>(1,251,944)</u>	<u>547,651</u>
Contribution, net of deferred federal excise tax	<u>1,179,711</u>	<u>394,835</u>
Change in unrestricted net assets	<u>(72,233)</u>	<u>942,486</u>
Temporarily restricted revenues:		
Contributions (<i>Note 4</i>)	<u>1,913,143</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Change in temporarily restricted net assets	<u>1,913,143</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Change in total assets	<u>1,840,910</u>	<u>942,486</u>
Net assets at beginning of year	<u>3,618,639</u>	<u>2,676,153</u>
Net assets at end of year	<u>\$ 5,459,549</u>	<u>\$ 3,618,639</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 84–89.

Statements of Cash Flows
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Year Ended December 31	
	2001	2000
Cash flows from operating activities:		
Cash collected on program-related loan receivable	\$ -0-	\$ 1,429
Interest and dividends received	76,808	74,218
Cash received (paid) for federal excise tax, net of refund	5,655	(16,794)
Cash paid to suppliers and employees	(21,446)	(16,252)
Grants paid	(119,923)	(135,748)
Net cash used in operating activities	<u>(58,906)</u>	<u>(93,147)</u>
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Purchases of equipment	(642)	(289)
New building project	(11,896)	(1,093)
Cash received from partnership distributions	30,085	18,906
Proceeds from sale of investments	4,621,883	7,033,295
Purchase of investments	(4,579,611)	(6,958,090)
Net cash from investing activities	<u>59,819</u>	<u>92,729</u>
Net increase (decrease) in cash	913	(418)
Cash at beginning of year	26	444
Cash at end of year	<u>\$ 939</u>	<u>\$ 26</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 84–89.

Statements of Cash Flows
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Year Ended December 31	
	2001	2000
Reconciliation of change in net assets to net cash used in operating activities:		
Change in total net assets	\$ 1,840,910	\$ 942,486
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash used in operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization	372	385
Stock contributions	(1,179,711)	(400,000)
Increase in interest and dividends receivable	(896)	(3,698)
Decrease (increase) in federal excise tax refundable	6,550	(5,549)
(Increase) decrease in prepaid expenses and other assets	(408)	1,375
Increase in distribution receivable from Hewlett Trust	(1,913,143)	-0-
Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and accrued liabilities	1,274	(347)
Increase in grants payable	89,103	770
Increase in gift payable, net of discount	336,928	-0-
Decrease in deferred federal excise tax	(8,223)	(528)
Net unrealized and realized losses (gains) on investments	768,338	(628,041)
Net cash used by operating activities	\$ (58,906)	\$ (93,147)
Supplemental data for non-cash activities:		
Stock contributions	\$ 1,179,711	\$ 400,000
Fixed-asset additions, not yet paid, included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities	\$ 1,781	\$ -0-

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 84–89.

*Notes to Financial Statements
December 31, 2001 and 2000
(Dollars in Thousands)*

NOTE 1

The Organization

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (“the Foundation”) is a private foundation incorporated in 1966 as a nonprofit charitable organization. The Foundation’s grantmaking activities are concentrated in the seven program areas of conflict resolution, education, environment, family and community development, performing arts, population, and U.S.–Latin American relations. More detailed information regarding the Foundation’s charitable activities can be obtained from the Foundation’s Web site at www.hewlett.org.

NOTE 2

*Significant
Accounting Policies*

Basis of presentation. The accompanying financial statements have been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting.

Cash and cash equivalents. Cash consists of short-term, highly liquid investments with an original maturity of three months or less. Cash equivalents consist of money market mutual funds held for investment purposes.

Investments. Investments in stocks and bonds which are listed on national securities exchanges, quoted on NASDAQ, or on the over-the-counter market are valued at the last reported sale price or in the absence of a recorded sale, at the value between the most recent bid and asked prices. Futures, forwards, and options which are traded on exchanges are valued at the last reported sale price or if they are traded over-the-counter at the most recent bid price. Short-term investments are valued at amortized cost, which approximates market value. Since there is no readily available market for investments in limited partnerships, such investments are valued at amounts reported to the Foundation by the general partners of such entities. The investments of these limited partnerships include securities of companies that may not be immediately liquid, such as venture capital, private debt and equity placements, and real estate. Accordingly, their values are based upon guidelines established by the general partners. Management believes this method provides a reasonable estimate of market value. These values may differ significantly from values that would have been used had a readily available market existed for such investments, and the differences could be material to the change in net assets of the Foundation.

Investment transactions are recorded on trade date. Realized gains and losses on sales of investments are determined on the specific identification basis. Investments donated to the Foundation are initially recorded using the average of the high and low market values on the date of gift.

Foreign currency amounts are translated into U.S. dollars based upon exchange rates as of December 31. Transactions in foreign currencies are translated into U.S. dollars at the exchange rate prevailing on the transaction date.

Fixed assets. Fixed assets consist of furniture, leasehold improvements, computer and office equipment, and the new headquarters building project. Furniture and computer and office equipment are stated at cost and depreciated using the straight-line method over estimated useful lives of three to ten years. Leasehold improvements are amortized on a straight-line basis over the lesser

of the assets' useful life or the lease term. The new headquarters building project is under construction in progress and will be depreciated upon completion.

Grants. Grants are accrued when awarded by the Foundation.

Use of 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. Estimates also affect the reported amounts of investment activity and expenses during the reported period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Reclassifications. Certain reclassifications have been made to the 2000 balances to conform with the 2001 presentation. These reclassifications had no effect on the change in net assets in 2000 or total net assets at December 31, 2000.

NOTE 3
Investments

The investment goal of the Foundation is to maintain or grow its asset size and spending power in real (inflation adjusted) terms with risk at a level appropriate to the Foundation's program objectives. The Foundation diversifies its investments among various financial instruments and asset categories, and uses multiple investment strategies. As a general practice, except for the Foundation's holdings in Hewlett-Packard and Agilent stock, all financial assets of the Foundation are managed by external investment management firms selected by the Foundation. All financial assets of the Foundation are held in custody by a major commercial bank, except for assets invested with partnerships and commingled funds, which have separate arrangements appropriate to their legal structure.

The majority of the Foundation's assets are invested in stocks, which are listed on national exchanges, quoted on NASDAQ, or in the over-the-counter market; treasury and agency bonds of the U.S. government; and investment grade corporate bonds for which active trading markets exist. Realized and unrealized gains and losses on investments are reflected in the Statements of Activities and Changes in Net Assets.

Approximately 14% and 21% of the Foundation's investment assets at December 31, 2001 and 2000, respectively, were invested with various limited partnerships that invest in the securities of companies that may not be immediately liquid, such as venture capital and buyout firms, and in real estate equity limited partnerships that have investments in various types of properties. The December 31 valuation of certain of the investments in limited partnerships are based upon the value determined by each partnership's general partner as of September 30 and adjusted for capital contributions and distributions that occurred during the quarter ended December 31. As of December 31, 2001, the Foundation is committed to invest approximately \$691,100 in additional capital in future years to various partnerships.

The gains and losses on the investment portfolio consists of the following:

	2001	2000
Net realized gain (loss)	\$ (30,373)	\$ 1,025,567
Net unrealized gain (loss)	(737,965)	(397,526)
	\$ (768,338)	\$ 628,041

Investment securities are exposed to various risks, such as changes in interest rates or credit ratings and market fluctuations. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities and the level of uncertainty related to changes in the value of investment securities, it is possible that the value of the Foundation's investments and total net assets balance could fluctuate materially.

The investments of the Foundation include a variety of financial instruments involving contractual commitments for future settlements, including futures, forwards, and options which are exchange traded or are executed over-the-counter. Some investment managers retained by the Foundation have been authorized to use certain financial derivative instruments in a manner set forth by either the Foundation's written investment policy, specific manager guidelines or partnership/fund agreement documents. Specifically, financial derivative instruments may be used for the following purposes: (1) currency forward contracts and options may be used to hedge nondollar exposure in foreign investments; (2) covered call options may be sold to enhance yield on major equity positions; (3) futures contracts may be used to equitize excess cash positions, rebalance asset categories within the portfolio or to rapidly increase or decrease exposure to specific investment positions in anticipation of subsequent cash trades; and (4) futures contracts and options may be used to hedge or leverage positions in managed portfolios. Financial derivative instruments are recorded at fair market value in the Statements of Financial Position with changes in fair market value reflected in the Statements of Activities and Changes in Net Assets.

The total value of investments pledged with respect to options and futures contracts at December 31, 2001 and 2000 was \$3,195 and \$3,076, respectively.

One of the Foundation's fixed income managers sells securities forward, and the Foundation records its liability for unsettled sales as a reduction of the related investment. This liability represents the obligation of the Foundation to make future delivery of specific securities, and accordingly creates an obligation to purchase such securities at prevailing market prices at a later date. At December 31, 2001 and 2000, the liability for these forward sales (stated at market value) was \$0 and \$74,600, respectively. The proceeds received with respect to these forward sales at December 31, 2001 and 2000 were \$0 and \$73,163, respectively. Forward sales are paired with long positions in the same or highly correlated assets, thereby mitigating the risk of short position exposure in the account.

In the opinion of the Foundation's management, the use of financial derivative instruments in its investment program is appropriate and customary for the investment strategies employed. Using those instruments reduces certain investment risks and may add value to the portfolio. The instruments themselves, however, do involve investment and counterparty risk in amounts greater than what are reflected in the Foundation's financial statements. Management does not anticipate that losses, if any, from such instruments would materially affect the financial position of the Foundation.

The Foundation's custodian maintains a securities lending program on behalf of the Foundation, and maintains collateral at all times in excess of the value of the securities on loan. Investment of this collateral is in accordance with specified guidelines. Interest earned on these transactions is included with other investment income in the Statements of Activities and Changes in Net Assets. The market value of securities on loan at December 31, 2001 and 2000, was \$89,838 and \$60,071, respectively. The value of the collateral received at December 31, 2001 and 2000, aggregated \$92,645 and \$61,594, respectively, of which \$90,437 and \$50,065, respectively, is in short-term money market funds. Management does not reflect the collateral received nor the corresponding liability in the Statements of Financial Position as they believe the amounts are not material to the financial position of the Foundation.

At December 31, 2001, net due to brokers includes a receivable from brokers of \$26,490 and a payable to brokers of \$179,153. At December 31, 2000, net due to brokers includes a receivable from brokers of \$103,301 and a payable to brokers of \$254,600. The payable to brokers includes a liability for options written at December 31, 2001 and 2000, in the amounts of \$42,533 and \$0, respectively. Premiums received with respect to options contracts at December 31, 2001 and 2000, are \$38,506 and \$0, respectively.

The Foundation held 36.5 million shares of Hewlett-Packard Company ("Hewlett-Packard") stock (approximately 1.9% of that Company's total outstanding shares) with a market price of \$20.54 per share at December 31, 2001. At December 31, 2000, the Foundation held 14.2 million shares with a market price of \$31.56 per share. During 2001, the Foundation received 33.9 million shares of Hewlett-Packard stock and reduced its Hewlett-Packard stock holdings by 11.6 million shares by sale. The Foundation held 8.3 million shares of Agilent Company ("Agilent") stock with a market price of \$28.51 per share at December 31, 2001. At December 30, 2000, the Foundation held 511 thousand shares with a market price of \$54.75 per share. During 2001, the Foundation received 9.5 million shares of Agilent stock and reduced its Agilent stock holdings by 1.7 million shares by sale.

NOTE 4
*Distributions
 Receivable from the
 William R. Hewlett
 Trust*

Upon the death of William R. Hewlett on January 12, 2001, the Foundation became the residuary beneficiary of the William R. Hewlett Revocable Trust ("the Trust") and is entitled to receive the trust assets remaining after distribution of certain specific gifts to members of Mr. Hewlett's family and payment of debts, expenses of administration, and federal and state estate taxes.

Between January 12, 2001, and December 31, 2001, the Foundation received contributions from the Trust of Hewlett-Packard stock and Agilent stock valued at \$1,138,400. At December 31, 2001, the estimated fair market value of the remaining assets to be distributed to the Foundation by the Trust was \$1,913,143. These assets are expected to be received in installments in the next two to five years. These assets consist almost entirely of Hewlett-Packard and Agilent common stock and are reflected in the financial statements as temporarily restricted net assets due to the fact that they are to be received in future years. The fair market value of the distributions receivable will fluctuate with changes in the share price of Hewlett-Packard and Agilent stock and as the Trust receives income and pays expenses.

NOTE 5
Fixed Assets

Fixed assets consist of the following at December 31, 2001 and 2000:

	2001	2000
Furniture and leasehold improvements	\$ 1,564	\$ 1,195
Computer and office equipment	1,303	1,243
	2,867	2,438
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization	(1,592)	(1,569)
Furniture, leasehold improvements and computer and office equipment	1,275	869
New headquarters building project	25,050	11,509
	\$ 26,325	\$ 12,378

The Foundation has undertaken the development of a new headquarters building. Construction of the building began in early 2001 and is expected to be completed in the spring of 2002.

NOTE 6
Grants Payable

Grant requests are recorded as grants payable when they are approved by the Board of Directors. Some of the grants are payable in installments, generally over a three-year period. Grants authorized but unpaid at December 31, 2001, are payable as follows:

Year Payable	Amount
2002	\$ 121,857
2003	20,132
2004 and thereafter	1,597
	\$ 143,586

NOTE 7
Gift Payable

The Foundation pledged a gift of \$400,000 in April 2001 to Stanford University for the School of Humanities and Sciences and for the undergraduate education program. The gift will be paid over a period of seven years and is discounted to a net present value as of December 31, 2001, using risk-free rates ranging from 3.62% to 4.91%. The first installment will be made in February 2002 in a stock contribution valued at \$10,900.

Gift payable, net of discount, at December 31, 2001, is as follows:

Gift payable	\$ 400,000
Less unamortized discount	(63,072)
Gift payable, net of discount	\$ 336,928

NOTE 8
Federal Excise Tax

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation is a private foundation and qualifies as a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Private foundations are subject to a federal excise tax on net investment income and may reduce their federal excise tax rate from 2% to 1% by exceeding a certain payout target for the year. The Foundation qualified for the 1% tax rate in both 2001 and 2000. Deferred federal excise tax is provided at 1.33%, the average effective rate expected to be paid on unrealized gains on investments.

The (benefit) expense for federal excise tax is as follows:

	2001	2000
Current	\$ 895	\$ 11,245
Deferred	(8,223)	(5,693)
	\$ (7,328)	\$ 5,552

Index

- A**
- Abhinaya Dance Company of San Jose, 47
- Academy for Educational Development, 24, 54
- ACCION International, 68
- Achieve, 22
- Acre Group for Agroforestry Research and Extension, 64
- Action Canada for Population and Development, 54
- Advancement Project, 73
- Advocates for Youth, 58
- African Population and Health Research Center, 58
- Agricultural Land-Based Training Association, 29, 64
- Alameda County Bar Association, Volunteer Legal Services Corporation, 39
- Alan Guttmacher Institute, 58
- Ali Akbar College of Music, 44
- Alliance for Microbicide Development, 60
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 24, 58
- American Association for Higher Education, 20
- American Association for the Advancement of Science, 54
- American Bach Soloists, 44
- American Communications Foundation, 27
- American Composers Forum, 49
- American Farmland Trust, 29
- American Institutes for Research, 21
- American Symphony Orchestra League, 49
- AmericaSpeaks, 7
- Andrus Center for Public Policy, 7, 27
- Arizona State University, Department of Psychology, 33
- Arizona, University of: Consortium on North American Higher Education Collaboration, 27, 64; Department of Planetary Sciences, 18; Latin American Area Center, 69
- Arts Council Silicon Valley, 49
- Asia Foundation, 8
- Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, 54
- Aspen Institute, 72; Democracy and Citizenship Program, 54; Program on Education, 23
- Associação Para O Planeamento da Família, 54
- Association of Centers for Family Planning and Sex Education, 54
- Association of Performing Arts Presenters, 49
- Association of Reproductive Health Professionals, 58
- A Traveling Jewish Theatre, 46
- Aurora Theatre Company, 46
- B**
- Bay Area School Reform Collaborative, 20
- Bay Area Video Coalition, 48
- Bay Institute of San Francisco, 32
- Berkeley Symphony Orchestra, 44
- Bernard Osher Marin Jewish Community Center, 49
- Boston College, 19
- Boston Symphony Orchestra, 50
- Boys and Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley, 39
- Brava! for Women in the Arts, 46
- Brazilian Population Association, CEDEPLAR/UFMG, 58, 70
- Bridgespan Group, 72
- Bridging the Gap Foundation, 57
- Brookings Institution, 24, 58
- Brown University, 17; Education Department, 20
- Bush Foundation, 20
- Business for Social Responsibility, 64
- C**
- California, University of, at Berkeley, 48; Center for Latin American Studies, 69; Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 54; Graduate School of Education, 20; Human Rights Center, 8; University Extension, 48
- California, University of, at Davis, 18
- California, University of, at Los Angeles: Department of Policy Studies and Economics, 22; Latin American Center, 69; UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities, 73
- California, University of, at Merced, 73
- California, University of, at San Diego, 27, 64
- California, University of, at San Francisco, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, 60
- California, University of, at Santa Cruz, Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, 41
- California, University of, California Policy Research Center, 37
- California Association of Human Relations Organizations, 7
- California Association of Nonprofits, 41
- California Budget Project, 37
- California Council of Churches, 33
- California Foundation for Improvement of Employer-Employee Relations, 5
- California Lawyers for the Arts, 49
- California Parenting Institute, 39
- California State University at Northridge, Department of Anthropology, 18, 64
- California State University at Sacramento, California Center for Public Dispute Resolution, 7
- California State University at San Marcos, Department of Psychology, 33
- California Summer Music, 44
- California Symphony Orchestra, 44
- California Western School of Law, McGill Center for Creative Problem Solving, 9, 66
- California Workforce Association, 38
- Calvert Social Investment Foundation, 29, 41, 70

- Capital of Texas Public Telecommunications Council, 24, 73
- CARE-Brazil, 68
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 9
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 17, 22
- Carnegie Mellon University, Institute for Strategic Development, 19, 68
- Catholic Charities of the East Bay, 38
- Catholics for a Free Choice, 54
- Cazadero Performing Arts Camp, 44
- CDR Associates, 13
- Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, 58
- Center for Holistic Resource Management, 29
- Center for Law and Social Policy, 37
- Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, 54
- Center for Strategic and International Studies, 9, 70
- Center for the Research of Societal Problems, 9
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 73
- Center on Education Policy, 23
- Centers on Fathers, Families and Public Policy, 40
- Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento, 64
- Centro de Investigación para el Desarrollo, 66
- Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, 9, 67, 68
- Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología, 60, 69
- Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental, 64
- Chamber Music America, 49
- Chicago, University of, Population Research, 59
- Child Trends, 54
- Child Welfare League of America, 73
- Choice U.S.A., 54
- Chorus America, 49
- Chronicle Season of Sharing Fund, 41
- City University of New York: Americas Center on Science and Society, 64; Bildner Center for Western Hemisphere Studies, 70; John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 5
- City Year, 38
- Classics for Kids Foundation, 51
- Coalition for Utah's Future, 31
- Coalition for Women's Economic Development and Global Equality, 54
- Colorado, University of, at Boulder: Center of the American West, 33; Conflict Research Consortium, 5; School of Law, 27, 33
- Columbia University: Mailman School of Public Health, 57; School of Law, 7, 23, 27, 73
- Commonwealth Medical Association Trust, 59
- Community Alliance with Family Farmers, 29
- Community Building Institute, 40
- Community Conservancy International, 31
- Community Dialogue, 9
- Community Educational Services of San Francisco, 20, 38
- Community Foundation Silicon Valley, 39, 42
- Community Partners, 7
- CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, 41, 49
- Conciliation Resources, 9
- Conflict Management Group, 9
- Conflict Management Initiatives, 13
- Connecticut, University of, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 70
- Corporation for the Advancement of Policy Evaluation, 22
- Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, 42
- Council for Aid to Education, 17
- Council of Independent Colleges, 19
- Council on Foreign Relations, 9
- CPR Institute for Dispute Resolution, 9
- Creative Response to Conflict, 6
- Crimes of War Education Project, 9
- Crosspulse, 44
- D**
- Dance Palace, 44
- Dancers' Group, 48
- Dartmouth College, 18
- Dell'Arte, 46
- Diablo Regional Arts Association, 49
- Dispute Resolution Center of Central Michigan, 5
- District of Columbia, University of the, Fund, 6
- Djerassi Resident Artists Program, 49
- Duke University, 17
- E**
- Earplay, 44
- Earth Policy Institute, 55
- East Bay Community Foundation, 7
- East Bay Conservation Corps, 38
- Eastern Mennonite University, Institute for Conflict Studies and Peace Building, 9
- Ecotrust, 29
- Editorial Projects in Education, 21
- Education Commission of the States, 23
- El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, 27, 64
- El Colegio de México: Centro de Estudios Económicos, 64; Centro de Relaciones Internacionales, 70
- Ella Baker Center for Human Rights, 73
- El Paso Community Foundation, 70
- Endangered Habitats League, 31

-
- Energy Foundation, 33
 Environment Hawaii, 27
 Environmental Defense, 29
 Environmental Law Institute, 28
 Environmental Leadership Program, 34
 Equal Access, 24
 Equilibres & Populations, 55
 Ethos Institute of Business and Social Responsibility, 65
 Every Child Can Learn Foundation, 20, 38
 EXIT Theatre, 46
- F**
 Facing the Future: People and the Planet, 55
 Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Argentina, 68
 Fairfield University, 17
 Family Law Center, 40
 Family Service Agency of San Francisco, 40
 Family Stress Center, 40
 Federal Judicial Center Foundation, Research Division, 6
 Federation of American Scientists Fund, 21
 Festival Opera Association, 47
 Film Arts Foundation, 48
 Film Makers Collaborative, Linda Harrar Productions, 55
 Finance Project, 37
 Florida State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, 7
 Florida, University of, 22, 68
 Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza, 65
 Fort Mason Foundation, 49
 Franklin Pierce College, 17
 Fremont Symphony Orchestra, 44
 Friends of Photography, 51
 Friends of the Israel Palestine Center for Research and Information, 10
 Fronteras Unidas Pro Salud Asociación Civil, 57
- Fundaão Getulio Vargas, Center for Public Administration and Government, 67
 Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, 65
 Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad, 32, 65
 Fundación Margarita Miranda de Mascareñas, 65
 Fundación para el Cambio Democrático, Partners-Argentina, 10, 67
 Fundación Terram, 65
 Fund for Public Schools: Brooklyn and Staten Island High School District, 73; New York City Board of Education, 73
- G**
 Generación Empresarial, 65
 Georgetown University, 74; Center for New Designs in Learning and Scholarship, 18; Law Center, 5, 13, 74
 George Washington University, 18
 Georgia Strait Alliance, 31
 Goodwill Industries, 37
 Grace Cathedral, 49
 Greater Washington Educational Telecommunications Association, MacNeil / Lehrer Productions, 74
 GreatSchools, 23
 Great Valley Center, 7, 29
 Greembelt Alliance, 31
- H**
 Hamilton College, 17
 Harvard University, 10, 23; David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, 70; Graduate School of Education, 23, 72; School of Law, 5
 Hawaii, State of, Department of Education, 7
 Hawai'i Community Foundation, 28
 Headlands Center for the Arts, 50
 Hendrix College, 17
 Henry L. Stimson Center, 10
 High Country Foundation, 27
- Holy Names College, 44
 Human Rights Watch, 10, 74
 Humboldt Area Foundation, 29, 51
- I**
 Indiana University, Indiana Conflict Resolution Institute, 13
 Information Renaissance, 7
 Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia, 10, 30
 Institute for EastWest Studies, 10
 Institute for Global Democracy, 10
 Institute for International Mediation and Conflict Resolution, 10
 Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, 10
 Institute for Sustainable Forestry, 30
 Institute of International Education, 55, 71
 Institute of World Affairs, 10
 Institutes for Journalism and Natural Resources, 27
 Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social, 67
 Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia, 65
 Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey: Centro de Calidad Ambiental, 32, 65; Virtual University, 19, 68
 Inter-American Dialogue, 67
 Interdisciplinary Center, 74
 International Association for Public Participation, 8
 International Planned Parenthood Federation, 57; Western Hemisphere Region, 57
 Intersection for the Arts, 50
 Ipsas, 57
 Issues TV, 74
 Ives String Quartet, 44
- JK**
 Japanese Organization for International Cooperation in Family Planning, 55
 Jewish Vocational and Career Counseling Service, 37
 John F. Kennedy University, 20

- Sierra Nevada Alliance, 30
 Smith College, Project on Women and Social Change, 24
 Social Policy and Health Economics Research and Evaluation Institute, 19
 Social Science Research Council, 12
 Sonoran Institute, 30
 South Carolina, University of, 18
 Spanish Speaking Unity Council, 37
 Stand for Children, 75
 Stanford Jazz Workshop, 46
 Stanford University, 50, 75; Center for Economic Policy Research, 28; Center for International Security and Cooperation, 12; Center for Latin American Studies, 70; Department of Biological Sciences, 28, 66; Department of Political Science, 19; Institute for International Studies, 20; Law School, 12, 67; School of Education, 19, 22; Social Science History Institute, 69; Stanford Learning Laboratory, 18
 State of the World Forum, 24
 Stern Grove Festival Association, 50
 Sunnyvale School District, 21
 Surface Transportation Policy Project, 31
 Sustainability Institute, 72
 Sustainable Conservation, 30
 Sustainable Northwest, 30
 Swarthmore College, 18
 Swiss Peace Foundation, 12
 Synergos Institute, 12
- T**
 Tanana Chiefs Conference, 13, 30
 Texas, University of, at Austin, 71
 Theatre Bay Area, 47
 Theatre Communications Group, 50
 Theatreworks, 47, 75
 Tides Center, 8, 28, 32, 33, 40, 56, 66, 72, 75
 Toronto, University of, Faculty of Law, 56; University College, 56
 Twenty-First Century Initiative, 75
- U**
 Union College, 18
 United Nations, Executive Office of the Secretary-General, 12
 United Nations Foundation, 12, 56
 United States Committee for United Nations Population Fund, 56
 Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Instituto Latinoamericano de Doctrinas y Estudios Sociales, 12, 67
 Universidad Autónoma de Baja California Sur, Departamento de Geología Marina, 19, 66
 Universidad Católica De Temuco, 12, 67
 Universidad de Chile, Departamento de Ingeniería Industrial, 69
 Universidad de las Américas—Puebla, 70
 Universidade Cândido Mendes, 12, 67
 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Center for Studies of Crime and Public Security, 12, 67
 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Centro de Investigaciones sobre América del Norte (CISAN), 70
 Universidad Torcuato di Tella, 69
 Urban Institute, 72
 Utah, State of, Office of the Governor, 6
- VW**
 Vermont, University of, 18
 Village Foundation, 41
 Virginia, University of, 13; Institute for Environmental Negotiation, 8, 29
 Volunteer Center of Alameda County, 39
 Washington, University of, 18, 59
 Washington Office on Latin America, 13, 68
 Watershed Research and Training Center, 30
 Wesleyan University, 18
- West Bay Opera Association, 47
 WestEd, 21
 Western Consensus Council, 8, 32
 Western Folklife Center, 31, 51
 Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 19
 Western Justice Center Foundation, 6
 Wheaton College, 17
 Wider Opportunities for Women, 37
 Wilderness Society, 34
 Wisconsin, University of, at Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, 59; Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 22
 Women's Link Worldwide, 56
 Women's Philharmonic, 46
 Women's Policy, 56
 Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Latin American Program, 13, 68
 Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, 24
 Workforce Strategy Center, 38
 Workplace Solutions, 6
 World Affairs Council of Northern California, 73
 World Bank Institute, 59
 World Population Foundation, 56
 Worldwatch Institute, 29, 57
- YZ**
 Yale University: Child Study Center, 13; School of Music and Library, 51
 Yellow Barn Music School and Festival, 75
 Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 50
 Youth Service California, 39
 Zellerbach Family Fund, 51
 Zero Population Growth, 57
 Zeum, 51