



Minnesota State University, Mankato
Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly
and Creative Works for Minnesota
State University, Mankato

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

1988

Funding of Women's Programs by Minnesota Foundations

Suzanne E. Runte
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>



Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Runte, S. E. (1988). Funding of women's program by Minnesota foundations [Master's thesis, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/1086/>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.


FUNDING OF WOMEN'S PROGRAMS
BY
MINNESOTA FOUNDATIONS

by
Suzanne E. Runte

A thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Science at
Mankato State University

Mankato, Minnesota

June, 1988



Date 5/26/88

This thesis has been examined and approved.

Examining Committee:

Abstract

Funding of Women's Programs By Minnesota Foundations

Suzanne E. Runte, M. S.
Mankato State University, 1988

The purpose of this thesis was to determine how much money Minnesota foundations contributed to programs for women. The study examined the grants awarded by a representative sample of 12 Minnesota foundations over a four year period (1980-1983). Data was collected from foundations' annual reports or 990 tax forms. The amount of funding each foundation contributed to women's programs and the type of services funded were recorded.

Results from the study indicate that programs for women do not receive much of the total amount of funding given by these Minnesota foundations. The four year average percentage of funding to women was 3.46% of total giving. In 1980, women's programs received 4.24%, in 1981, 3.20%, in 1982, 3.24% and in 1983, 3.45%. The percentage of funding for women dropped significantly in 1981 and increased very little in 1982 and 1983.

This pattern of giving occurred during a time of federal cut backs to human services programs that primarily affected women and children. Statistics show increasing poverty among women. Increased funding of programs for women by foundations, individuals and the government is needed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who helped me with this study. I am grateful because without their kind assistance, this study would not have been possible. Thank you to the members of my committee: Dave Janovy and Barbara Keating for their encouragement, excellent assistance and persistence to the end. I would also like to thank Sally Roesch Wagner for her support in developing the research topic and writing assistance. Her encouragement was invaluable. I appreciate Vanda Hedges suggestions early in the process. My thanks to Dean Bill Webster and Dean Winston Benson for their support which allowed me to finish the work. Thank you also to Mankato State University and the Smith Foundation, Inc. for the financial assistance which made this study possible.

Mankato State University's library staff assisted me with a very thorough literature search. The Minneapolis Public Library's Foundation Center staff and the Foundation Center staff (Patricia Salozar and Candice Kutah) in New York gave me excellent data collection assistance. Thanks to Delores Swanson at the Minneapolis United Way and the Women's Studies Department staff at the University of Minnesota.

My sincere thanks to Patsy Parker for sharing her strength with me and showing me my own. I appreciate her encouragement with compiling the data and writing the thesis. I am grateful to her for introducing me to the Macintosh computer and generously making it possible for me to purchase one. Thank you to my brother, Dave Runte, for locating computer resources

when I needed help learning how to use my new computer. The University of Minnesota's Microcomputer Lab offered excellent computer assistance.

Thank you to Kris Kylo for being there with me throughout the entire process. I appreciate the hours she spent calculating percentages. A true friend! My thanks to Jean Captain for her kind assistance as I wrote my thesis. She gave me constant encouragement by talking through the various sections, reading what I wrote, preparing meals and offering me the final push I needed at the end.

Special thanks to my parents, Kay and Otto Runte, for their love and support. I am grateful to them for valuing the importance of education and offering their financial support and "care packages." My father spent hours helping me recalculate all of the data. For everyone's assistance, I am moved and extremely grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
Chapter	
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Acknowledging 'The Personal'	1
Human Services Background	1
Political Climate	2
Class Background	2
The Women's Movement.....	3
Current Political Context.....	3
Problems and Needs of Women.....	8
The Feminization of Poverty	8
Abuse of Women.....	10
Low Self-Esteem.....	12
Needed Programs	12
Effects of Federal Cut Backs.....	14
How This Study Came About	16

Chapter	Page
Problem Statement.....	17
Literature Search.....	17
Financial Support of Women's Programs in the 1970's (The Ford Foundation Study,1979).....	18
Funding of Programs for Women and Girls By a Selected Sample of Major Corporations (The Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy Study,1980)	19
Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged (The Philanthropy Project, 1984, 1985).....	20
Short-Changed: A Look at Funding for Chicago-Area Women's Organizations (Chicago Women in Philanthropy, 1985).....	22
Summary of Literature Search.....	23
2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	24
Introduction	24
Research Design	24
Similar Study-Philanthropy Project.....	24
How this Study Differs from the Philanthropy Project	25
The United Way and Other Federated Giving Programs...	25
Research Procedures	26
Selection of Foundations for the Sample.....	26
Difficulties in Foundation Data Collection.....	27
The Study's Sample.....	29
Types of Foundations in the Study.....	30
Service Categories.....	31

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Federal Spending 1980-1983	6
2. Funding of Women's Programs by Minnesota Foundations, 1980-1983.....	40
3. Funding for Women by Type of Foundation, 1980-1983.....	51
4. Service Categories Funded for Women's Programs.....	58

FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Federal Spending 1980-1983	5
2. Percentage of Funding for Women's Programs by Foundation, 1980-1983.....	44
3. Funding of Women's Programs by Year and Percentage, 1980-1983.....	53
4. Trends in Funding of Women's Programs, 1980-1983	57
5. Service Categories Funded for Women's Programs, 1980-1983	61
6. Individual Service Categories Funded for Women's Programs, 1980-1983	63

CHAPTER ONE

Statement of Problem

Introduction

Acknowledging 'The Personal'

I found reading Theories of Women's Studies II to be helpful in affirming that 'the personal' is important in research. All research is influenced by the person conducting the research. One's reason for choosing to study a certain topic is very much related to what the person considers important. For this reason, I decided to describe myself. I have included information about my background and motivation for doing the study.

Human Services Background

This thesis emerged from my 20 years of experience working in the field of human services. I remember having many questions as I worked with people on a daily basis and planned programs to meet their needs. I thought about why people came to receive help and what social conditions caused their needing assistance. I wondered what changes on a larger scale would make a difference in the lives of the people I saw. In my wonderings, I came up with several possible explanations and solutions to the problems I saw.

In working for a nonprofit human service agency, I noticed a lot of

women seeking assistance. We provided food, clothing, short-term counseling and referrals. I wondered why so many women needed help. I helped set up a single parent support group, an advocacy program for those who have been victims of sexual assault and a program to prevent chemical use problems among women homemakers. This is some of the work experience that influenced my study.

Political Climate

I also grew up at a time when John F. Kennedy was president. Human needs were seen as important and funding was provided for human services. Martin Luther King was organizing and leading black people in their struggle for human dignity. It was a time of concern for human rights. Programs were started that addressed the needs of people living in poverty. There were services like the Headstart child care program and the Model City Program that was an umbrella for a cluster of services.

Class Background

I remember feeling a sense of compassion for people less fortunate than I. I grew up in a middle to upper-middle class family in a good area of Minneapolis. It was near the Minnehaha Creek and Lake Harriet. I was fortunate. I had a chance to go to college and pursue my education. My Bachelor's Degree was in Social Welfare at a time when many people were going into the field of social work. This was an era of social concern and I personally shared that concern. I wanted to contribute to making the world a better place. I remember wanting to affect a large number of people in positive social change. This was my vision.

The Women's Movement

During this time people also began talking about the real problems of women. Women started moving beyond their fear and began saying what was true for them. Women were finding their voices. In the past, the issues of women being subservient and lacking equal rights were not spoken. I remember there being a fear of what men would say. Women were afraid of male disapproval and were concerned about not being believed or taken seriously. Words like "women's libber" were used to discredit women. They were told that what they had to say was "not true." Women were afraid to speak about what was, indeed, their reality.


I found it heartening and exciting when women began to organize and speak to each other about common concerns. There was a sense of sisterhood. I remember walking down the street and smiling at a woman in a way that acknowledged our similar realizations. We both felt a sense of freedom. I remember believing that I could be myself. I could be fulfilled as a person. It was a time when I started discovering my artistic abilities. I was taking a silkscreening class and made cards that I sold at a gathering of women. How good I felt to know that my work was appreciated: people were interested enough in my art to purchase it.

Current Political Context


Since President Reagan came into office, human service funding has been reduced. The following graphs (Figure 1) from The United States Budget in Brief, F. Y. 1984, (1983:33, 48, 49,) shows selected portions of the federal budget during the time of this research study. The graphs offer a visual representation of how the human service budget decreased and the

defense budget substantially increased. The graphs shows the amount of money spent on human service programs and defense activities from 1980 through 1983.

National Defense Programs (Budget Authority)



Outlays for Training, Employment, and Social Services



Outlays for Education




Figure 1

Federal Spending, 1980-1983
(The United States Budget in Brief, 1984)

As can be seen from the graphs, drops in funding were experienced by higher education, elementary, secondary and vocational education, research and general education aids, public service employment and other training and employment. Social services remained around the same amount of funding during this time, while national defense experienced a steady, sharp increase in funding.

The amount of funding going towards defense was \$210.5 billion in 1983 while education, training, employment and social services received only \$26.6 billion in 1983. It is interesting to note the large amount of dollars going to defense in comparison to the much smaller amount going toward the human service programs mentioned above.

In The United States Budget in Brief, F. Y. 1985, (1984:73, 75) the following federal spending information is given for the same years in my study: 1980-1983 (Table 1).

Table 1
Federal Spending
1980-1983
(In billions of dollars)

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
Education, training, employment and social services	\$ 30.8	\$ 31.4	\$26.3	\$26.6
National defense	135.9	159.8	187.4	210.5

The amount of funding going to education, training, employment and social services dropped by \$4.2 billion between 1980 and 1983, while the national

defense budget increased by \$74.6 billion during the same time period. This was a time of decreasing funding for human services and substantial increases in defense spending.

In a handout by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (1982), the following intriguing comparisons were made between funding human service and defense programs.

JOBS \$5.6 billion would restore 1982 cuts in CETA Public Service Jobs and Training Programs,
OR
build two nuclear powered aircraft carriers.

FOOD \$1.7 billion would restore full funding for Food Stamps,
OR
build one Trident nuclear submarine.

HOUSING \$11 billion would restore the cuts in subsidized housing,
OR
fund the Cruise Missile program.

HEALTH \$400 million would restore cuts in health education and training programs,
OR
pay what Congress authorized to develop the Pershing II (first) missile.

EDUCATION \$460 million would restore the cut in the Guaranteed Student Loan program,
OR
buy 12 more F-15 fighter planes.

CHILD CARE \$2.7 billion would restore cuts in funds for Aid to Dependent Children and Child nutrition programs,
OR
pay for research and development for a long-range combat aircraft.

In this first chapter I shall talk about the needs of women. Then, I shall describe how this study came about and explain the problem addressed in my thesis. I shall conclude the chapter with a presentation of other similar studies.

Problems and Needs of Women

This thesis is written at a time when the feminization of poverty is a very real issue. Currently, every 2 out of 3 poor adults are women. It is also a time when federal human service expenditures, which especially affect women and children, have been extensively cut back in the budget.

Though extensive works have been written to describe the problems and needs of women, I have chosen to limit my discussion to three areas of concern. The first, and I believe underlying, issue affecting women is economics: the feminization of poverty. Next, I describe the various types of abuse that women experience in our culture that I believe stem from mysogony, a dislike or hatred of women. In our culture, women are perceived as being "less than" men. Women experience various forms of abuse: physical, sexual, emotional.

The final issue I address that women face is one of low self-esteem. This comes from being raised in a culture where they are viewed as being inferior (seen as being less intelligent, poor drivers, weak, ineffective, child-like).

The Feminization of Poverty

As reported in the Capitol Bulletin of The Minnesota Women's Consortium (1985, Bulletin 192), in the last census of 1980, 374,000

Minnesotans lived in poverty. 41% of these poor people were women, 33% were children and 26% were men. So, 74% of the poor were women and children. In Minnesota women are a greater proportion of the poor than they are nationally.

The profile of who is poor in Minnesota changed dramatically over 2 decades from 1959 to 1980. Female-headed families and women not in families accounted for 26.1% of the poor in 1959 and increased to 50.1% in 1980, almost doubling the percentage.

When looking at the poor in Minnesota by the categories (1) married-couple and male-headed families, (2) female-headed families, (3) men not in families and (4) women not in families, a significant difference exists for individuals "not in families." Men not in families represented 3.9% of the poor and women not in families 17.3% in 1959, men 5.5% and women 14.5% in 1970, and men 7.3% and women 14.5% in 1980.

For every \$1.00 earned by men, women make \$0.59. Occupations where women traditionally work are usually lower paying: secretary, nurse, social worker, waitress, beautician. Major discrepancies also exist when comparing earnings of more educated women with less educated men. College educated women earn less than men who graduated from high school. When comparing the earnings of both men and women who work full-time, non-stop from graduation to retirement, the male high school graduate will earn \$1,041,000 and the female college graduate will just make \$846,000 (Capitol Bulletin, The Minnesota Women's Consortium, 1985, Bulletin 192).

Both women physicians and lawyers earn much less than men in the same occupations. The income differences are striking, indeed. Women physicians in the United States make significantly less money than men in the same profession. Women M.D.'s median income was \$57,190 while men M.D.'s was \$110,340. 2/3 of the women M.D.'s are in lower paying fields: pediatrics, family practice, internal medicine and psychiatry while most men go into the surgical fields, still the highest paying (Medical Economics Co., Inc.). Minnesota women lawyers in 1982 had a median income of \$27,960 while that of men lawyers was \$43,690 (Minnesota Women Lawyers).

Abuse of Women

In American society, women have been allotted a lower status than men. They tend to be the object of a great deal of physical, sexual and emotional abuse. Trova Hutchins and Vee Baxter in their article, "Battered Women," in Alternative Social Services for Women, (1980:179) describe the abuse of women.

The physical abuse of women by men is among the most extreme manifestations of sexism. The social and cultural roots of abuse are deep, complex, and ultimately related to two basic realities: the longstanding subjugation of women and the irrevocable fact that most women are physically smaller and weaker than most men.

Hutchins and Baxter, (1980: 184) give examples of the physical abuse women experience.

A man may use his hand to slap a woman, his fist to sock her, or his foot to kick her. He may hit her once, several times, or a hundred times. He may strike any part of her body, although the face, head, and abdomen are particularly common targets. Depending on his size and hers, an abuser may pick her up

and throw her to the floor or against walls and furniture. A frequent pattern is for the physical abuse to begin with slaps and shoves, to progress to hitting and throwing, and once the woman is down, to advance to kicking, choking, and a literal "battering" of the woman's head against the floor or wall...

The injuries most frequently sustained by battered women are bruises, contusions, and broken bones, particularly ribs, fingers, and collarbones. Concussions, burns, and wounds requiring stitches are also common. Miscarriages resulting from abuse of a pregnant woman are not unusual.

In reviewing the literature on abuse, researchers find that men frequently beat up women but that women rarely beat up men. Research also shows that wife beating is not a rare event and that abuse occurs at all socioeconomic levels. "Both partners caught up in abuse situations tend to be isolated and alienated from others, with few friends or social activities." There are also established historical roots regarding wife beating and the overall abuse of women. Current thinking is influenced by the past: It is inconsistent and tends to result in blaming the victim (Hutchins and Baxter, 1980:182,187).

Susan Brownmiller in her book Against Our Will (1975:8), defines rape in the following way. "If a woman chooses not to have intercourse with a specific man and the man chooses to proceed against her will, that is a criminal act of rape." The early legal definition of rape did not see it as a crime of man against woman or as a matter of a female's right to her bodily integrity. Instead, rape was seen as a property crime of man against man: a woman being owned by a man.

Any female may become a victim of rape. Factors such as extreme youth, advanced age, physical homeliness and virginal life-style do not provide a foolproof deterrent or render a woman impervious to sexual assault...Dr. Charles Hayman's five-year study conducted at D.C. General Hospital in Washington reported that victims of rape who were processed through the emergency ward ranged from a child of 15 months to a woman of 82 (Brownmiller, 1975, 388).

Doris Stevens in "Rape Victims" from Gotlieb's (1980:237) collection states:

...some statutes have substituted "sexual assault" for "rape" in order to recognize and criminalize a variety of possible types of abuse (e.g., penetration of anus and mouth as well as vagina, and penetration by fingers and objects as well as by penises). Some of the revised rape laws are not sex specific, thus recognizing the fact that males as well as females are victims of sexual violence. Other legal terms commonly used to define acts of sexual abuse are statutory rape and incest.

Low Self-Esteem

Women raised in our culture have less status than men. The role of women is seen as being subservient. This can result in women having low self-esteem. Low self-esteem is also caused by and contributes to the conditions of poverty and abuse experienced by women.

Many women feel inadequate and have low expectations of the amount of money they could earn. Women tend to underestimate their abilities. Besides choosing lower paying occupations, occupations that traditionally employ women are lower paying. Also, women tend to get paid less than men in higher status, more traditionally male occupations.

Needed Programs

Programs are needed for women that address the problems of poverty, abuse and low self-esteem. These are not problems with the individual women, but social conditions which cause women certain

difficulties. Services are also needed that respond to the special needs of older women, women of color, lesbian women and handicapped women. There are problems that are unique to these groups of women.

It is important to realize that women have needs for programs to address their specific needs. Their needs are not met by more traditional programs. In Alternative Social Services for Women, Gottlieb and Hutchins (1980:xii-xiii) describe the need for women's programs.

Historically, the overall result for women clients has been the provision of services that are too often ineffective. Such services are not merely insufficient or inappropriate. Sometimes they are harmful, actually worsening the women's situation....(There are) many gaps and inadequacies in social service provisioning-that women who are raped, for instance, may have nowhere to turn, that the resources allocated to training programs for women offenders are insufficient, or that counseling about sexual alternatives is not offered to disabled women in rehabilitation centers.

They also talk about the need for social service workers to be aware of the pervasiveness of sexism. It is important to realize how sexual stereotyping, conditioning, and discrimination can affect the individual woman. Social service workers need to be aware of their own attitudes toward women and be willing to deal with them in healthy, constructive ways.

Psychoanalytic theory and theories of development utilized by social service professionals, tend to have a male bias. This discredits the experiences of women and sets male behavior as the norm. The value of being a woman is, then, neither appreciated or really understood.

Effects of Federal Cut Backs

The shift in federal spending during the Reagan administration resulted in major cut backs of needed programs for women and children. This occurred during a sharp rise in the share of the U.S. population living below the poverty line according to the Coalition on Women and the Budget in Inequality of Sacrifice: The Impact of the Reagan Budget on Women (1984:3).

Between 1979 and 1982, the number of people living in poverty rose from 26.1 million to 34.4 million persons (from 11.7% to 15% of the population). Women, especially women of color, are disproportionately represented among these persons, particularly as heads of household with dependent children and as older women living alone. (Coalition on Women and the Budget:1984:3).

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that:

*income security programs (food stamps, A.F.D.C., child nutrition, low-income energy assistance, unemployment insurance, housing assistance, and the Women, Infants and Children (W.I.C) Program cuts have totaled approximately \$27 billion,

*employment programs and retirement/disability programs have been cut about \$25 billion each,

*in all human resources programs, reductions will total over \$100 billion over the fiscal year 1982-1985 period.

When President Reagan took office in 1981, he promised to increase the standard of living of all Americans through a combination of tax cuts and federal spending reductions that would, in turn, reduce the federal deficit. His tax cuts have, however, helped the rich at the expense of the poor. And his reductions in federal spending, as our analysis makes clear, have harmed individuals in and near poverty-a disproportionate number of whom are women. Finally, the deficit has not been reduced but has grown substantially, because of the President's refusal to hold military spending level or to raise taxes to obtain greater revenues from those

more able to provide them. Deficit projections are already being used as a weighty argument either against increases in spending or, worse, for further decreases in the social programs on which women depend.

...The military budget has swelled from \$135.9 billion in 1980 to \$245.3 billion in 1984, an increase of \$109.4 billion....For each dollar cut from low-income programs since 1981, 5.15 has been added to the military budget, while \$5.40 has been cut from taxes. (Coalition on Women and the Budget:1984:4).

Hundreds of thousands of families have had their AFDC benefits terminated or reduced as a result of the 1981 and 1982 cuts. The Congressional Budget Office estimated in January 1984 that the 1981 and 1982 changes would reduce federal expenditures for AFDC by more than \$3.6 billion over fiscal years 1982 and 1986. The result will be reductions in AFDC benefits of close to twice that amount. (Coalition on Women and the Budget:1984:10).

President Reagan said that the private sector would make up the federal human service cutbacks. Budget analysis shows that this is not happening.

During the first three years of the Reagan Administration, private giving managed to offset only about 17 percent of the estimated revenue losses of nonprofits...The organizations affected by federal budget cuts gained only about \$1 billion more in new charitable support in FY 1983 than they received in FY 1980. By contrast, they lost an estimated \$4.1 billion in federal support....By fiscal year 1988, federal support to nonprofit social service organizations would be 54 percent below its FY 1980 level. (Salomon and Abramson, 1985, p 54).

So, the federal cut-backs have adversely affected programs for women. Funding has been increased for military spending while social programs (mostly affecting women and children) have been greatly

reduced. Private foundations have not made up for the loss in federal funding.

How This Study Came About

I wanted to do something meaningful for my master's thesis. My background is in human services, and my style of working with people is as an advocate for their needs. I wanted to do something that would be relevant and have a positive impact on the lives of others.

I remember looking through the rows of master's theses on the library shelves at Mankato State University and the University of Minnesota. I was amazed at the number of theses that didn't seem to have much relevance. Many were about topics that didn't seem very important. Some were on obscure subjects that had titles which were difficult to even understand. I wanted to do something that would be useful and would benefit others.

In my human service work, most of my clients were women. I was interested in exploring why this was true. As a woman, caring about women (my sisters), I wanted to do something meaningful for them.

I received excellent direction and support from Dr. Sally Roesch Wagner, who was then chair of the Women's Studies Department. She encouraged me to journal and discover what specific research topic I wanted to pursue for my thesis. She encouraged me to trust myself and do work that would hold my interest.

What emerged for me was my concern for funding of programs for women. Much federal funding had been cut from social programs. That was difficult for me to experience. I ended up asking women in our community what was needed. I explained that I was doing a research project and

wondered what information would be useful to know. They said that they wanted to know how much money our local foundations contributed to programs for women. So, this is how my study originally came about.

Problem Statement

The study is a descriptive longitudinal study utilizing available data on foundation giving patterns from 1980-1983. The study addresses the following questions:

- *How much money was given to programs for women by a representative sample of Minnesota foundations? What percentage of total giving does this represent?
- *What was the trend in funding from 1980 to 1983 (one year before President Reagan came into office and three years during his term)? Was there any change in foundation funding during this time period?

Literature Search

To see if there were other studies similar to mine, I did a computerized literature search. With the kind assistance of the Mankato State University library staff, I conducted a computerized literature search in the following data bases: Social Science Citation Index, Sociological Abstracts, Foundation Grants Index, Dissertation Abstracts, American History and Life, ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), NTIS (National Technical Information Service). The search uncovered two major studies done on foundation contributions to women. They were Financial Support of Women's Programs in the 1970's (the Ford Foundation Study) and Funding of Programs for Women and Girls by a Selected Sample of Major Foundations (the Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy Study).

Locally, The Philanthropy Project published Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged which looked at how much money Minnesota foundations gave to the disadvantaged, including women. Chicago Women in Philanthropy also published a study, Short-Changed: A Look at Funding for Chicago-Area Women's Organizations. I shall go over the studies and their findings in the order they were published. For each study, I shall describe how programs for women was defined and compare it to my study, the sample used and the results.

Financial Support of Women's Programs in the 1970's (The Ford Foundation Study, 1979)

The Ford Foundation report is the first comprehensive summary and analysis of private foundation and government funding for advancing women's interests. Foundation data is based on the Foundation Center's computerized grants index. This includes voluntary reports on grants of \$5,000 for more from some 420 foundations, including most of the larger foundations. Some of the foundations in the study are the Ford, Carnegie, Mellon, Rockefeller, San Francisco, Rubenstein and Rosenberg foundations. The index does not include lesser grants by these same foundations or grant activity from the almost 26,000 known to exist. The Ford Foundation Study covers data for the period 1970-1976. (National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, Private Foundation Funding of the Women's Movement, 1979:4.)

The Ford Foundation study found that less than 1% (0.6%) of private foundation funding supports activities designed to help eliminate sex

discrimination or to further opportunities for women in nontraditional fields.

The funding women received was distributed to the following programs:

52% for education and training

18% for legal, political and community action

14% for sex roles, family and children

13% for employment and economics

2% for health and safety.

The Ford Foundation study accounted for activities designed to help eliminate sex discrimination or to further opportunities for women in nontraditional fields. The types of women's programs in this study were more limited in scope than mine.

Funding of Programs for Women and Girls By a Selected Sample of Major Corporations (The Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy Study, 1980)

The following project areas for women and girls were included in this study: education, employment, social services and health services, leadership training, cultural and recreational activities, overcoming sex discrimination, the development and distribution of materials, shelters, networks, hotlines and legal assistance centers. This study was quite inclusive, much like my own.

The study surveyed the giving of eight corporations who have been leaders in corporate giving and who agreed to participate in the study. The corporations were RCA, Sears, Roebuck and Co., Syntex, Xerox, The Aetna Life and Casualty Co., Atlantic Richfield Co., International Paper Co. and Polaroid Corporation.

The study found that in 1979, 2.25% of funding went to programs for women and girls. The study also looked at the composition of the staff and boards. While more than half of the professional staff of these corporate gifts programs are female, women constitute 1 of the 6 foundation heads, 2 of the 7 contributions officers and 3 of the 62 foundation board members.

Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged (The Philanthropy Project, 1984, 1985)

These studies examined to what extent Minnesota foundations applied their resources to the needs of women, racial minorities and other disadvantaged people in 1982 and 1984. There were some minor differences in how the Philanthropy Project defined programs for women compared to my study. Their studies categorized programs for minority women under programs for racial minorities. The Philanthropy Project was interested in seeing how programs for disadvantaged people were funded. They did not include women's service organizations that served the more economically advantaged (e.g. Women's Association for the Minnesota Orchestra). I did include these organizations in my study. Also, the Philanthropy Project included a percentage of funding from the United Way I did not because this information was not available for women. (A further discussion of the Philanthropy Project studies is in the first part of chapter 2).

The sample used was thirty-three of Minnesota's top forty foundations because of the difficulty in collecting complete information from all forty foundations. The Philanthropy Study also examined the governance of the programs funded for the disadvantaged. It categorized the organizations

funded according to their level of constituency control. The Study also categorized grants according to their geographic location.

The Philanthropy Project Study found in 1982 that women received 3.1 percent of the total funding. Racial minorities received 6.8 percent and other disadvantaged received 18.3 percent of the total funding. Women received the lowest amount and percent of funding, the fewest number of grants and the smallest average grant among the three groupings of disadvantaged constituencies.

The Philanthropy Project's Study of 1984 giving had the same research design as the 1982 study except for the addition of a new category: organizational activity. This category analyzes the grants by the purpose and consequent activities of the recipient organization. It is designed to test the hypothesis that larger, traditional service organization, rather than advocacy or alternative service organizations, receive the greatest amount of funding intended to benefit disadvantaged people. The findings show this to be true. Traditional services received two-thirds of the dollars given to benefit disadvantaged people and also received the highest average grants. Organizations that primarily advocate for disadvantaged people received the least number of dollars and the smallest average grants.

In the Philanthropy Project's Study of 1984 results, women again received the lowest amount and percent of funding, the fewest number of grants and the smallest average grant among the three groupings of disadvantaged constituencies. Women received 5.5 percent of the total funding. The increase in funding of women's programs from 1982 to 1984 is mostly due to grants for the Women's Economic Development Corporation

and the Minnesota Women's Fund. These two organizations received funding and were not in existence in 1982.

Short-Changed: A Look at Funding for Chicago-Area Women's Organizations (Chicago Women in Philanthropy, 1985)

The Chicago Women in Philanthropy study surveys the amount of money given to women's organizations in 1983. It defines a women's organization as one that: primarily serves women, serves women intentionally, is directed by women and is located in the Chicago metropolitan area. This study does not include other organizations that primarily serve women (e.g. Planned Parenthood), unless they meet the criteria above. It differs from my study in this way. I have a broader definition of programs for women.

The study used data available from the Donors Forum of Chicago which is made up of 162 of Chicago's independent and family foundations and corporate giving programs. It found that women's organizations received only 1.77% of the total grant dollars given in 1983. Sixty-two women's organizations comprised 3.82% of the 1,622 recipients of grants. If women's organizations received 3.82% of total grant dollars, it would more than double the amount they received. One quarter of Chicago-area foundations and corporations gave no grants to women's organizations and, including those giving no grants, almost eighty percent gave less than 3.82% of their grant dollars to women's organizations.

Summary of Literature Search

Even though the criteria for women's programs varies from study to study, all of these research projects have similar results. The percentage of grant dollars for programs specifically designed to serve women and girls is 5% or less.

These studies and mine address programs that are specifically designed to serve women. Foundation funding does go to programs that serve both men and women. Examples of these are: a neighborhood human service agency that serves everyone, an agency that provides counseling services to people and programs serving racial minorities. Women are served by these organizations, and they are not included in these studies.

It is difficult to know how much funding women received from these types of programs. A person would need to check with each one of them, and they would have to have kept accurate statistics on the number of women served. Because the Minneapolis Area United Way did not keep precise records on the gender of the population served during the time of this study, I was unable to include an accurate percentage of funding foundations gave to the United Way. Gender related statistics are needed to more accurately track the amount of funding going to women.

Women are often in need of specific programs to meet their needs, not found in some traditional agencies. For instance shelters for battered women, sexual assault advocacy and counseling services that empower women have needed creation. Programs with this focus need funding.

CHAPTER TWO

Research and Design and Procedure

Introduction

This study examined the giving pattern for grants to specifically benefit women and girls by a selected sample of twelve of Minnesota's top forty foundations from 1980 through 1983. I chose the years 1980 through 1983 for the study because the time period represents one year before President Reagan took office and three years while he was in office. I wanted to see if his statement was true that the private sector would indeed help pick up the federal human service cut backs. By selecting these years for study, I could find out what Minnesota's experience was for this time period. I could see if foundation contributions to women's programs had increased or decreased during this time period.

Research Design

Similar Study-Philanthropy Project

I discovered that the Philanthropy Project was doing a similar study of Minnesota foundations at the time. Their staff were very helpful in sharing their experiences with foundation selection and data collection with me. The Philanthropy Project was studying Minnesota foundation giving to the disadvantaged in 1982. I looked at thirty-three of Minnesota's top forty

foundations to select the sample (twelve) because of the difficulty in collecting complete information from all forty foundations. The Philanthropy Project studied giving to three major groupings of disadvantaged people: 1) Racial Minorities, 2) Women, and 3) Other Disadvantaged. The "other disadvantaged" category was for predominately low income people and included the handicapped, unemployed, senior citizens, mentally ill, mentally impaired, illiterates, and disabled veterans.

How this Study Differs from the Philanthropy Project

My study varies in several ways from the Philanthropy Project's Study. The Philanthropy Project categorized programs for minority women under programs for racial minorities. I have included programs for minority women as programs for women. The Philanthropy Project did not include funding for W.A.M.S.O. (Women's Association for the Minnesota Orchestra) as a program for women, while I did. I included W.A.M.S.O. under the category of "women's service organizations." The Philanthropy Project's prime interest was in seeing how programs for disadvantaged people are funded and probably did not consider the Minnesota Orchestra as a program for the disadvantaged.

The United Way and Other Federated Giving Programs

The Philanthropy Project included a percentage of foundation's United Way contributions as going to the disadvantaged. I did not include United Way contributions because data for how much money went to programs for women was not available from 1980 through 1983 by the Minneapolis United Way which is the largest United Way in the State. Since the United Way did not keep data on giving to women during this time

period, I could not give an estimate. I did include United Way contributions in the few cases where the funding was designated in the granting process to specific women's programs. At the time, United Way was not collecting data in the same manner as it is now.

Currently United Way agencies are reporting who they serve by gender. It is important to note that many foundations did give to various United Ways and other federated giving programs. This information is not recorded in my study because of the lack of an available estimate on how much money goes to serve women.

Research Procedures

Selection of Foundations for the Sample

The Minnesota Council on Foundations list of the "Minnesota 1982 Largest Grantmaking Foundations" was used as a guide by the Philanthropy Project to select the top forty foundations. Together, these foundations represent \$135,682,001 or 75 percent of the total amount given by Minnesota foundations. Approximately 500 other foundations account for the remainder of foundation giving in Minnesota. The foundations in my study came from this same top forty list. I used every other one (half) of the twenty-eight foundations that the Philanthropy Project staff said had complete information.

To determine the percentage of grant monies that benefit women and girls, I needed to examine each grant made by the foundations. To accomplish this task, the following information was needed for each

foundation grant: the grant recipient (organization), the amount of each grant, and the purpose of each grant. Because this information could be obtained only for grants from twenty-eight of the largest forty foundations, the results are based on a selected sample of these twenty-eight foundations.

I selected the foundations for the study in this manner: step 1, from Minnesota's top forty foundations, I began with the twenty-eight foundations with complete information available, step 2, from the list of twenty-eight foundations with complete information, I chose every other foundation starting with the largest, the Mc Knight Foundation.

This selection process allowed the study of fourteen foundations so that a picture could be created of Minnesota foundation's giving trends. By selecting every other foundation and including larger and smaller foundations, the study is based on a representative sample of Minnesota foundations.

During the research process after much information had been collected, I realized that two foundations in my sample had difficult data which I could not use in my study. The two foundations I could not include in my study were the Honeywell Foundation and the Jerome Foundation. The Honeywell Foundation did not give the purpose of the money that was given. So, I could not tell if money was given to women and could not use the Honeywell Foundation in my study. The Jerome Foundation funded many art organizations in New York. Because I was not familiar with them, I did not know if they were women's arts organizations. Also, individual artists were funded, and it was not noted if they were women. Because of the form

in which funding information was given, I was unable to use the Jerome Foundation in my study. Not being able to use these two foundations occurred in a random way, so it did not affect the validity of the sample. I needed to eliminate two foundations in my original sample of fourteen, so my study is of the twelve foundations which do have complete information.

Difficulties in Foundation Data Collection

The Philanthropy Project Study (1984:5) noted the difficulties in data collection for the top forty Minnesota foundations and corporations.

Foundations are required by law to provide on this tax form (IRS 990) specific information for each grant: the purpose, the amount, and the recipient organization. However, some foundations fail to fulfill these minimum requirements, particularly failing to list the purpose of grants or the location of grantees. The publicly available information, therefore, was often not sufficient to make a determination of who the beneficiaries were...Only 50 percent of the top forty foundations publish annual reports. (Such publication is not required by law.) Only 61 percent of these published reports list the organization, purpose and amount for each grant...Corporate tax returns are not publicly available; therefore information on corporate grant programs is available only when corporations choose to release it.

In a conversation I had with Robert Bothwell from the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy in Washington, D. C., he said that researchers for all of the national foundation studies have had similar problems with collecting available data.

An example of the variation in ways funding information is recorded can be seen with two of the foundations in my original sample. The Mc

Knight Foundation lists specific descriptions of the type of service it is funding. For instance, Women's Advocates in St. Paul, MN received funding in 1980 for "assistance in providing additional security for two facilities housing battered women's shelters." The location of the program is given and the amount appropriated and paid (\$11,000) that year is also in their annual report. In contrast, the Honeywell Foundation, which I could not include in my sample, gives only the name of the agency that was funded and a general heading for the purpose. For example, the Center for Women, Inc. received \$1,400 in 1980. The only information supplied under purpose is its listing under "Health and Welfare-Local Agencies."

A description of the grant was important, because some organizations other than agencies serving women funded women's programs. For example, the Y.M.C.A. sometimes got funding for their child care program. The Phyllis Wheatley Community Center had a program for "Education in Cooperative Living, a program decreasing the incidence of battering through mental health education and intervention with men." The St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center received a grant for "emergency funding to maintain day care centers for adolescent mothers attending St. Paul Public Schools." There are quite a few programs like this that would have been lost in my study without a more detailed description of the grants' purpose.

The Study's Sample

Here is the sample of Minnesota foundations in my study.

Sample of MN Foundations

MC KNIGHT FOUNDATION
DAYTON HUDSON FOUNDATION
GENERAL MILLS FOUNDATION
SAINT PAUL FOUNDATION
PILLSBURY COMPANY FOUNDATION
CHARLES K. BLANDIN FOUNDATION
OTTO BREMMER FOUNDATION
CARGILL FOUNDATION
F. R. BIGELOW FOUNDATION
JOSTENS FOUNDATION
MEDTRONIC FOUNDATION
MARDAG FOUNDATION

Minnesota's 1982 largest grantmaking foundations with complete information from which the sample was taken are listed in Appendix A. The original sample chosen is located in Appendix B.

Types of Foundations in the Study

Foundations in the study are of three types: company-sponsored, independent, and community. Carol Kurzig in Foundation Fundamentals: A Guide for Grantseekers (1980:4-5) describes these foundations.

Company-sponsored foundations obtain their funds from profit-making companies but are legally independent entities. They are often used as conduits for corporate giving, making grants to organizations serving company employees, to communities where the company has operations, to conduct research in related fields, or to improve the company's public image. Company-sponsored foundations vary a great deal in the

amount of money they give annually, but they tend to give a large number of relatively small grants....

Independent foundations make up the bulk of the private foundation universe. The assets of independent foundations commonly come from the gift of an individual or family. Many function under the direction of family members and are often called "family foundations." Others may bear a family name but have independent boards of trustees and professional staff, such as The Ford Foundation....

Community foundations generally make grants only in their own metropolitan areas and are governed by boards broadly representative of their community. Their income is from a variety of sources, including trusts established by individuals, families, or companies, and they can also be the recipients of private foundation grants. In some cases a substantial percentage of their grants is made according to very specific donor instructions, leaving little money to be distributed at the discretion of the board. Community foundations are usually classified by the IRS as public charities...(They) are among the most open foundations, and they usually make a great deal of information available about their activities.

In this sample, the following foundations are company-sponsored:

Dayton Hudson, General Mills, Pillsbury Company, Cargill, Jostens and Medtronic. Independent foundations are: Mc Knight, Charles Blandin, Otto Bremer, F. R. Bigelow and Mardag. The one community foundation in the sample is The St. Paul Foundation.

Service Categories

I created categories of the type of services that were funded. I thought it would be helpful for programs for women and the foundations themselves to know what kinds of programs received funding. These are the categories I found that most closely describe the services.

Service Categories

1. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
battered women's shelters, support services for battered women and their children, housing and rent assistance for battered women, programs for children of battered women, intervention and services for men who batter
2. EMPLOYMENT
career programs for women, programs to get women in the work force
3. FAMILY PLANNING
family planning including natural family planning, abortion counseling and clinics, programs dealing with male role in family planning
4. WOMEN'S ATHLETICS
women's athletic scholarships, women's athletic programs in educational institutions
5. WOMEN'S EDUCATION
women's educational institutions, scholarships for women, individual research grants for women
6. DAY CARE
child care, after school child care
7. SEXUAL ASSAULT ADVOCACY PROGRAMS
counseling of rape victims, sexual assault prevention, family treatment for incest, programs for victims of abuse, programs dealing with sexual harassment
8. YOUTH SERVICES
programs working with teen prostitution, girls' group homes, teen parenting programs, teen pregnancy programs, apartment living programs for adolescent mothers, big sisters, girls' clubs, girl scouts, campfire girls, services not covered in other categories (e.g. family planning, education, offenders)
9. WOMEN IN THE ARTS
visual and performing arts for women, women writers, women's books, women's poetry, women's music, dance companies run by women

10. WOMEN'S SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS
League of Women Voters, Women's Association of the Minnesota Orchestra
11. WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP
12. WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE
research on cervical cancer, support for women with mastectomies, maternal health care, nurse-midwife film at hospital, hospital care for woman with heart condition, services not covered in other categories (e.g. family planning)
13. FOUNDATIONS AND FUNDING FOR WOMEN
funding for Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, Minnesota Women's Fund, special opportunities fund for organizations promoting programs for women and children
14. CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY SERVICES FOR WOMEN
treatment for women, aftercare facilities for women
15. BASIC SERVICES FOR WOMEN
rent, mortgage payments, utilities, food, moving expenses, furnace repair for low income woman, emergency living expenses for A.F.D.C. family, medical expenses for children of single parent mothers, services not covered in other categories (e.g. domestic violence)
16. MULTI-SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS
Y.W.C.A.; counseling, information and referral agencies; outreach and advocacy; crisis intervention and counseling; legal defense and education
17. OFFENDERS
women offenders, women ex-offenders, residential program for women released from Minnesota correctional institutions
18. WORKSHOPS AND SYMPOSIUMS
symposiums on the needs of low income single parents; conference on women, the economy and public policy; workshop on racism; workshop on A.F.D.C., services not covered in other categories (e.g. Women's Leadership)
19. MISCELLANEOUS
type of program was unknown, programs which do not fit in any other category

Data Collection Process

I reviewed all of the grants funded for each foundation in my sample from the years 1980 through 1983. I listed the programs that specifically served women on a data sheet (see Appendix C for sample data sheet). I kept a record of the data by foundation and year (eg. Mc Knight, 1980). I recorded what agency received funding, how much was granted (paid) during the year, the purpose of the grant and what service category the grant fit into. I recorded only the amount actually paid. Some programs were granted money that was spread over several years. I recorded how much was actually given to the programs each year.

I then noted how much money was paid during the year to all programs. This information was given in the annual reports in summary form either at the beginning or end of the report. In the 990 tax forms when annual reports were not available, the information was given on line 23, (Contributions, gifts, grants) on the first page of the form where summary information is listed.

In order to find out if the colleges, universities and private schools funded were institutions for women or girls, I checked each one with school reference books. I looked up each college and university in Everywoman's Guide to Colleges and Universities and The College Man's Guide to All Women's Colleges: Where the Girls are Today. I needed to look in both references (using the latter one to my dismay with its sexist title and content) because some colleges and universities were in one but not the other. Cross-checking them with both afforded me the most thorough listing of women's higher educational institutions. For private elementary and high

schools, I used The Handbook of Private Schools as a reference guide. When enrollment figures for women or girls were very high (80% or more) and the educational institution was co-educational, I did include it as education for women.

Rounding Off Procedure

I rounded off the numbers in my research to the hundredths place. In calculating the percentage of money given by foundations to women, I rounded off by increasing the number in the hundredths place by .01 if the number in the thousandths place was 5 or above. If it was less than 5, I left the number as it was and just dropped any numbers after the hundredths place. For example, 4.325 became 4.33%, 5.036 became 5.04% and 3.244 became 3.24%.

When I calculated the percentage of money going to each service category, I rounded off the numbers so they would add up to 100%. I did this by using the same procedure as above with one additional factor. If rounding in this manner put the total either over or under 100%, I decided which numbers should be raised or lowered based on the numbers in the thousandths place. I increased those numbers with the largest number in the thousandths place. Here is a hypothetical example to illustrate the procedure I used:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 49.2493 = 49.25 \\
 25.2482 = 25.25 \\
 15.2563 = 15.25 \\
 10.2512 = \underline{10.25} \\
 \qquad \qquad 100\%
 \end{array}$$

Exceptional Research Situations

During the course of researching, I needed to make some judgements about the data. In some cases, the grants fit into two service categories. An example of this kind of grant is Dallas Women's Employment and Education Inc. which received \$10,000 for general support. I divided the money equally into the two service categories: \$5,000 to employment and \$5,000 to education. I used this procedure of dividing the grant equally in half for all grants to women that were for two purpose

In some cases, a program was specifically designated to serve both men and women. When Big Brothers and Big Sisters (one organization) was funded, I counted half of the grant as funding for women.

In the area of education, several scholarships were for women or minority students. In these cases, I counted half of the money as given to women. When a scholarship said "preference to women," I counted 3/4 of the grant to women's funding. When colleges or universities had high enrollment figures for women (80% or more), I included them in the study. An example of this is colleges that were just for women and have now become co-educational. Some of them have high enrollment figures for women.

Several foundations gave money to "independent or private colleges." I did not include them, because there was no information specifying which colleges these were, so I could not tell if they funded women's colleges. Some foundations gave matching contributions to various schools. They gave the total amount given but did not breakdown how much was given to the individual school or the names of the schools

that received funding. In this case, where the information was unknown, I did not include it in the study as funding for women. Some foundations gave scholarships to their employees' children. I did not include them, because there was no information on the children's gender. I included dance residencies at a women's college under education rather than under the arts category.

When programs were for single parents, I included them as funding for women. I did this because, currently, women are single parents more often than men.

I included the YWCA under the "multi-service" category unless a specific program at the "Y" was funded that fit under another category.

I did include family sexual abuse programs as serving women, because currently, mostly girls and women are being helped by these programs. In the same vein, I included family violence in the study. In talking with the director of one of the programs that received most of this money, women are the prime recipients of services.

The St. Paul Foundation gave many small grants in their Community Sharing Fund. Where money was given to an "individual" and no gender was listed, I did not include it as money for women. In some cases the description of what the money was used for indicated it was given to a woman. In these cases I did include them as funding for women.

Some of the programs were located in other states. Because I am from Minnesota, I am more familiar with programs from this area. In some case the program was in another state and the grant's purpose had no mention of women (e.g. general operating support, program underwriting,

purchase equipment). When this occurred, I included it if the title of the organization indicated it was a program for women.

CHAPTER THREE

Findings

Introduction

This chapter describes what I found from the research. I shall describe the findings by using tables and graphs.

I shall begin describing the findings by presenting a table showing the amount of money each foundation gave to women's programs and the percent change for the years under study. I shall illustrate with pie charts the percent given to women by each foundations. I shall present a table that ranks the percent given to women by type of foundation. This will be followed by pie charts graphically illustrating the percentage of money given to women each year of the study and the total percent given between 1980-1983. Then, I shall introduce a line graph that shows the the trends in funding of women's programs over the four year period by dollar amount and percentage. Then, I shall present in table form the amount of money and percent by year given to specific services for women. I shall rank the service categories by percentage to women over the four year period. Using bar graphs, I shall visually show what percent went to each service category for every year in the study.

Foundation Funding to Women: 1980-1983

The following table (Table 2) shows the amount of funding women's programs received from Minnesota foundations. It describes the total dollar amount each foundation contributed to all programs from 1980 through 1983. It then shows the dollar amount given to women's programs and what percentage this is of the total. Then, I have listed the percent change, from 1980 to 1983, of each foundation's funding of women's programs.

Table 2

Funding of Women's Programs by Minnesota Foundations:
1980-1983

<u>Foundation</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>	<u>\$ to Women</u>	<u>% to Women</u>	<u>% Change: 1980-1983</u>
<u>MC KNIGHT</u>	1980	\$ 9,153,202	\$531,371	5.81%	<u>-2.29%</u>
	1981	24,796,148	456,720	1.84	
	1982	28,445,800	483,595	1.70	
	1983	25,061,052	882,219	3.52	
<u>DAYTON HUDSON</u>	1980	7,350,815	304,000	4.14	<u>-1.08</u>
	1981	7,141,648	328,895	4.61	
	1982	8,157,954	311,150	3.81	
	1983	9,181,883	281,414	3.06	
<u>GENERAL MILLS</u>	1980	5,110,838	204,834	4.01	<u>+1.78</u>
	1981	5,658,683	212,462	3.75	
	1982	6,219,713	289,937	4.66	
	1983	6,133,987	355,171	5.79	

<u>SAINT PAUL</u>	1980	2,273,878	105,945	4.66	<u>-2.67</u>
	1981	2,101,869	186,161	8.86	
	1982	3,939,692	171,412	4.35	
	1983	10,738,415	213,254	1.99	

<u>PILLSBURY COMPANY</u>	1980	2,500,262	82,000	3.28	<u>-1.16</u>
	1981	2,613,370	109,700	4.20	
	1982	2,738,436	102,500	3.74	
	1983*	4,006,709	85,099	2.12	

*includes "plant community giving total"

<u>BLANDIN</u>	1980	5,228,823	35,530	0.68	<u>+0.17</u>
	1981	4,136,956	60,700	1.47	
	1982	3,734,879	173,475	4.64	
	1983	6,569,148	56,000	0.85	

<u>OTTO BREMER</u>	1980	1,221,662	121,313	9.93	<u>+2.59</u>
	1981	1,501,851	180,925	12.05	
	1982	2,361,403	270,795	11.47	
	1983	2,324,894	290,980	12.52	

<u>CARGILL</u>	1980	995,690	9,750	0.98	<u>+0.54</u>
	1981	1,251,963	12,550	1.00	
	1982	illegible copy of 990 tax form			
	1983	1,396,285	21,250	1.52	

<u>F.R. BIGELOW</u>	1980	696,950	60,000	8.61	<u>+0.69</u>
	1981	820,205	0	0	
	1982	939,733	17,500	1.86	
	1983	1,094,171	101,800	9.30	

<u>JOSTENS INC.</u>	1980	322,010	6,225	1.93	<u>-0.16</u>
	1981	388,157	5,385	1.39	
	1982	442,101	4,390	0.99	
	1983	456,770	8,070	1.77	

<u>MEDTRONIC</u>	1980	548,194	11,930	2.18	<u>-1.57</u>
	1981	728,366	21,150	2.90	
	1982	756,337	10,900	1.44	
	1983	821,660	5,000	0.61	
<hr/>					
<u>MARDAG</u>	1980	747,375	58,500	7.83	<u>+1.82</u>
	1981	631,822	84,610	13.39	
	1982	680,026	55,000	8.09	
	1983	563,822	54,411	9.65	

As can be seen from the table, half of the foundations decreased in the percentage of money they gave to women between 1980 and 1983.

Losses in percentage of funding ranged from 2.67% to 0.16% with two foundations decreasing by over 2%, another three by over 1% and one by less than 1%. Saint Paul Foundation's percentage of funding to women's programs decreased by 2.67%, Mc Knight by 2.29%, Medtronic by 1.57%, Pillsbury Company by 1.16%, Dayton Hudson by 1.08% and Jostens by 0.16%.

Half of the foundations increased their percentage of money given to women between 1980 and 1983. One increased by over 2%, two by over 1%, and three by less than 1%. The Otto Bremer Foundation increased their funding to women by 2.59%, Mardag by 1.82%, General Mills by 1.78%, Bigelow by 0.69%, Cargill by 0.54% and Blandin by 0.17%. Overall the decreases in percentage of funding (-8.93%) is greater than the increases (+7.59%).


Percentage of Funding to Women by Foundation: 1980-1983

The following pie charts in Figure 2, show the percentage of money given to women's programs by each foundation over the four year period. The total of all funding, the amount given to women and the one year average is also given for each foundation in the study.

Figure 2

Percentage of Funding for Women's Programs
By Foundation: 1980-1983


MC KNIGHT FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$87,456,202
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 2,353,905

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$588,476)


DAYTON HUDSON FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$31,832,300
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 1,225,459

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$588,476)


GENERAL MILLS FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



**TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$23,123,221
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 1,062,404**

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$265,601)**


SAINT PAUL FOUNDATION: 1980-1981



**TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$19,053,854
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 676,772**

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$169,193)**


PILLSBURY FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$11,858,777
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 379,299

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 94,825)**


BLANDIN FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$19,669,806
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 325,705

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 81,426)**

OTTO BREMER FOUNDATION: 1980-1983




11.66%

TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$ 7,409,810
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 864,013

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$216,003)

CARGILL FOUNDATION: 1980, '81 & '83*




1.20%

TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$ 3,643,938
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 43,550

(*3 year average:
1982 data illegible)

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 14,517)


BIGELOW FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$ 3,551,059
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 179,300

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 44,825)


JOSTENS FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$1,609,038
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 24,070

(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 6,018)


METRONIC FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$ 2,854,557
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 48,980

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 12,245)**

MARDAG FOUNDATION: 1980-1983



TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$ 2,623,045
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 252,524

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$ 63,131)**

As can be seen from the pie charts, all of the foundations in the study gave money to programs for women. What is significant is the range of foundation giving to women's programs. Foundation giving to women's programs ranged by individual foundations in the study from 1.20% to 11.66%. The Cargill foundation gave the smallest percentage to women's programs, while The Otto Bremer Foundation gave the largest percentage. Four foundations in the study gave 1-2% (Cargill, Jostens, Blandin and Medtronic,), one gave 2-3% (Mc Knight), three gave 3-4% (Pillsbury, St. Paul and Dayton Hudson), one gave 4-5% (General Mills), one gave 5-6% (Bigelow), one gave 9-10% (Mardag) and one gave 11-12% (Otto Bremer).

Funding for Women by Type of Foundation

Following in Table 3, is a breakdown of the foundations by type. I have looked at the percent of funding given to women by the three types of foundations in the study: company-sponsored, independent and community foundations. I wanted to determine if there was a significant difference in the percentage of total dollars granted to women's programs by type of foundation.

Table 3
Funding for Women by Type of Foundation
(1980-1983)*

<u>Type/Name of Foundation</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>	<u>Funding to Women</u>	<u>% to Women</u>
<u>COMPANY-SPONSORED</u>			
DAYTON HUDSON	\$ 31,832,300	\$1,225,459	3.85%
GENERAL MILLS	23,123,221	1,062,404	4.59
PILLSBURY	11,858,777	379,299	3.20

CARGILL *('80, '81, '82)	3,643,938	43,550	1.20
JOSTENS INC.	1,609,038	24,070	1.50
MEDTRONIC	2,854,557	48,980	1.72

TOTALS	\$ 74,921,831	\$2,783,762	3.72%
<u>INDEPENDENT</u>			
MC KNIGHT	\$ 87,456,202	\$2,353,905	2.69%
BLANDIN	19,669,806	325,705	1.66

OTTO BREMER	7,409,810	864,013	11.66
F.R. BIGELOW	3,551,059	179,300	5.05
MARDAG	2,623,045	252,524	9.63

TOTALS	\$120,710,022	3,975,447	3.29%
<u>COMMUNITY</u>			
ST. PAUL	\$ 19,053,854	\$ 676,772	3.55%

In comparing the percentage of total dollars given to women's programs by type of foundation, there is only a slight difference: company-sponsored, 3.72%; independent, 3.29%; and community foundations, 3.55%.

However, when the lists are subdivided into larger foundations (granting in excess of 11.8 million dollars over the four year period) and smaller foundations (granting between 1.6 and 7.4 million dollars in four years), a pattern emerges in the data. The large company-sponsored foundations granted a significantly higher percentage of money to women's programs (3.20% to 4.59%) than did the smaller company-sponsored foundations (1.20% to 1.72%). The opposite is true for the independent foundations: the smaller foundations awarded a much higher percentage (5.05% to 11.66%) to women's programs than did the large independent foundations (1.66% and 2.69%). Also, the smaller independent foundations gave a greater percentage of money to women's programs than the large company-sponsored foundations.

The community foundation gave 3.55% which is comparable to the large company-sponsored foundations.


Percentage to Women by Year

The pie charts in Figure 3, show the percentage of funding given to women's programs in each year of the study. Information describing the dollar amount given to women and total giving is also presented for each year. The percentage and dollar amounts are also shown for 1980-1983.

Figure 3

Funding of Women's Programs
by Year and Percentage, 1980-1983


1980: FUNDING FOR WOMEN



TOTAL FUNDING - \$36,159,699

FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 1,531,398


1981: FUNDING FOR WOMEN



TOTAL GIVING - \$51,771,038

FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 1,659,261

1982: FUNDING FOR WOMEN*




TOTAL GIVING - \$58,416,074

FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 1,890,654

* does not include Cargill Foundation (data illegible)


1983: FUNDING FOR WOMEN



TOTAL GIVING - \$68,348,796

FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 2,354,668

1980-1983 FUNDING FOR WOMEN*



**TOTAL ALL FUNDING - \$214,695,607
FUNDING FOR WOMEN - \$ 7,435,981**

**(*does not include
Cargill Foundation 1982:
data illegible)**

**(1 YEAR AVERAGE
FUNDING FOR WOMEN:
\$1,858,995)**


The graphs show the percentage of funding women's programs for every year in the study. The percentage for the four year period is 3.46%.

Trends in Funding to Women

The following line graph (Figure 4), plots the percentage of funding (the blackened squares) and the amount of money (light squares) given to women's programs during each of the four years in the study. This graph shows the trends in giving over the four year period.

Figure 4

Trends in Funding of Women's Programs: 1980-1983



The graph shows the increase in amount of dollars given to women's programs over the four year period from \$1.5 million in 1980 to \$2.4 million in 1983. Total foundation giving to all programs also increased during this period from \$36 million in 1980 to \$68 million in 1983. The graph shows the decrease in percentage of giving from 1980 (4.24%) to 1981-1983 ('81, 3.20%; '82, 3.24%; '83, 3.45%) and the nearly constant percent of giving in 1981-1983. So, although the dollar amount of funding to women and total funding to all programs has increased, the percentage of funding to women has remained about the same over this time period.

Types of Women's Programs Funded

Table 4, portrays the type of services funded for women. It breaks down the amount of money and the percentage going to each service category for every year in the study.

Table 4
Service Categories
Funded for Women's Programs
(Proportional Funding: amt. category/yearly total)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>YEAR</u>			
	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	22.45%	20.05%	20.67%	21.19%
	\$343,849	\$332,690	\$390,877	\$489,951
EMPLOYMENT	10.68	8.14	11.59	8.24
	163,526	135,000	219,125	194,000

FAMILY PLANNING	4.27 65,389	15.49 256,978	8.08 152,686	5.02 118,100
WOMEN'S ATHLETICS	.87 13,400	2.01 33,400	.75 14,180	.19 4,430
EDUCATION FOR WOMEN & GIRLS	25.31 387,533	13.93 231,205	27.48 519,636	16.29 383,585
DAY CARE	8.53 130,650	11.86 196,805	9.54 180,395	10.29 242,360
SEXUAL ASSAULT PROGRAMS	4.21 64,456	1.57 26,100	1.66 31,330	2.64 62,085
WOMEN IN THE ARTS	1.08 16,500	3.97 65,825	2.61 49,352	2.02 47,500
WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE	.16 2,500	.18 3,000	.05 1,009	.40 9,491
WOMEN'S CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY PROGRAMS	1.00 15,334	1.83 30,366	.42 7,886	.19 4,550
YOUTH SERVICES	14.71 225,306	9.14 151,647	7.95 150,270	6.02 141,852
WOMEN'S SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	1.10 16,880	1.42 23,650	.65 12,250	1.94 45,700
WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP	.07 1,000	2.23 36,992	.71 13,384	.70 16,470

SPECIAL FUNDING FOR	.72	1.33	1.56	7.18
WOMEN'S PROGRAMS	11,100	22,000	29,500	169,000
BASIC SERVICES FOR	0	.18	.24	1.26
WOMEN & THEIR	0	3,003	4,524	29,794
CHILDREN				
MULTI-SERVICE	2.92	6.20	5.72	13.59
ORGANIZATIONS	44,675	102,800	108,250	319,900
WOMEN	1.59	.29	.08	1.97
OFFENDERS	24,300	4,800	1,500	46,300
WORKSHOPS &	.20	.18	.21	.87
SYMPOSIUMS	3,000	3,000	4,000	20,600
MISCELLANEOUS	.13	0	.03	0
	2,000	0	500	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
	\$1,531,398	\$1,659,261	\$1,890,654	\$2,354,668

Ranking of Service Categories

In Figure 5, the service categories funded for women's programs are ranked according to their percent over the four year period.

Figure 5
 Service Categories
 Funded for Women's Programs:
 1980-1983
 (Ranked by percent of giving)

<u>Service Category</u>	1980-1983	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Domestic Violence _____	\$1,566,376	21.06%
2. Education _____	1,521,959	20.47
3. Day Care _____	750,210	10.09
4. Employment _____	711,651	9.57
5. Youth Services _____	669,075	9.00
6. Family Planning _____	593,153	7.98
7. Multi-Service Organizations _____	575,625	7.74
8. Special Funding Women's Programs _____	231,600	3.12
9. Sexual Assault Advocacy Programs _____	183,971	2.47
10. Women in the Arts _____	179,177	2.41
11. Women's Service Organizations _____	98,480	1.33
12. Women Offenders _____	76,900	1.03
13. Women's Leadership _____	67,846	0.91
14. Women's Athletics _____	65,410	0.88
15. Women's Chemical Dependency Programs _____	58,136	0.78
16. Basic Services for Women and Their Children _____	37,321	0.50
17. Workshops and Symposia _____	30,600	0.41
18. Women's Health Care _____	16,000	0.22
19. Miscellaneous _____	2,500	0.03
 TOTAL	 \$7,435,981	 100.00%


Over 50% (51.62%) of the funding for women over the four years went to programs in the first three service categories (domestic violence, education and day care). Over 85% (85.91%) of the funding went into the top 7 categories: domestic violence, education, day care, employment, youth services, family planning and multi-service organizations. The remaining

services are funded at 3.12% or less. Six of the services are funded at less than 1%: women's leadership, women's athletics, women's chemical dependency programs, basic services for women and their children, workshops and symposiums and women's health care. Women's health care received the smallest percentage of funding over the four year period: 0.22%.


Percent Change in Funding Service Categories: 1980-1983

Figure 6, shows the change in percent of funding to the various service categories over the four years in the study. When reading the bar graphs, note the different scales.


DOMESTIC VIOLENCE



EMPLOYMENT



FAMILY PLANNING



WOMEN'S ATHLETICS






Figure 6

Individual Service Categories Funded
For Women's Programs, 1980-1983


EDUCATION




DAY CARE




SEXUAL ASSAULT PROGRAMS




WOMEN IN THE ARTS




WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE




WOMEN'S CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY PROGRAMS




YOUTH SERVICES




WOMEN'S SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS




WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP




SPECIAL FUNDING FOR WOMEN'S PROGRAMS




BASIC SERVICES FOR WOMEN & THEIR CHILDREN




BASIC SERVICES FOR WOMEN & THEIR CHILDREN




WOMEN OFFENDERS



WORKSHOPS & SYMPOSIUMS



MISCELLANEOUS



CHAPTER FOUR

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to address two questions: (1) "What percentage of Minnesota foundation grant dollars went to programs for women in 1980-1983?" and (2) "Over this time period was the amount of funding for these programs changing, and if so was there an established trend?"

The study examined the grants awarded by a representative sample of 12 Minnesota foundations over a four year period. The total dollars given to programs for women were calculated for each foundation. The results were then expressed as a percentage of total grant dollars awarded by year for each foundation. A cumulative total and percentage given to women was then figured for all of the foundations in the study.

Results from the study indicate that programs for women do not receive much of the total amount of funding given by Minnesota foundations. The four year average percentage of funding to women was 3.46%. In 1980, women's programs received 4.24%, in 1981, 3.20%, in 1982, 3.24% and in 1983, 3.45%. The percentage of funding for women dropped significantly in 1981 and increased very little in 1982 and 1983.

These changes occurred during a time of federal cut backs to human services programs that primarily affected women and children. There is

increasing poverty among women as seen from figures on the feminization of poverty. The need for services increased, yet the percentage of funding given to women decreased. Increased funding of programs for women by foundations, individuals and the government is needed. The study shows how much funding individual foundations gave to women. It is my hope that this information will be useful to those foundations and will help increase funding allocated to women's programs. It would be helpful if the foundations would prioritize women as needing services and keep records on the gender of the population they serve.

The range of foundation giving to women's programs was from 1.20% to 11.66%. The Cargill foundation gave the smallest percentage to women's programs (1.20%), while The Otto Bremer Foundation gave the largest percentage (11.66%). Four foundations in the study gave 1-2% (Cargill, Jostens, Blandin and Medtronic,), one gave 2-3% (Mc Knight), three gave 3-4% (Pillsbury, St. Paul and Dayton Hudson), one gave 4-5% (General Mills), one gave 5-6% (Bigelow), one gave 9-10% (Mardag) and one gave 11-12% (Otto Bremer).

In comparing the percentage of total dollars given to women's programs by type of foundation, there is only a slight difference: company-sponsored, 3.72%; independent, 3.29%; and community foundations, 3.55%.

The large company-sponsored foundations (granting in excess of 11.8 million dollars over the four year period) gave a significantly higher percentage of money to women's programs (3.20% to 4.59%) than did the smaller company-sponsored foundations (1.20% to 1.72%).

The opposite is true for the independent foundations: the smaller foundations awarded a much higher percentage (5.05% to 11.66%) to women's programs than did the large independent foundations (1.66% and 2.69%). Also, the smaller independent foundations gave a greater percentage of money to women's programs than the large company-sponsored foundations. The community foundation gave 3.55% which is comparable to the large company-sponsored foundations.

The findings also show that little money went to programs for women's health care. Women's health care received the smallest percentage of funding over the four year period, only 0.22%. Women's chemical dependency programs only received 0.78%, women's athletics 0.88%, programs for women offenders 1.03%, women in the arts 2.41% and sexual assault programs 2.47%. I also noticed that there were few programs funded for women of color. It would be helpful if foundations would grant more funding to the programs above. The programs receiving the most funding, over 50% (51.62%) of the amount given to women's programs, during the four year period were domestic violence, education and day care.

Further research could be conducted on funding for women's programs. It would be helpful if research based on this design was conducted every year to note change in funding. It would also be interesting to note the gender composition of the foundations' board of directors and to find out their sensitivity to the needs of women.

With the feminization of poverty and issues specifically concerning women, there is a need for funding of women's programs. Increased

funding is needed by all funding sources: foundations, individuals and the government. The responsibility for funding women's programs should be shared by both private and public funding sources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bowles, Gloria and Duelli-Klein, Renate (ed.). Theories of Women's Studies II. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1981.

Brownmiller, Susan. Against Our Will. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.

Capitol Bulletin. St. Paul, MN: The Minnesota Women's Consortium, February 20, 1985.

Feed the Cities...Not the Pentagon! Handout prepared by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. May, 1982, Philadelphia, PA.

Financial Support of Women's Programs in the 1970's. New York: Ford Foundation, 1979.

Gottlieb, Naomi and Hutchins, Trova. Alternative Social Services for Women. ed. Naomi Gottlieb. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Howe, Florence, Suzanne Howard, and Mary Jo Boehm Strauss (ed.). Everywoman's Guide to Colleges and Universities. Old Westbury, New York: The Feminist Press, 1982.

Hutchins, Trova and Baxter, Vee. "Battered Women." Alternative Social Services for Women. ed. Naomi Gottlieb. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Inequality of Sacrifice: The Impact of the Reagan Budget on Women. Washington D. C.: Coalition on Women and the Budget, 1984.

Kurzig, Carol. Foundation Fundamentals: A Guide for Grantseekers. New York: The Foundation Center, 1986.

Meara, Hannah and Brooks, Lonna. Short-Changed: A Look at Funding for Chicago-Area Women's Organizations. Chicago, IL: Chicago Women in Philanthropy, 1985.

Pratt, John and Aburto, Rosange'lica. Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged. Minneapolis, MN: The Philanthropy Project, 1984.

Pratt, John and Aburto, Rosange'lica. Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged. 1984. Minneapolis, MN: The Philanthropy Project, 1985.

Private Foundation Funding of the Women's Movement. Washington D. C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 1979.

Rachlin, Seth and George Van Hoomissen. The College Man's Roadtrip Guide to All Women's Colleges: Where the Girls Are Today. New York: Crown Publishers, 1984.

Salamon, Lester M. and Abramson, Alan J. "Nonprofits and the Federal Budget: Deeper Cuts Ahead." Foundation News, March/April 1985, pp. 48-54.

Sargent, Kathryn. The Handbook of Private Schools. Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, Inc., 1985.

Stevens, Doris. "Rape Victims." Alternative Social Services for Women. ed. Naomi Gottlieb. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

The United States Budget in Brief. FY 1984, Washington D. C.: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, 1983.

The United States Budget in Brief. FY 1985, Washington D. C.: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, 1984.

Towers, Cheryl R. Funding of Programs for Women and Girls By a Selected Sample of Major Corporations. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, 1980.

APPENDIX A

Minnesota's 1982 Largest Grantmaking Foundations
with Complete Information

The Mc Knight Foundation
The Bush Foundation
Dayton Hudson Foundation
Northwest Area Foundation
Honeywell Foundation
3 M Foundation
General Mills Foundation
First Bank System Foundation
The Saint Paul Companies
The Pillsbury Company Foundation
Alliss Educational Foundation
Charles K. Blandin Foundation
The Minneapolis Foundation
Otto Bremer Foundation
Deluxe Check Printers Foundation
Jerome Foundation
Ordean Foundation
Cargill Foundation
I. A. O'Shaughnessy Foundation
F. R. Bigelow Foundation
B. C. Gamble and P. W. Skogmo Foundation
Jostens Foundation
General Service Foundation
Medtronic Foundation
Hormel Foundation
Mardag Foundation
Tozer Foundation

APPENDIX B

Original Sample

The Mc Knight Foundation
Dayton Hudson Foundation
Honeywell Foundation
General Mills Foundation
The Saint Paul Foundation
The Pillsbury Company Foundation
Charles K. Blandin Foundation
Otto Bremer Foundation
Jerome Foundation
Cargill Foundation
F. R. Bigelow Foundation
Jostens Foundation
Medtronic Foundation
Mardag Foundation

Foundation/
Corporation: MEDTRONIC
Year: 1983

DATA SHEET FOR STUDY OF
FUNDING FOR WOMEN & GIRLS

Page 1 of 1
Source: ANNUAL REPORT
Date: YEAR ENDING APRIL 30, 1983

ORGANIZATION	Amount	PURPOSE	SERVICE CATEGORIES #																	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Alexandra House (Circle Pines, MN)	2,000	RESIDENCE FOR BATTERED WOMEN	2,000						1											
CHART (mpls)	2,000	Prog. For women with CHILD WORK ISSUES		2,000																
Working Opportunities For Women (St Paul)	500	Aid women with employ- ment needs			500															
Nancy Hauser Dance Company	500	Program for modern DANCE (Woman owned Dance Company)										500								
SUB-TOTAL THIS PAGE	5,000		\$ 2,000	2,500								500								
			N= 2,000	2,500								500								

TOTAL \$ TO F = \$ 5,000
*TOTAL \$ GIVEN = \$ 821,660 | % TO F = .6170

APPENDIX C

Data Collection Sheet