

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, 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 disburseable 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

Paul Brest
President
Stanford, California

Robert F. Erburu
Los Angeles, California

James C. Gaither
Hillsborough, California

Eleanor H. Gimon
Greenwich, Connecticut

H. Irving Grousbeck
Portola Valley, California
(through Apr. 2002)

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

Susan Bell
Vice President, Planning

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

Nancy Strausser
Corporate Secretary

PROGRAM STAFF

Conflict Resolution

Melanie Greenberg
Program Director
(through Oct. 2002)

Terry Amsler
Program Director
(effective Oct. 2002)

Stephanie Smith
Consulting Program Officer

Cindy Gire
Senior Consultant

Angela Jones
Program Assistant

Education

Marshall (Mike) Smith
Program Director

Jorge Ruiz de Velasco
Program Officer

Sally Tracy
Program Assistant

Environment

Michael Fischer
Program Director
(through Feb. 2002)

Hal Harvey
Program Director
(effective Feb. 2002)

Rhea Suh
Program Officer

Anne Atkinson
Program Assistant

Kate Thorneloe
Program Assistant

Family and Community
Development

Bettie Hodges
Program Director

Renu Karir
Program Officer

Yvette Clark
Program Assistant

Performing Arts

Moy Eng
Program Director

Andrea Faiss
Program Officer

John McGuirk
Program Officer

Kerry O'Connor
Program Assistant

Population

J. Joseph Speidel, M.D.
Program Director

Wendy R. Sheldon
Program Officer

Tamara Fox
Program Officer

Nicole Gray
Program Officer

Karen Andrews
Program Assistant

Theresa Jacobson
Program Assistant

U.S.–Latin American Relations

David E. Lorey
Program Officer

C. R. Hibbs
Program Officer

Joseph Ryan
Program Officer

Hoa Tran
Program Assistant

FINANCE GROUP

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

Susan Ketcham
Treasurer

Diana Lieberman
Director, Investment Research

Kelly Meldrum
Director, Private Equity

Lucy Ellis
Controller

Charlene E. Cooper
Senior Accountant

Tim Reid
Accountant

Mitzi Woods
Accountant

Mary Civitell
Accounting Clerk

Ruth Gilroy
Executive Assistant

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Susan Bell
Vice President, Planning

Luisa Smith
*Assistant to the Vice President,
Planning*

Christine Sherry
*Director, The Philanthropy
Workshop West*

Christy Cory
*Executive Assistant, The
Philanthropy Workshop West*

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Paul Brest
President

Nancy Strausser
*Assistant to the President /
Corporate Secretary*

Alvertha Penny
*Senior Advisor to the President
and Director, Neighborhood
Improvement Initiative*

Cindy Ho
Project Manager, NII

Yvette Clark
Program Assistant

Michael Wald
*Senior Advisor to the President
on Evaluation, Policy, and
Children and Youth Issues*

Paula Gann
Program Assistant

Cheryl Hughes
Program Assistant

Smita Singh
*Special Advisor for Global
Affairs*

Shasta Black
Assistant, Global Affairs

Linda Clayton
*Executive Assistant,
Administration
Program Assistant, Special
Projects*

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Nancy Strausser
*Assistant to the President /
Corporate Secretary*

Andres Anaya
Facilities

Shaka Dickson
Receptionist

Gonzalo Villa
Facilities

Tony Keller
*Librarian
(through Sept. 2002)*

HUMAN RESOURCES

Alana Wilson
Director, Human Resources

Gregg Servis
Management Associate

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
SERVICES

Terry Keenor
*Director, Information
Technology*

Sally Lee
IT Project Manager

Harry Lim
Exchange Administrator

Lily Chiu
IT Analyst

John Cho
Network Administrator

Trinh Tran
IT Assistant

GRANT'S ADMINISTRATION

Carolyn Provost
*Manager, Grants
Administration*

Constance Bassett
Grants Administrator

Celia Lonborg
Grants Assistant

Heather Jackson
Proposal Assistant

FELLOWS

James Emerson

Michael Fischer

Samantha Graff

Ryan MacDonnell

Tia Martinez

Barbara Mertz

Marnie Sigler

Smita Singh
(through July 2002)

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

In recent years, there has been much talk within the nonprofit sector about “strategic” or “effective” philanthropy, aimed at maximizing the social impact of foundation grants to nonprofit organizations. This talk takes place in the context of nonprofit organizations’ perennial and increasing concern that the large majority of philanthropic dollars are earmarked for particular projects – often designed by foundation staff with little or no consultation – rather than for general operating, or core, support. In 1994, only 16 percent of the grants budgets of large foundations provided general operating support, and by 2001 this had declined to 11 percent.¹ Many observers of the nonprofit sector argue that this trend seriously diminishes the efficacy and vitality of the organizations and the sector as a whole.²

Does the new interest in strategic philanthropy provide yet another reason, or rationalization, for not providing general operating support? Some foundations apparently believe that impact is best achieved and measured through grantor-initiated projects. Early in my tenure at the Hewlett Foundation, I spoke to an experienced evaluation officer at a foundation known for its ambitious projects, who flatly asserted that one cannot evaluate the impact of general support grants. If she is correct, then general operating support and strategic philanthropy are indeed in conflict – for strategic philanthropy depends on evaluation, feedback, and correction.

If only because almost 50 percent of the Hewlett Foundation’s grant dollars are designated for general operating support and because we think of ourselves as strategic and results-oriented, I was skeptical of the evaluation officer’s assertion. My skepticism has only grown with experience. Yes, the evaluation of projects is often simpler, and surely there are situations in which project support yields the greatest impact. For example, it is relatively easy to make and evaluate a grant to a museum to purchase a particular Rembrandt. Yet a strategic funder can often have the most significant and sustainable impact through general operating support grants – for example, maintaining the overall excellence of the museum’s collection and its accessibility to a diverse public. Moreover, a nonprofit organization that cannot cover its overhead expenses, of which project grants seldom pay their proportionate share, simply cannot sustain its operations.

This essay identifies the competing interests at stake in the funding of nonprofit organizations. It begins by categorizing the different kinds of support a funder may give an organization and by defining the concept of strategic philanthropy. It then articulates the legitimate interests of funders and grantees implicated by different kinds of support.

The essay concludes by proposing general principles for reconciling the potential competition between strategic philanthropy and general operating support. Although I do not believe that there is a single approach, resolution of the tensions often lies in what I shall call “negotiated general operating support,” based on a clear agreement and ongoing relationship between the funder and the grantee, and also in the willingness of project funders to bear overhead costs.

General Operating Support and Project Support

One can array the forms of funding for nonprofit organizations on a continuum, anchored at one end by totally unrestricted general operating support – for example, an expendable gift to Yale University to be used as its president pleases – and at the other by funding for projects designed by the funder – for example, a grant for a professor in Yale’s astrophysics department to identify asteroids heading toward the earth. There are many possible hybrids, but it suffices to describe two basic models of general operating support and two of project support.

General operating support

The least constrained form of general operating support is unrestricted support with “no strings attached” and minimal donor engagement. This is the support typically given by annual donors to colleges, symphony orchestras, museums, and membership organizations such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Rifle Association, and the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Donors do not seek to influence the recipient’s actions directly, and they rely on general newsletters and annual reports to learn of the organization’s achievements.

By contrast, negotiated general operating support is based on an agreed-upon strategic plan with outcome objectives. Here, the funder engages in a due diligence process, which culminates in an agreement about what outcomes the organization plans to achieve, how it plans to achieve them, and how progress will be assessed and reported. With these

understandings in place, the funder's support goes to the organization's operations as a whole rather than to particular projects, and the organization has considerable autonomy in implementing the plan.³ For example, the Hewlett Foundation recently made a substantial general operating support grant to a performing arts organization. We expressed some concerns about the viability of the organization's business plan, which led to changes in the plan before the grant was made. However, our goal throughout the discussions was to support the organization's vision rather than impose our own.⁴

When given by foundations, either sort of general operating support typically consists of multiyear expendable grants, often with a reasonable likelihood of renewal.

Project support

While general operating support is an investment in the grantee's overall expertise, strategy, management, and judgment, project support is typically based on the organization's capacity to carry out specific activities. Here too there are two basic models, also with possible hybrids.

First, foundations and other organizations can support projects designed and autonomously implemented by the grantee. The paradigm is a medical, natural science, or social science research project designed by university faculty, who then shop it to foundations or government funders. For example, we recently made a grant to Princeton University for a professor to carry out an empirical study of the effects of affirmative action in higher education. And together with the Mellon Foundation, we are supporting the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's OpenCourseWare project, which makes course materials available free on the Internet.

Second, funders can initiate projects and seek organizations to carry them out. The paradigm is a funder initiative designed to achieve a particular result, such as protecting biological diversity in the Amazon. The funder designs a strategy that includes a number of component parts and assembles a portfolio of grantees to carry them out – for example, organizations doing scientific field research, indigenous groups trying to change regional policies and practices, and organizations advocating sustainable practices by multinational businesses. The funder may seek out particular grantees or issue a request for proposals. The funder thus serves as architect and general contractor, and the organizations as subcontractors.⁵

What is Strategic Philanthropy?

By strategic philanthropy, I simply mean philanthropy that is structured to be effective in achieving a donor's charitable goals, whatever they may be. The essence of strategic philanthropy is that (1) the funder specifies objectives and has a plausible (strategic) plan for marshaling its resources to achieve them; (2) the funder seeks grantee organizations that share its aims, and engages in due diligence to ensure that grantees have the capacity to achieve them; (3) the funder and its grantees articulate how they will ascertain if they are moving toward their shared objectives; and (4) they take reasonable steps to assess progress and evaluate outcomes.⁶

If there is a polar alternative to strategic philanthropy, it is a funder having a vague set of goals or preferences (for example, "protect the environment" or "help disadvantaged children"), waiting for organizations with interesting ideas or projects to come knocking, and making grants with little due diligence or agreed-upon objectives, strategies, and milestones. This is not usually the way to maximize impact. Achieving most social or environmental goals requires a coherent strategy that takes into account the scale of the problem, the ecology of nonprofit organizations working in the field, the funder's resources, and the roles of other funders.⁷

What Interests are Served by Different Modes of Support?

Strategic philanthropy, with its emphasis on planned and measured progress toward clearly articulated goals, is generally more suited to project support or negotiated general operating support than to general operating support with no strings attached. Does strategic philanthropy also favor project support over negotiated general operating support? Not necessarily, or even usually – though tensions with general operating support may arise. To understand the tensions and how they might be resolved, one must first ask what interests are served by the different modes of support. The following section outlines three clusters of interests held, respectively, by funders, grantee organizations,⁸ and funders and grantees together.

The Funders' Interests

Strategic focus. A strategically oriented funder endeavors to achieve particular outcomes. Sometimes, a grantee's mission will be optimally aligned with the funders'

goals. To the extent they diverge, however, general operating support blunts the funder's impact, and the funder may be more effective by making a series of coordinated project grants. For example, a funder focused on protecting biological diversity in the Amazon would not achieve this aim efficiently by providing general operating support to a multipurpose environmental organization. Even where the grantee and funder agree on outcomes, there may be sufficient disagreement about the strategies necessary to achieve them that the funder would deem general support ineffective.⁹

Accountability. A funder also has an interest in ensuring that grant funds are used effectively and for the agreed-upon purposes. Accountability entails at least that the organization report on its activities, outputs, and outcomes in a form satisfactory to the funder. Accountability is weakest with respect to general operating support when (1) there are no strings attached, (2) the organization's operations are not transparent, (3) outcomes are difficult to discern, and (4) the funder's only control is the organization's hope that the grant will be renewed. Accountability is greatly enhanced by the essentially contractual nature of negotiated general operating support, where the funder and organization agree on outcomes, strategies, measures of progress, and reporting requirements.¹⁰

Evaluation. When a project is well-defined in terms of objectives, activities, and indicators of progress, evaluating progress seems a fairly straightforward task. Although the evaluation of a general support grant is comparatively more complex, one should not exaggerate its difficulty. In effect, the grantor of general operating support assumes the grantee organization's mission as its own, and evaluates progress and the success of the grant essentially as the organization evaluates itself. This is the norm when the Hewlett Foundation makes general support grants to organizations ranging from Human Rights Watch to Planned Parenthood to the San Francisco Opera.

Making a difference. When one is the sole funder of a discrete project, one can take individual pride, shared only with the grantee, in its success. By contrast, funders providing general operating support often contribute only a small fraction of an organization's budget. A funder who contributes 3 percent of the budget of a large environmental organization may wonder just what difference the grant makes, and is unlikely to get the same ego gratification or publicity from the organization's success.

In this respect, providing general operating support is no different from any other activity or enterprise that depends on many people's contributions – for example, paying taxes or voting – where no individual makes a difference, but where the aggregate contributions are critical to the enterprise. The essential argument for such support is Kantian: If every potential funder acted on the belief that its contribution were not necessary, the enterprise would fail for want of funding. Most foundation executives who question the value of relatively small contributions to an organization's budget probably write personal checks to educational, cultural, and advocacy groups even though their contributions are even smaller drops in a bucket. The underlying principle, and the need for such philanthropy, are not different.

The Organizations' Interests

Autonomy. Grantee organizations value general operating support – the fewer strings attached, the better – because it allows them to operate autonomously, free from the funder's control. The grantee may have more expertise than the funder and may be able to carry out its mission most effectively with minimal interference. Advocacy organizations, universities, and think tanks may be particularly concerned about political interference from funders.

Coherence. A related organizational interest in general operating support is ensuring the coherence of the grantee's strategies and programs. A well-run organization will have developed its own strategic plan for solving the problems it addresses. A funder who approaches the organization with a particular project in mind is likely to have strategies that differ more or less from the organization's, calling for more or less different actions and allocations of resources. As the number of project-oriented funders increases, the organization's own strategic plans can get quite fragmented and distorted. An organization that depends heavily on project support must engage in fundraising that cobbles together grants of particular interest to funders while trying to maintain some semblance of a coherent plan.

Project support may thus contort the organization's fundraising and operations. Even negotiated general operating support may burden an organization if a number of different funders emphasize different strategies or require different sorts of information in different formats.

Sustainability. An organization's sustainability is compromised to the extent that foundations supporting particular projects do not cover overhead, or "indirect" costs for rent, electricity, back-office functions, and the like. Some foundations will not pay overhead at all, while others limit such payments to an amount, say 10 percent, that often comes nowhere close to covering the actual costs. So for \$1 of project funding, the organization must obtain additional unrestricted funds – anywhere from 25 cents to more than \$1 (for, say, a university's science or medical research project). Thus, a funder's ability to support particular projects depends on other funders providing general support. There is a problem of the commons here: It is in every funder's long-term interest to have viable organizations to carry out the projects of its choice, but any particular funder can usually avoid paying its fair share of what is needed to keep an organization viable.

Interests Shared by Funders and Organizations

Optimal deployment of expertise. Funders and organizations both may have considerable expertise in addressing the issues they tackle. The due diligence process involved in negotiated general operating support is a way for both parties' expertise to contribute to the outcome. This can also be true of project support if the funder is well-versed in the field and has taken account of the organization's particular capacities.

Flexible response. To the extent that an organization relies on project support, it cannot respond quickly or flexibly to changing needs. If the organization lacks discretionary funds, the sole responsibility for rapid responses falls on funders.

Advocacy. Although U.S. Internal Revenue Service regulations prohibit a foundation from earmarking any portion of a grant for lobbying, they permit nonprofits to do a certain amount of lobbying using funds provided from general operating support grants.¹¹ Thus, to the extent that direct or grassroots lobbying is an effective way to achieve the shared objectives of a funder and organization, general support is in both of their interests.

A robust nonprofit sector. Americans rely on nonprofit organizations to perform a wide range of functions in the realms of education, religion, social and health services, and culture; we also rely on nonprofit organizations as watchdogs of government and industry, and to engage in advocacy for every imaginable cause – and some that are nearly unimaginable. These organizations are woven into the institutional fabric of our

society. Though citizens and funders may disagree about the relative importance or desirability of particular organizations, much of society's well-being depends on the work of the nonprofit sector. Beyond the mission of any particular organization, there is value in a strong, vibrant, and pluralist "independent sector" – independent, that is, from government and business – and this interest demands organizational sustainability.¹²

A Proposed Approach to Reconciling the Interests

The real issue is not general operating support versus project support, but how best to accommodate the legitimate interests of funders and nonprofits, achieve the funder's philanthropic objectives and the grantee's mission, and maintain a vibrant nonprofit sector. I propose three general principles.

The first is simply that in designing strategies, funders should actively consult with others in the field, taking into account fieldwide knowledge and the opinions of nonprofit organizations. A strategy that is well-informed by research, consultation, and peer-review is far less likely to end up as a concoction of donor whim and presumption, and therefore less likely to introduce distortions into the work of good nonprofit organizations. Some of the potential tensions between general operating support and project support are reduced when the design of projects reflects the shared expertise of the funder, the organization, and the fields in which they operate.

Second, granting that there are many situations where funder and organizational interests only coalesce around particular projects, funders should nonetheless have a presumption in favor of negotiated general operating support. To be sure, the funder must sometimes tolerate "slippage" between its strategic focus and the organization's operations, and the organization will bear some loss of autonomy as well as the additional administrative costs of due diligence, evaluation, and reporting. But negotiated general operating support is not merely a way of splitting the difference. Agreement on a strategic plan and the evaluation process conduces to the organization's achievement of its own goals. Therefore, if done with appreciation of the organization's interests and capacities, negotiated general operating support strengthens the organization at the same time as it ensures accountability.¹³

Negotiated support should be designed to maximize the grantee's candor toward the grantor in the reporting phases of the grant. This entails, among other things, that the

grant include some leeway for changing circumstances, that assessment criteria be reasonable, and that the risks inevitable in almost any grant be mutually acknowledged.

Third, as mentioned above, project support pays for the direct costs of a project – for example, the salaries and travel expenses of the staff immediately involved in implementing the project – but typically covers only a small portion of indirect costs. Project support thus takes a “free ride” on others’ general support, which pays for overhead. Especially an organization that does not have a significant membership or alumni base may have to contort itself – and not always with full candor to donors – to accommodate diverse projects. Therefore, project support should presumptively include the organization’s indirect costs. A funder should get a realistic sense of an organization’s financial situation, and should stand ready to pay its full way.

This presumption requires funders to compromise at least their short-term interests, since funds spent on overhead could be channeled to other strategic projects. However, the presumption serves the social interest in sustaining a vibrant nonprofit sector, as well as the interests of the organizations themselves. It also compensates to some extent for the institutional costs (for example, in autonomy and flexibility) of not providing general operating support.

Is project support inevitably parasitic on general operating support, or can the two live in a symbiotic relationship? Consider a research university, where general operating support comes largely from tuition and alumni contributions (whether in the form of annual giving or endowments) and where research projects are funded by governments, the private sector, or foundations. On the one hand, to hold that the funding of research projects should pay all of its indirect costs would imply that alumni contributions should support only the university’s teaching mission and no part of its research. On the other hand, the financial reality is that universities could not afford to undertake certain projects without funders’ covering a significant proportion of indirect costs.¹⁴

Effective philanthropy requires a clear strategic direction. But just as surely, effective nonprofit organizations require the means and flexibility to carry out their own strategies. Earnest consultation and shared design can minimize the tension between these interests, and result in negotiated general support grants that achieve both philanthropic and organizational goals. Focused work will sometimes entail project-specific grants, but

these too should be designed with respect for the grantee's mission, personnel, and financial needs. In either case, it is essential that the funder and organization share a clear sense of their mutual goals and indicators of progress.

¹ Foundation Center Data 1996-2003, analyzed by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. See Cohen, R. "Cutting to the Core," *Responsive Philanthropy* (fall 2002).

² See, for example, *Cutting to the Core*, which argues that the decline of general operating support threatens nonprofit organizations; Eisenberg, P. "The Case for General Support," *The Nonprofit Quarterly* (winter 1999), which maintains that general operating support is essential for strong and independent community-based organizations; and David, T. "Reflections on Sustainability," *California Wellness Foundation*, which explains the importance of general operating support to nonprofits' sustainability.

³ General operating support may, without losing its essential character, focus on a particular unit or department of a large organization rather than the organization as a whole. For example, a funder might provide general operating support to Stanford University's School of Humanities and Sciences, or to CARE's population work. Even with respect to a general support grant to the organization as a whole, the agreed-upon outcomes and evaluation may focus on a subset of the organization's activities.

⁴ So-called "venture" or "engaged" philanthropy is a more engaged form of negotiated general operating support, typically assisting relatively young and small organizations in increasing their scale – for example, the number of clients served. The venture philanthropist is often significantly involved in the organization's operations, through board membership, frequent consultations with the CEO, or other activities. The rationale for engagement is that the funder possesses business or organizational expertise not otherwise present in the organization. For discussions of venture philanthropy, see Letts, C. and Ryan, W. "Filling the Performance Gap," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, (spring 2003); and Letts, C.; Ryan, W.; and Grossman, A. "Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists," *Harvard Business Review* 97 (1997): 36-41. The present essay does not focus on venture philanthropy, but considers the more common form of negotiated general operating support provided to mature or stable organizations as well as to those poised for growth.

⁵ One might also characterize as "project support" grants aimed at improving an organization's capacity in, say, fundraising or database management. While such grants are intended to support the organization's achievement of its own goals, Pablo Eisenberg, founder of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy and a senior fellow at the Georgetown University Public Policy Institute, has cautioned that they may divert the organization's time and resources from its core needs. See *The Case for General Support*.

⁶ See Brest, P. "The Hewlett Foundation's Approach to Philanthropy," *2002 Annual Report*.

⁷ This is not to say that a strategically oriented funder need commit all of its resources to a set of tightly focused goals. On the contrary, a funder may sensibly reserve a certain amount of its grants budget for special opportunities. Even then, however, a strategically oriented funder will approach each special opportunity with clear objectives, strategic plans, and criteria for assessing progress and outcomes. For example, although it does not fit within guidelines of the Hewlett Foundation's environment program, when we were presented with the opportunity to restore thousands of acres of salt manufacturing ponds in San Francisco Bay to wetlands, we joined with three other foundations to help state and federal agencies purchase the ponds. The foundations worked together to negotiate a strategic plan for the restoration and are continuing to collaborate to assure that the plan is well-implemented. (This is also an example of an appropriate project-related grant, since the foundation has no reason to provide general support to either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Game.)

⁸ For a comprehensive statement of organizational interests, see *Reflections on Sustainability* and *Cutting to the Core*.

⁹ Sometimes, a funder may wish to effect change in ways that existing organizations are not equipped or motivated to do, necessitating a strategic series of project-oriented grants or even the establishment of new organizations. Two historic examples from the postwar era are the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations' establishment of the international agricultural research centers that initiated the "Green Revolution," leading to increased food production in Latin America, India, the Philippines and other developing nations; and the effort by Ford and others to establish area studies programs in American universities. I am indebted to Kenneth Prewitt, professor of political science at Columbia University, for this point.

¹⁰ Accountability is a two-way street. In addition to owing the broader society results in its chosen area of work, a funder has obligations of respectful and candid dealings with applicants and grantee organizations. See Emerson, J.

“Mutual Accountability and the Wisdom of Frank Capra,” *Foundation News & Commentary* 42, no. 2 (March/April 2001). Both negotiated general operating support and project support offer the opportunity to build accountability into the agreement between the funder and organization, but neither assures it.

¹¹ Troyer, T. “Private Foundations and Influencing Legislation,” *Charitable Lobbying in the Public Interest* (http://www.clpi.org/lobbying_and_funding.html).

¹² See, for example, O’Connell, B. *Civil Society: The Underpinnings of American Democracy* (Boston: Tufts University, 1999), which describes the importance of the nonprofit sector to a democratic polity; and Prewitt, K. “The Importance of Foundations in an Open Society,” in *The Future of Foundations in an Open Society*, ed. Dieter Feddersen and Bertelsmann Foundation (Gutersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 1999), which describes the nonprofit sector’s role in promoting polyarchy.

¹³ Funders providing negotiated general operating support should be aware that rigid requirements for proposal and reporting formats may subject an organization to responding to inconsistent demands by multiple funders. Therefore, a funder should take into account the size of its grant vis -à-vis those of other funders, and should consider collaborating with others on a common due diligence process, with one funder taking the lead.

¹⁴ Granting that cost accounting is more an art than a science, and that indirect cost negotiations between universities and federal government agencies reflect politics and power as well as rationality and fairness, funders of all types of organizations could learn from the guidelines resulting from those negotiations. For a criticism of certain caps and exclusions imposed by the government, see Bienenstock, A. “A Fair Deal for Federal Research at Universities,” *Issues in Science and Technology* (fall 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

Recognizing that differences in interests, values, and perspectives among individuals and diverse groups often lead to destructive conflict, the Conflict Resolution Program supports organizations that anticipate and respond to domestic and international strife through a variety of means, including preventing and resolving particular disputes, facilitating systemic change in states, organizations, and communities, and promoting participation and dialogue in democratic decision-making. The Foundation favors general support grants intended to strengthen the institutional capacity of conflict resolution organizations and academic centers.

The following descriptions reflect the Conflict Resolution Program funding categories in 2002.

Field Infrastructure. The Hewlett Foundation supports leading conflict resolution practitioner organizations and academic institutions that serve as critical infrastructure for the field. Practitioner organizations receiving support are usually national in scope, represent broad field or subfield constituencies, and promote quality of practice, knowledge building, field sustainability and growth, public/consumer education, and effective conflict resolution–related policymaking. Although the focus is primarily on North America, limited support for organizations elsewhere may be considered. Foundation support for academic institutions in this category will presently be limited to existing Hewlett Foundation Theory Centers. Significant and critical emerging issues in the field may also be supported in this category.

Consensus Building and Democratic Engagement. Funding in this category (currently under development) supports the use of collaborative and consensus-oriented processes addressing contentious social, political, environmental, and other public policy issues. The program is also interested in the innovative use of dialogue models and in promising approaches for addressing intergroup controversies. In 2002, it supported only a very limited number of grantees in this funding category, whose work directly contributed to knowledge building in these areas and helped to plan new funding strategies.

Program Description

International Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution.

The Foundation supports a limited number of organizations working to prevent, manage, and resolve intractable international conflict. Funding is primarily designated for international umbrella NGOs with their own contacts on the ground in local areas. The program will make a small number of grants directly to local groups in geographical areas determined during the 2002 calendar year. It favors work focusing on capacity building, civil society building, and long-term dialogue rather than crisis management or short-term dialogue and prevention efforts.

Post-Conflict Peace Building. The Foundation supports efforts to rebuild civil society and support ongoing peace after violent conflict. The program places special emphasis on post-conflict justice and reconciliation mechanisms; the intersection between conflict resolution, development, and humanitarian assistance; and the effective implementation of peace agreements. It does not focus on military or security aspects of peacekeeping.

Democratization. Recognizing that democratic processes link closely with the tools and goals of conflict resolution, the Foundation supports groups working on international democracy building in the civil society and governmental sectors. Special interests include improving civic engagement; increasing transparency in governmental processes; exploring the intersection between conflict resolution and human rights; countering corruption; and supporting rule of law and public security.

Consensus Building, Public Participation, and Policymaking

CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR REGIONAL LEADERSHIP

San Francisco, California

For the Aligning State Policy to Implement Regional Equity program

\$100,000

For the California Policy Reform Network

750,000

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SILICON VALLEY

San Jose, California

For the Alliance for Regional Stewardship

50,000

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Los Angeles, California

For the California Policy Forum

80,000

CONSENSUS BUILDING INSTITUTE

Cambridge, Massachusetts

For the Environmental Justice Research project

50,000

For the Global Forum on Trade, Environment and Development

100,000

DC AGENDA SUPPORT CORPORATION

Washington, D.C.

For development of a plan to improve collaborative relationships and leadership in Washington, D.C.

125,000

FUND FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK

New York, New York

For the Center for Court Innovation

200,000

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

Cambridge, Massachusetts

For a research project to compare participatory and deliberative governance models

60,000

INFORMATION RENAISSANCE

Washington, D.C.

For the Online Dialogue on the California Master Plan for Education project (Collaboration with Education)

75,000

JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

Washington, D.C.

For the Coalition for a National Conference on Dialogue and Deliberation

75,000

MALPAI BORDERLANDS GROUP

Douglas, Arizona

For general support (Collaboration with Environment)

0

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, CIVIL SOCIETY/COMMUNITY BUILDING INITIATIVE

College Park, Maryland

For the Engaged Scholarship and Informed Practice for a Democratic World project (Collaboration with Education)

0

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, SCHOOL OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Ann Arbor, Michigan

For the development of methods to evaluate collaborative ecosystem initiatives

200,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
MORRIS K. UDALL FOUNDATION Tucson, Arizona <i>For the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution</i>	250,000
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For an initiative in participatory municipal governance</i>	125,000
NORTHERN VIRGINIA MEDIATION SERVICE, THE INSTITUTE FOR CONFLICT ANALYSIS AND RESOLUTION Fairfax, Virginia <i>For the Virginia Association for Community Conflict Resolution</i>	175,000
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Notre Dame, Indiana <i>For the Latino National Survey (Collaboration with Special Projects and Population)</i>	25,000
OHIO COMMISSION ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT Columbus, Ohio <i>For general support</i>	175,000
PACE UNIVERSITY, LAND USE LAW CENTER White Plains, New York <i>For the Consensus Building Alliance, a land-use conflict resolution program in the Hudson River Valley</i>	200,000
PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN DEVELOPMENT, ENVIRONMENT, AND SECURITY Oakland, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment and Population)</i>	100,000
POLICYLINK Oakland, California <i>For increasing knowledge about the capacities and strategies required for effective community engagement of low-income and people of color constituencies</i>	100,000
RESOLVE Washington, D.C. <i>For the National Environmental Dispute Resolution Case Database project</i>	175,000
SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION, SAN DIEGO DIALOGUE La Jolla, California <i>For a community engagement initiative for San Diego City schools (Collaboration with Education)</i>	0
SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND Washington, D.C. <i>For the development of the United States Consensus Council</i>	200,000
SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL Truckee, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, SCHOOL OF POLICY, PLANNING, AND DEVELOPMENT Los Angeles, California <i>For the Neighborhood Participation Project</i>	125,000
TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the California Futures Network's Civic Engagement Campaign for a Better California</i>	100,000
<i>For the Resources for Community Collaboration evaluation and grantee support services programs (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	300,000
WESTERN CONSENSUS COUNCIL Helena, Montana <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
WOODS HOLE RESEARCH CENTER Woods Hole, Massachusetts <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment and U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0

Field Infrastructure

AMERICASPEAKS Washington, D.C. <i>For the Deliberative Democracy Consortium and further research and development of deliberative democracy models</i>	400,000
ASSOCIATION FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION Washington, D.C. <i>For strategic planning, infrastructure development, and the annual meeting of the Environment / Public Policy section</i>	75,000
CALIFORNIA DISPUTE RESOLUTION INSTITUTE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	225,000
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, CONFLICT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM Boulder, Colorado <i>For the Conflict Resolution Information Source project</i>	400,000
CONFLICT RESOLUTION NETWORK CANADA Waterloo, Ontario, Canada <i>For general support</i>	100,000
CONSENSUS COUNCIL Bismarck, North Dakota <i>For general support</i>	200,000
CONSENSUS ORGANIZING INSTITUTE San Diego, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA, MATSUNAGA INSTITUTE FOR PEACE Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the Program on Conflict Resolution</i>	100,000
INDIAN DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICES Sacramento, California <i>For general support</i>	300,000
KEY BRIDGE FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH Washington, D.C. <i>For the establishment of a national clearinghouse and resource information center on mediator roster management</i>	50,000
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY MEDIATION CENTERS Towson, Maryland <i>For research on the outcomes of community-based mediation in Maryland</i>	100,000
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST, DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL STUDIES Amherst, Massachusetts <i>For the Center for Information Technology and Dispute Resolution</i>	100,000
MEDIATION CENTER FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION Saint Paul, Minnesota <i>For the Broad Field project supporting the cross-disciplinary development of conflict resolution theory and practice</i>	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT COLUMBIA, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION Columbia, Missouri <i>For a project on enhancing infrastructure in conflict resolution through education and research in law, journalism, organizational change, and community decisionmaking</i>	100,000
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY MEDIATION Washington, D.C. <i>For research to collect and analyze community mediation cases and other data from throughout the United States</i> <i>For general support</i>	125,000 800,000
NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PEACEMAKING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION Bensalem, Pennsylvania <i>For general support</i>	375,000
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, J.L. KELLOGG GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT Evanston, Illinois <i>For the Dispute Resolution Research Center</i>	75,000
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS Portland, Oregon <i>For the National Policy Consensus Center</i>	265,000
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA, LOUIS DE LA PARTE FLORIDA MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTE Tampa, Florida <i>For the Collaborative for Conflict Management in Mental Health project</i>	150,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
STANFORD UNIVERSITY Stanford, California <i>For the Stanford Center on Conflict and Negotiation</i>	150,000
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, MAXWELL SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS Syracuse, New York <i>For the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts</i>	100,000
VICTIM OFFENDER MEDIATION ASSOCIATION Minneapolis, Minnesota <i>For general support</i>	375,000
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF URBAN, LABOR AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS Detroit, Michigan <i>For the Program on Mediating Theory and Democratic Systems</i>	75,000
 <i>International Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution</i>	
BETTER WORLD FUND, UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For the United Nation's Secretary-General's initiative on conflict prevention</i>	300,000
CARTER CENTER Atlanta, Georgia <i>For the Conflict Resolution program</i>	400,000
CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the next phase of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction project</i> <i>For the Preventive Diplomacy Program</i>	150,000 100,000
CONCILIATION RESOURCES London, England <i>For general support</i>	100,000
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT GROUP Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For general support</i>	100,000
CONFLICT RESOLUTION, RESEARCH, AND RESOURCE INSTITUTE Tacoma, Washington <i>For general support</i>	100,000
FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY Banbury, Oxfordshire, England <i>For general support</i>	100,000
FOUNDATION FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN CENTRAL AMERICA Round Rock, Texas <i>For La Coordinadora del Bajo Lempa in El Salvador</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	40,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
FUND FOR PEACE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	500,000
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the Mexico Project (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Women Waging Peace Initiative</i>	50,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, WEATHERHEAD CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i> <i>For the Program on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution</i>	250,000 100,000
HENRY L. STIMSON CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	200,000
INITIATIVE FOR SOCIAL ACTION AND RENEWAL IN EURASIA Washington, D.C. <i>For community-based environmental protection activities in the Russian Far East (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
INSTITUTE FOR EASTWEST STUDIES New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	250,000
INSTITUTE FOR RESOURCE AND SECURITY STUDIES Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the International Conflict Management Program</i>	225,000
INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS Washington, D.C. <i>For the Applied Conflict Resolution Organizations Network</i>	1,000,000
INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP Washington, D.C. <i>For efforts to build sustainable international defenses against terrorism (Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	200,000
KETTERING FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For a program on post-conflict peacebuilding in Tajikistan</i>	300,000
PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY Los Angeles, California <i>For the development of a research and studies program on globalization (Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	100,000

Conflict Resolution: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	300,000
<i>Post-Conflict Peace Building</i>	
INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE New York, New York <i>For the International Center for Transitional Justice</i>	1,000,000
<i>Democratization</i>	
CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY New York, New York <i>For the Collegium Budapest's project entitled Honesty and Trust: Theory and Evidence in Light of the Post-Socialist Transformation</i>	200,000
FREEDOM HOUSE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	300,000
JUSTICE STUDIES CENTER OF THE AMERICAS Santiago, Chile <i>For general support (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	1,250,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Stanford, California <i>For the Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law</i>	800,000
UNIVERSIDAD DIEGO PORTALES, ESCUELA DE DERECHO Santiago, Chile <i>For work on judicial reform and legal education (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDAD RAFAEL LANDÍVAR, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS POLITICAS Y SOCIALES Guatemala City, Guatemala <i>For INTRAPAZ, the Institute for Transforming Conflicts and Building Peace in Guatemala (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	50,000
VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE New York, New York <i>For the Global Alliance for Justice (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000

Education

Grants in the Education Program should promote long-term institutional or field development, reform, or knowledge development in the 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 carried out a comprehensive planning effort. Consequently, the program's priorities will be different in 2003 and beyond from those described below. A strategic plan for the Education Program and guidelines are available on the Hewlett Foundation's Web site (www.hewlett.org). Grants are awarded on the basis of merit, educational importance, relevance to program goals, and cost-effectiveness.

Program Description

Higher Education

Liberal Arts and Diversity. The Foundation did not accept unsolicited letters or proposals in this area in 2002.

Using Technology Effectively. The Foundation is interested in rigorous studies of innovative approaches for using technology to increase substantially the effectiveness and quality of instruction, as well as to increase opportunities for students.

California Community Colleges. Over the next few years, California will go through a substantial 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 Hewlett Foundation supports an ongoing program of grants for capital needs and faculty and administrator development at private black colleges and universities. The Bush Foundation administers this program.

Elementary and Secondary Education

Bay Area Regional Support. The Foundation supports organizations and programs that develop capacity and provide support for public school reform and improvement in the Bay Area.

Educational 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 education both nationally and in California. The Foundation is particularly interested in proposals that address urban education issues and educational problems of Latino and African-American students.

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

All Programs

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

Opportunity Grants. The opportunity grant category provides for meritorious recommendations that are consistent with the overall aims of the Education Program but that fit none of the formal categories.

Higher Education

Liberal Arts and Diversity

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Cambridge, Massachusetts

*For the Humanities Indicators project
(Collaboration with Special Projects)*

\$375,000

POMONA COLLEGE

Claremont, California

For a cognitive science interdisciplinary program

431,000

Technology

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

Berkeley, California

For the creation of an open online general chemistry course

250,000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT IRVINE, DISTANCE LEARNING CENTER

Irvine, California

For a seminar on the state of learning content sharing in the e-learning industry

87,000

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

For the development of free and open online courses in high-demand subject areas

1,900,000

COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

Washington, D.C.

For a project on distance learning and the future role of accreditation

75,000

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cambridge, Massachusetts

For the Harvard University Library Digitalization Planning and Pilot project

1,250,000

JSTOR

New York, New York

*For an archive of academic journals
(Collaboration with Special Projects)*

0

RICE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING

Houston, Texas

For Connexions, an experimental, open-source educational technology project

1,000,000

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Boulder, Colorado

Planning for a Web-based online course evaluation system

219,000

Community Colleges

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY INSTITUTE

San Jose, California

For a study of California community colleges

200,000

Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities

BUSH FOUNDATION

Saint Paul, Minnesota

For the support of historically black private colleges and universities

463,900

Knowledge Development

SANTA FE INSTITUTE

Santa Fe, New Mexico

For the Research Program on the Co-Evolution of States and Markets

550,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Stanford, California

For completion of a project to test the effect of racial diversity on cognitive complexity in college students

40,000

Opportunity Grants

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Washington, D.C.

For publication of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education's 30th anniversary special issue of Change Magazine

17,000

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

New York, New York

For junior faculty research development

600,000

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

Menlo Park, California

For a study of political engagement

200,000

ENGINEERING SCHOOLS OF THE WEST INITIATIVE

Five grants were made under this one-time initiative and are reported under Special Projects

0

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

Cambridge, Massachusetts

For the National Young Education Leaders program

300,000

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, CIVIL SOCIETY/COMMUNITY BUILDING INITIATIVE

College Park, Maryland

For the Engaged Scholarship and Informed Practice for a Democratic World project (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)

600,000

Elementary and Secondary Education

Bay Area Regional Support

BAY AREA SCHOOL REFORM COLLABORATIVE

San Francisco, California

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

7,666,667

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
JULIA MORGAN CENTER FOR THE ARTS Berkeley, California <i>For the Lincoln Center Institute program (Collaboration with Performing Arts)</i>	75,000
OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT Oakland, California <i>For developing the use of data to guide administrative and instructional improvement</i>	490,000
PARTNERS IN SCHOOL INNOVATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	300,000
ROCKMAN ET CETERA San Francisco, California <i>For a project to research Bay Area informal learning institutions</i>	160,000
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION San Francisco, California <i>To the Institute for Social Justice and Education for support of school reform in the Bay Area</i>	500,000
SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION COMMUNITY INITIATIVE FUNDS San Francisco, California <i>For the San Francisco Arts Commission for the Arts Education Funders' Collaborative (Collaboration with Performing Arts)</i>	100,000
<i>To assist in the establishment of an arts-integrated curriculum in seven Bay Area pilot public elementary schools (Collaboration with Performing Arts)</i>	100,000

Educational Policy and Reform—California

ADVANCEMENT PROJECT Los Angeles, California <i>For general support</i>	200,000
ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES Sacramento, California <i>For implementation of a task group on the promotion of the Master Plan for K-6 Education in California</i>	600,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRACY, EDUCATION AND ACCESS Los Angeles, California <i>For the California Campaign for Educational Equity and Opportunity</i>	250,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, PROGRAM IN PUBLIC INTEREST LAW AND POLICY Los Angeles, California <i>For strategic research, coalition building, and planning to provide information to all sectors of society about the condition of education in California</i>	485,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, SCHOOL OF LAW Los Angeles, California <i>For work on a project to inform the California public about the quality of education within the state</i>	50,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2000
CENTER FOR THE FUTURE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING Santa Cruz, California <i>For general support</i>	1,200,000
CENTURY FOUNDATION New York, New York <i>For a study of the role of unions in education reform and Albert Shanker</i>	100,000
CITIZENS COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS Washington, D.C. <i>For a project to produce guides for parents and advocates on school accountability issues</i>	85,600
EAST BAY COMMUNITY FOUNDATION Oakland, California <i>For the formation of a forum on public school accountability in California</i>	150,000
GRANTMAKERS FOR EDUCATION Portland, Oregon <i>For the spring 2003 Institute for Education Grantmakers in California</i>	25,000
INFORMATION RENAISSANCE Washington, D.C. <i>For the Online Dialogue on the California Master Plan for Education project (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	0
LEARNING MATTERS New York, New York <i>For public education media projects</i>	650,000
SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION, SAN DIEGO DIALOGUE La Jolla, California <i>For a community engagement initiative for San Diego City schools (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	116,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stanford, California <i>For a project on understanding urban high school reform in San Diego</i>	25,000

Educational Policy and Reform—National

ASPEN INSTITUTE, PROGRAM ON EDUCATION IN A CHANGING SOCIETY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Urban Superintendents Network</i>	128,000
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO Chicago, Illinois <i>For a project entitled Transforming Schools Through Information Technology</i>	1,000,000
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES Denver, Colorado <i>For the 10th Amendment project</i>	40,000
EDUCATION WRITERS ASSOCIATION Washington, D.C. <i>For a national forum in Washington, D.C., and for a seminar at Stanford University</i>	45,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
GREATSCHOOLS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	1,200,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For a study of alternative teacher certification programs</i>	50,000
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EDUCATION POLICY CENTER East Lansing, Michigan <i>For a study of instructional improvement</i>	110,000
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, STUDY OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT Ann Arbor, Michigan <i>For the study of instructional improvement in high poverty elementary schools</i>	2,000,000
PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION New York, New York <i>For a national examination of teachers' attitudes about the status of their profession</i>	38,000
RAND CORPORATION Santa Monica, California <i>For a research and analysis project on big city school district reform in three school districts</i> <i>For the development of a conceptual framework for test-based accountability and for an analysis and report on the United States and California K-12 education systems</i>	1,500,000 450,000
 Technology	
BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION New York, New York <i>For planning of Mimi III: The Mississippi Adventures, a multimedia, interdisciplinary learning program (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	120,000
BOSTON COLLEGE, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF TESTING, EVALUATION, AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts <i>For the establishment of a new online Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment</i>	160,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ FOUNDATION Santa Cruz, California <i>For the College Preparatory Initiative</i> <i>For the Virtual High School Summer Institute</i>	44,000 25,000
CENTER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE FUND: WASHINGTON TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION TRUST Seattle, Washington <i>For the Washington State Digital Learning Commons program</i> <i>For the Governor's Virtual Education Initiative Task Force</i>	300,000 50,000
DISTRIBUTED LEARNING WORKSHOP Berkeley, California <i>For the Mathematics and English Language Learning Environment program</i>	342,000

Education: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
NEW SCHOOLS VENTURE FUND San Francisco, California <i>For developing plans for the Technology Innovation Fund</i>	212,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR INNOVATIONS IN LEARNING Stanford, California <i>For the development of a program of research on education and technology</i>	400,000
TECHNICAL EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTERS Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Pulse Math Project to be managed by Learning Friends</i> <i>For the Center for the Study of Learning in Online Environments</i>	95,000 300,000
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN Austin, Texas <i>For the assessment and implementation of an advanced placement Web-based system</i>	500,000
WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION Boulder, Colorado <i>For development of a national organization of state virtual high schools</i>	220,000

Knowledge Development

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS Washington, D.C. <i>For production of a television documentary on the Teaching and Learning Network</i>	15,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For a field-based study on alternative teacher certification</i>	75,000
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES , DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES AND EDUCATION Washington, D.C. <i>For a study of ways to improve education research</i>	400,000
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON, WISCONSIN CENTER FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH Madison, Wisconsin <i>For a study of District Accountability Systems Supporting Continuous School Improvement</i>	100,000

Opportunity Grants

EQUAL ACCESS San Francisco, California <i>For information and education services in Afghanistan</i> <i>For general support for delivery of information via satellite technology to developing nations</i>	25,000 600,000
---	-------------------

Environment

In 2002, the board and staff of the Hewlett Foundation developed a new strategic plan for its work in the West and on energy. The plan carries on the strongest qualities in the Foundation’s environmental grantmaking: it is committed to programs that build institutional capacity in the field, that can build solutions embraced by diverse constituencies, and that rely on sound analysis and scientific research. The program will focus on preserving lands and ecosystems in the West, and on developing a clean energy future.

The West

The lands and waters of the North American West are among the country’s—and indeed the world’s—greatest natural resources. Yet the environment of the West is threatened by energy development, timbering, motorized recreational vehicles, and rapid population growth. At the same time, many of the traditional businesses—notably ranching and farming—that have served as custodians for open space are under great economic pressures. The goals of the Foundation’s work in the West are to protect its great open spaces and important ecosystems, and to promote productive collaboration among a broad range of people committed to building an environmentally sustainable West. The Foundation is pursuing a six-part response, using strategies appropriate to the objectives:

Private Land Conservation: Public Finance and Ranchland and Farmland Protection. The Foundation supports organizations that help build public support for land protection and acquisition, and that maintain viable ranching and farming.

Western Water Reform. The Foundation supports efforts to reform federal and western state water policy to ensure that enough water is available to keep natural systems intact.

Fossil Fuel Development. The Foundation supports organizations working to ensure that energy development in the West complies with strong environmental standards.

Wilderness Areas. The Foundation supports groups working within their communities to permanently protect the vast tracks of

Program Description

wilderness areas in the West, both in the United States and in Canada.

Off-Road Vehicle Use. The Foundation supports organizations working to develop basic environmental standards for off-road vehicle use on public lands.

New Environmental Constituencies. The Foundation supports efforts to develop environmental science and public affairs capacities in communities not traditionally associated with conservation efforts. These constituencies may include people of color in California, hunters and anglers, Native Americans and First Nations, ranchers, and farmers.

Energy

Inefficient use of energy is at the heart of the most difficult domestic and global environmental problems, including acid rain, urban air pollution, global climate change, nuclear waste, and oil spills. The Foundation pursues the reduction of energy waste and the promotion of renewable energy through the following three strategies:

National Energy Policy. The Foundation supports efforts to bolster scientific and political support for a new, visionary U.S. energy policy.

Western Energy Policy. The Foundation supports efforts to build a clean energy plan for the West, aimed at promoting renewable energy and utility energy efficiency programs and at reducing unnecessary conventional power plant development. The Energy Foundation will administer the Hewlett Foundation's work in this area.

Transforming Cars and Trucks: Sustainable Mobility. The Foundation supports efforts in the United States, China, Mexico, and Brazil to encourage more efficient, lower-polluting cars and trucks. The U.S.- and China-related work is conducted through the Energy Foundation. The Hewlett Foundation's Environment and U.S.–Latin American Relations programs work collaboratively on efforts in Mexico and Brazil.

Opportunity

At the Foundation's initiative, the Environment Program supports extraordinary initiatives not encompassed in the preceding program components.

Guidelines for these programs can be found on the Foundation's Web site (www.hewlett.org).

Journalism and Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM Berkeley, California <i>For the Center for Environmental Journalism</i>	\$100,000
CENTER FOR RESOURCE ECONOMICS Washington, D.C. <i>For Island Press</i>	100,000
INSTITUTES FOR JOURNALISM AND NATURAL RESOURCES Missoula, Montana <i>For general support</i>	100,000
SOCIETY OF ENVIRONMENTAL JOURNALISTS Jenkintown, Pennsylvania <i>For general support</i>	100,000
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND Boston, Massachusetts <i>For the Public Land Conservation Funding in the West program</i>	100,000
WORLD MEDIA FOUNDATION Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Living on Earth program</i>	150,000

Environmental Sciences, Economics, and Policy

ALASKA CONSERVATION FOUNDATION Anchorage, Alaska <i>For Sustainable Futures—Alaska, a regranting and leadership development program</i>	300,000
BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION New York, New York <i>For planning of Mimi III: The Mississippi Adventures, a multimedia, interdisciplinary learning program (Collaboration with Education)</i>	0
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO La Jolla, California <i>For the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	100,000
CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION Bethesda, Maryland <i>For the National Rural Funders Collaborative (Collaboration with Family and Community Development)</i>	100,000
CENTER FOR WATERSHED AND COMMUNITY HEALTH Springfield, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	50,000
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER Boulder, Colorado <i>For the Center of the American West</i>	165,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
FOREST COMMUNITY RESEARCH Taylorsville, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
INSTITUTE FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE Washington, D.C. <i>For the initial phase of the Green Growth Initiative</i>	75,000
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY FOUNDATION San Diego, California <i>For the Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
MISSOURI BOTANICAL GARDEN Saint Louis, Missouri <i>For the Center for Conservation and Sustainable Development</i>	100,000
NATURE CONSERVANCY, CALIFORNIA REGIONAL OFFICE San Francisco, California <i>For general support of activities in California</i>	1,000,000
PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN DEVELOPMENT, ENVIRONMENT, AND SECURITY Oakland, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Population and Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000
PRO ESTEROS LAGUNAS Y MARISMAS DE LAS CALIFORNIAS Ensenada, Baja California, México <i>For general support (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	75,000
PRONATURA NORESTE Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico <i>For general support (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY San Diego, California <i>For the Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	50,000
SONORAN INSTITUTE Tucson, Arizona <i>For general support and for the annual gathering of national and regional environmental groups working in the West</i>	230,000
TROUT UNLIMITED Arlington, Virginia <i>For the Building Coalitions to Improve Public Land Conservation project</i>	700,000
WESTERN CONSENSUS COUNCIL Helena, Montana <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	100,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
WILDERNESS SOCIETY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Natural Trails and Waters Coalition's campaign to protect the wild lands of the West from damage caused by off-road vehicles</i>	100,000
WOODS HOLE RESEARCH CENTER Woods Hole, Massachusetts <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution and U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	150,000
<i>Environmental Management in Rural Communities</i>	
CENTER FOR SCIENCE IN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION Bozeman, Montana <i>For general support</i>	100,000
DAVID SUZUKI FOUNDATION Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada <i>For the Forestry and Turning Point programs</i>	250,000
ECOTRUST Portland, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	250,000
GRAND CANYON TRUST Flagstaff, Arizona <i>For programs within the Colorado Plateau region</i>	600,000
GREATER YELLOWSTONE COALITION Bozeman, Montana <i>For general support</i>	800,000
INDIAN LAW RESOURCE CENTER Helena, Montana <i>For general support</i>	150,000
KA^ʻALA FARM Waiʻanae, Hawaii <i>For general support</i>	100,000
MALPAI BORDERLANDS GROUP Douglas, Arizona <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	100,000
NATIONAL TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDEN Kalaheo, Hawaii <i>For the Limahuli Garden's Ahupaʻa project</i>	100,000
SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL Truckee, California <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	100,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
TIDES CANADA FOUNDATION Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada <i>For the Rain Forest Solutions project</i>	150,000
TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For Environmental Media Services</i> <i>For the Resources for Community Collaboration evaluation and grantee support services programs</i> <i>(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	300,000 0
TIDES FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Indigenous Communities Mapping Initiative</i>	500,000
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND San Francisco, California <i>For the Conservation Finance Program</i>	650,000
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING Laramie, Wyoming <i>For the Institute for Environment and Natural Resources</i>	75,000

Growth Management in Metropolitan Areas

COLLINS CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY Miami, Florida <i>For the Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities</i> <i>(Collaboration with Family and Community Development)</i>	35,000
OCEANS BLUE FOUNDATION Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada <i>For general support</i>	375,000
ONE THOUSAND FRIENDS OF NEW MEXICO Albuquerque, New Mexico <i>For general support</i>	150,000
ONE THOUSAND FRIENDS OF OREGON Portland, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	100,000
SMART GROWTH BRITISH COLUMBIA Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada <i>For general support</i>	75,000

Freshwater Management

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE, U.S.-MEXICAN BORDER REGION El Paso, Texas <i>For the Paso del Norte Water project</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
--	---

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
HOUSTON ADVANCED RESEARCH CENTER, CENTER FOR GLOBAL STUDIES The Woodlands, Texas <i>For the Paso del Norte Water project</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	0
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY, CENTRO DE CALIDAD AMBIENTAL Monterrey, Nuevo León, México <i>For the Rio Grande / Río Bravo basin hydrological assessment</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	100,000
NATURAL HERITAGE INSTITUTE Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i> <i>For the Rio Grande / Río Bravo Basin hydrological assessment</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	75,000 100,000
RIO GRANDE/RÍO BRAVO BASIN COALITION El Paso, Texas <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	225,000
 <i>Energy Initiative</i>	
BREAKTHROUGH TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE/FUEL CELL 2000 Washington, D.C. <i>For the Non-Road Engine Campaign</i>	1,200,000
CALIFORNIA CLIMATE ACTION REGISTRY Los Angeles, California <i>For general support</i>	500,000
CALIFORNIA FOUNDATION ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY San Francisco, California <i>For a roundtable conference on air quality and population growth</i>	10,000
ENERGY FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the China transportation program and for the renewable energy project in the Rockies</i> <i>For the promotion of clean energy policies in the United States to promote cleaner, more efficient vehicles</i>	3,500,000 3,500,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY AND PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAM Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Energy Technology Innovation Project</i>	400,000
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, INTERNATIONAL PACIFIC RESEARCH CENTER Honolulu, Hawaii <i>For the Air Pollution / Climate Change workshop</i>	25,000
HEALTH EFFECTS INSTITUTE Boston, Massachusetts <i>For the Science to Inform Worldwide Transport and Air Quality Decisions initiative</i>	500,000

Environment: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
HYPERCAR Basalt, Colorado <i>Program-related investment</i>	2,000,000
LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES Boulder, Colorado <i>For the Rocky Mountain Energy Campaign</i>	415,000
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENERGY POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	4,000,000
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL San Francisco, California <i>For the partnership between the NRDC and the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group to strengthen energy efficiency policy in the Silicon Valley's high-tech world</i>	210,000
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, CLIMATE CENTER New York, New York <i>To protect California Clean Air programs</i>	300,000
NORTHEAST STATES CLEAN AIR FOUNDATION Boston, Massachusetts <i>For research on strategies to reduce vehicular air pollution</i>	1,000,000
NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION Seattle, Washington <i>For the Citizens' Energy Plan and Campaign</i>	200,000
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>	100,000
RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT Portland, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	200,000
SAVE OUR WILD SALMON COALITION Seattle, Washington <i>For an ecologically sound energy strategy</i>	200,000
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Clean Vehicles Program</i>	750,000
YALE UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF FORESTRY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES New Haven, Connecticut <i>For research on "Punctuated Equilibria: A New Approach to Understanding and Promoting Policy Change"</i>	70,000

*Other***ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM**

Cambridge, Massachusetts

*For the creation, publication, and dissemination of a "Diversity Storybook and Resource Guide"*75,000

INITIATIVE FOR SOCIAL ACTION AND RENEWAL IN EURASIA

Washington, D.C.

*For community-based environmental protection activities in the Russian Far East (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)*500,000

PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES CENTER

Oakland, California

*For a regranting program to leading conservation organizations in Asian Russia*500,000

Family and Community Development

Through its work in the Family and Community Development Program, the Hewlett 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.

For the time being, no new grants will be awarded in this program. For further information on the current areas of Foundation interest, see the Web site (www.hewlett.org).

Program Description

Transition to Work

ASIAN NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

San Francisco, California

For the Jobs Plus Club

\$150,000

CALIFORNIA BUDGET PROJECT

Sacramento, California

For the Welfare Reform Monitoring project

160,000

CORPORATION FOR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Oakland, California

For the Bay Area Families Employment and Services initiative

100,000

DAVIS STREET COMMUNITY CENTER

San Leandro, California

For the San Leandro Works! program and for the Family Support Services program

200,000

SECOND START

San Jose, California

For the Families in Transition program

80,000

UNITED WAY OF THE BAY AREA

Oakland, California

For San Francisco Works

200,000

WOMEN'S INITIATIVE FOR SELF-EMPLOYMENT

San Francisco, California

For general support

75,000

Employment Development

BAY AREA INDUSTRY EDUCATION COUNCIL

Fremont, California

For the Machine Technology Workforce Development Model project

150,000

CATHOLIC CHARITIES OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY

San Jose, California

For vocational training programs

200,000

COMMUNITY ACTION MARIN

San Rafael, California

For the Career Plus employment development project

200,000

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF THE GREATER EAST BAY

Oakland, California

For the Family-Based Skills project

45,000

MISSION HIRING HALL

San Francisco, California

For the Construction Administration Training and Employer Linkage Program

200,000

Family and Community Development: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LAW CENTER	
Oakland, California	
<i>For the National Network of Sector Practitioners</i>	205,000
<i>For the Working Poor Field Building project</i>	500,000
RUBICON PROGRAMS	
Richmond, California	
<i>For the Allied Health Career Ladders program</i>	433,000
URBAN INSTITUTE	
Washington, D.C.	
<i>For the Oakland-based Program on Regional Economic Opportunity</i>	75,000
WORKING PARTNERSHIPS USA	
San Jose, California	
<i>For the Temporary Workers Employment project</i>	125,000

Community Service

MILLS COLLEGE	
Oakland, California	
<i>For the Community Action, Reciprocal Education, and Service Center</i>	40,000
VOLUNTEER CENTER OF SAN MATEO COUNTY	
San Mateo, California	
<i>For the San Mateo County Youth Service Initiative</i>	35,000

Responsible Fatherhood and Male Involvement

COMMUNITY BUILDING INSTITUTE	
East Palo Alto, California	
<i>For the Responsible Fatherhood program</i>	55,000
FAMILY STRESS CENTER	
Concord, California	
<i>For the Proud Fathers program</i>	60,000
INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF BLACK FAMILY LIFE AND CULTURE	
Oakland, California	
<i>For the HAWK Federation program</i>	40,000
JEWISH FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES	
San Francisco, California	
<i>For the Fathers' Support project</i>	95,000
MARIN COMMUNITY FOUNDATION	
Larkspur, California	
<i>For the Responsible Fatherhood and Male Involvement project</i>	250,000

Family and Community Development: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
NATIONAL COALITION OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS FOR YOUTH Austin, Texas <i>For the Fathers Matter program</i>	200,000
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For the Reaching Common Ground project</i>	50,000
SALVATION ARMY, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS Alexandria, Virginia <i>For the Fathering Project at adult rehabilitation centers in San Jose and San Francisco</i>	48,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Responsible Parenting project</i>	250,000
TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Social Policy Action Network program</i>	17,270
 <i>Emerging Opportunities</i> 	
CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION Bethesda, Maryland <i>For the National Rural Funders Collaborative (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	400,000
COLLINS CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY Miami, Florida <i>For the Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
 <i>Other</i> 	
CHRONICLE SEASON OF SHARING FUND San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	50,000
COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SILICON VALLEY San Jose, California <i>For the Palo Alto Weekly Holiday Fund</i>	25,000
LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORPORATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Neighborhood Improvement Initiative Area program</i>	350,000
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS San Francisco, California <i>For the Emergency Fund Committee</i>	25,000
PENINSULA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION San Mateo, California <i>For the 2002–2003 Holiday Fund</i>	25,000

Family and Community Development: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
POLICYLINK Oakland, California <i>For the Community Capital Investment Initiative</i>	35,000
SAN JOSE MERCURY NEWS WISH BOOK FUND San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	20,000

Performing Arts

The Performing Arts Program is founded on the premise that the experience, understanding, and appreciation of artistic expression give value, meaning, and enjoyment to people's lives. Its mission is to support artistic expression and its enjoyment through grantmaking aimed at the sustainability of high-quality Bay Area organizations and to achieve this through the following broad objectives:

- Stimulate increased access to and participation in the arts;
- Increase exposure to and understanding of diverse cultural expressions;
- Enhance opportunities for creative expression for both artists and audiences; and
- Promote long-term organizational health.

The program's geographic focus is the nine counties that border the San Francisco Bay, with additional limited funding in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties.

Organizations working in dance, music, musical theater, opera, and theater are eligible for consideration. Within these disciplines, the program supports the following types of organizations: performing companies, presenting organizations, service organizations, arts councils, training and participation programs, and national and nonresident organizations that serve Bay Area artists and audiences. The program also makes grants to film and media service organizations.

The focus of Hewlett Foundation support is on long-term artistic development and managerial stability, achieved primarily through a strategy of multiyear general operating support to organizations of programmatic merit that operate without incurring annual deficits.

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

The Performing Arts Program does not typically fund one-time events, such as fundraisers, festivals, or touring costs for per-

Program Description

forming companies; individual artists; visual or literary arts; film or video production; humanities; elementary and secondary schools; colleges and universities; community art classes; recreational, therapeutic, and social service arts programs; and cultural foreign-exchange programs.

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
<i>Music</i>	
AMERICAN BACH SOLOISTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	\$40,000
AMERICAN COMPOSERS FORUM Saint Paul, Minnesota <i>For the Composers Datebook radio program</i>	50,000
ASPEN MUSIC FESTIVAL AND SCHOOL Aspen, Colorado <i>For recruitment and scholarships for Bay Area students</i>	75,000
BERKELEY SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF TRADITIONAL MUSIC Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
BERKELEY SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	180,000
CALIFORNIA SUMMER MUSIC San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
CHAMBER MUSIC AMERICA New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	70,000
COMMUNITY MUSIC CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For a capital campaign to replace a failed heating system</i>	50,000
COMMUNITY SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND ARTS Mountain View, California <i>For renovation costs of its interim facility</i>	100,000
EAST BAY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS Richmond, California <i>For general support</i>	180,000
HOLY NAMES COLLEGE Oakland, California <i>For the Kodály Program's Folk Song Collection Online project</i>	130,000
IVES STRING QUARTET Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	12,000
KUUMBWA JAZZ SOCIETY Santa Cruz, California <i>For general support</i>	60,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
MENLO SCHOOL Atherton, California <i>For the Music@Menlo festival (Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	75,000
MIDSUMMER MOZART San Francisco, California <i>For general support and strategic planning</i>	40,000
MUSIC AT KOHL MANSION Burlingame, California <i>For general support</i>	36,000
NAPA VALLEY SYMPHONY ASSOCIATION Napa, California <i>For general support and critical needs</i>	90,000
NOONTIME CONCERTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	10,000
OAKLAND EAST BAY SYMPHONY Oakland, California <i>For general support</i>	225,000
OLD FIRST CENTER FOR THE ARTS/OLD FIRST CONCERTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support and planning</i>	66,000
OPERA AMERICA Washington, D.C. <i>For the National Music Leadership Coalition's Campaign for Music project</i>	2,200,000
OTHER MINDS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	100,000
PACIFIC CHAMBER SYMPHONY San Leandro, California <i>For general support</i>	50,000
PHILHARMONIA BAROQUE ORCHESTRA San Francisco, California <i>For general support and critical needs</i>	260,000
PIEDMONT CHOIRS Piedmont, California <i>For general support</i>	25,000
ROVA:ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	45,000
SAN FRANCISCO CHANTICLEER San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	225,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
SAN FRANCISCO CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	420,000
SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION COMMUNITY INITIATIVE FUNDS San Francisco, California <i>For the San Francisco Arts Commission for the Arts Education Funders' Collaborative (Collaboration with Education)</i> <i>For San Francisco Classical Voice</i> <i>To assist in the establishment of an arts-integrated curriculum in seven Bay Area pilot public elementary schools (Collaboration with Education)</i>	100,000 30,000 0
SAN FRANCISCO FRIENDS OF CHAMBER MUSIC San Francisco, California <i>For the Cypress String Quartet</i>	20,000
SAN FRANCISCO JAZZ ORGANIZATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	240,000
SAN FRANCISCO LIVE ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	36,000
SCHOLA CANTORUM Mountain View, California <i>For general support</i>	51,000
SONOS HANDBELL ENSEMBLE Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	15,000
 <i>Theater</i>	
A TRAVELING JEWISH THEATRE San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	195,000
BERKELEY REPERTORY THEATRE Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	360,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA CRUZ, DIVISION OF THE ARTS Santa Cruz, California <i>For general support of Shakespeare Santa Cruz</i>	150,000
IDRIS ACKAMOOOR AND CULTURAL ODYSSEY San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
MARIN THEATRE COMPANY Mill Valley, California <i>For general support</i>	120,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
THE MARSH San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	90,000
OREGON SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL Ashland, Oregon <i>For general support</i>	255,000
SHAKESPEARE SAN FRANCISCO San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	200,000
TEATRO VISIÓN San Jose, California <i>For emergency support</i> <i>For general support</i>	10,500 90,000
THEATRE OF YUGEN San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
Z SPACE STUDIO San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i> <i>For supplemental support to facilitate relocation plans</i>	120,000 125,000

Opera and Music Theater

BROADWAY BY THE BAY San Mateo, California <i>For general support</i>	20,000
---	--------

Dance

BERKELEY CITY BALLET Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	45,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION Berkeley, California <i>For the second phase of renovation of DanceAbout, a new facility for dance and other performing arts activities</i>	75,000
DANCERS' GROUP San Francisco, California <i>For Bay Area Celebrates National Dance Week</i> <i>For general support</i>	30,000 135,000
DANCE THROUGH TIME San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	30,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
DANCE USA Washington, D.C. <i>For Bay Area participation in the Dance USA and New England Foundation for the Arts White Oak Conference</i>	10,000
DIMENSIONS DANCE THEATER Oakland, California <i>For general support and long-range planning</i>	90,000
LAWRENCE PECH DANCE COMPANY San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
LINES CONTEMPORARY BALLET San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i> <i>For renovation and relocation costs and for capacity building</i>	300,000 800,000
OBERLIN DANCE COLLECTIVE San Francisco, California <i>For the renovation of a new facility</i>	1,500,000
SAN FRANCISCO BALLET ASSOCIATION San Francisco, California <i>For the San Francisco Ballet School</i>	675,000
SAN JOSE CLEVELAND BALLET San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	330,000
WORLD ARTS WEST San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
ZOHAR DANCE COMPANY Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	95,000

Film and Video

FILM ARTS FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For fundraising activities</i>	50,000
FRAMELINE San Francisco, California <i>For additional staff to implement an upcoming capital campaign</i>	50,000
NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION San Francisco, California <i>For fundraising activities</i> <i>For general support</i>	50,000 75,000

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
SAN FRANCISCO JEWISH FILM FESTIVAL San Francisco, California <i>For capital campaign fundraising activities</i>	50,000
SUNDANCE INSTITUTE Beverly Hills, California <i>For fellowships for Bay Area artists</i>	75,000
 <i>Supporting Services</i>	
ARTS COUNCIL SILICON VALLEY San Jose, California <i>For a supplemental grant in support of the regranting program</i>	100,000
BREAD AND ROSES Corte Madera, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
BUSINESS ARTS COUNCIL San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	175,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, CAL PERFORMANCES Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	145,000
CULTURAL COUNCIL OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY Aptos, California <i>For supplemental support of the grant program</i> <i>For general support</i>	50,000 215,000
DJERASSI RESIDENT ARTISTS PROGRAM Woodside, California <i>For support of residencies for Bay Area performing artists</i>	100,000
EIGHTY LANGTON STREET/NEW LANGTON ARTS San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	105,000
HEADLANDS CENTER FOR THE ARTS Sausalito, California <i>For support of residencies for Bay Area performing artists</i>	50,000
LA PEÑA CULTURAL CENTER Berkeley, California <i>For general support</i>	120,000
PAJARO VALLEY PERFORMING ARTS ASSOCIATION Watsonville, California <i>For general support</i>	45,000
SAN FRANCISCO PERFORMING ARTS LIBRARY AND MUSEUM San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i> <i>For completion of a feasibility study</i>	120,000 9,500

Performing Arts: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
SAN JOSE MUSEUM OF ART San Jose, California <i>For the museum's performing arts program</i>	30,000
STERN GROVE FESTIVAL ASSOCIATION San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	150,000
YOUNG AUDIENCES OF SAN JOSE AND SILICON VALLEY San Jose, California <i>For general support</i>	75,000
YOUNG AUDIENCES OF THE BAY AREA San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	120,000
 <i>Other</i>	
FUND FOR FOLK CULTURE Santa Fe, New Mexico <i>For general support and for the California Traditional Arts Advancement program</i>	210,000
JULIA MORGAN CENTER FOR THE ARTS Berkeley, California <i>For the Lincoln Center Institute program (Collaboration with Education)</i>	75,000
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS San Francisco, California <i>For the Arts Loan Fund</i>	100,000
PERFORMING ARTS WORKSHOP San Francisco, California <i>For general support</i>	30,000
WALLACE ALEXANDER GERBODE FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For co-sponsorship of the Gerbode Foundation's Instrumental and Choral Music Commission Awards and the Opera and Musical Theatre Commission Awards</i>	300,000

Population

Program Description

Rapid population growth continues to be a significant global problem, despite the impact that organized family planning programs have had in reducing fertility. The purpose of the Hewlett Foundation's Population Program is to help reduce population growth in countries, regions, and among groups having high fertility by helping individuals and couples attain access to the full array of high-quality family planning and reproductive health information, services, and fertility regulation technologies required to voluntarily determine the number and timing of their childbearing.

The Foundation has three primary goals in this area: to increase the involvement of the public and private sectors, the media, and educational institutions in population issues; to improve the delivery of family planning and related reproductive health services; and 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 smaller 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. Research on migration is also supported.
- Programs that address neglected issues, such as providing a full range of reproductive health information and services to young people and others traditionally underserved by existing programs, developing and disseminating the knowledge and techniques needed to improve the quality and effectiveness of family planning activities, and maintaining a secure supply of contraceptives to developing countries.
- The study and implementation 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. Promoting universal access to basic and secondary education figures prominently in this work. Programs that assess their costs, evaluate their impacts on fertility behavior, and demonstrate promise for larger scale replication are targeted.

- Limited 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. Although the focus of most activities is on high-fertility developing countries, selected organizations that engage in highly leveraged population-related activities in the United States also remain 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.

Increasing Commitment to Address Population Issues

2050

Tokyo, Japan

For general support \$300,000

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION, REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM PROJECT

New York, New York

For general support 450,000

AUSTRALIAN REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH FOUNDATION

Weston Creek, Canberra, Australia

For general support 500,000

CARE

Atlanta, Georgia

For general support 500,000

CENTER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL POLICY

San Francisco, California

For general support 50,000

CENTER FOR WOMEN POLICY STUDIES

Washington, D.C.

For general support 100,000

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

Fort Wayne, Indiana

For general support of the Religious Institute for Sexual Morality, Justice, and Healing 120,000

CINE QUA NON

New York, New York

For production of Sex Education in America, a PBS documentary 90,000

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Brussels, Belgium

For the Euro-Leveraging project 750,000

FEDERACIÓN DE PLANIFICACIÓN FAMILIAR DE ESPAÑA

Madrid, Spain

For the Spanish Interest Group 550,000

GENDER AND RIGHTS

Copenhagen, Denmark

For general support 10,000

INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Lausanne, Switzerland

For general support 350,000

INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

New York, New York

For the Reproductive Health for Refugees project 300,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
ITALIAN ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT Rome, Italy <i>For general support</i>	675,000
JAPANESE ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN FAMILY PLANNING Tokyo, Japan <i>For general support</i>	300,000
NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO PREVENT TEEN PREGNANCY Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	600,000
NATIONAL LATINA HEALTH ORGANIZATION Oakland, California <i>For reproductive health policy activities</i>	150,000
NATIONAL LATINA INSTITUTE FOR REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH Queens, New York <i>For general support</i>	150,000
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER Washington, D.C. <i>For the Reproductive Rights and Health program</i>	250,000
NEW ZEALAND FAMILY PLANNING ASSOCIATION Wellington, New Zealand <i>For the International Development Unit</i>	200,000
ÖSTERREICHISCHE STIFTUNG FÜR WELTBEVÖLKERUNG UND INTERNATIONALE ZUSAMMENARBEIT Vienna, Austria <i>For general support</i>	350,000
PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF KOREA Seoul, Republic of Korea <i>For general support and for the APA/ICPD annual meeting</i>	150,000
POPULATION ACTION INTERNATIONAL Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	1,300,000
POPULATION COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	600,000
RAND CORPORATION Santa Monica, California <i>For the Labor and Population program</i>	800,000
RELIGIOUS COALITION FOR REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	150,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES PROJECT Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	250,000
SWEDISH ASSOCIATION FOR SEX EDUCATION Stockholm, Sweden <i>For general support</i>	350,000
UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION Washington, D.C. <i>For the United Nations Population Fund</i>	500,000
WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION Boston, Massachusetts <i>For World in the Balance, a NOVA production on global population, biodiversity, and the environment</i>	150,000

International Family Planning and Reproductive Health

DKT INTERNATIONAL Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	800,000
ENGENDERHEALTH New York, New York <i>For general support</i> <i>For introducing and supporting long-term contraception in Sudan</i>	1,000,000 600,000
FAMILY CARE INTERNATIONAL New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	400,000
FEDERACIÓN MEXICANA DE ASOCIACIONES PRIVADAS DE SALUD Y DESARROLLO COMUNITARIO Cuidad Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico <i>For general support</i>	300,000
IBIS REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For programs in the Middle East</i>	360,000
INTERNATIONAL FAMILY HEALTH London, England <i>For general support</i>	250,000
INTERNATIONAL PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION London, England <i>For general support</i>	1,000,000
INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH COALITION New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	360,000
MANAGEMENT SCIENCES FOR HEALTH Boston, Massachusetts <i>For reproductive health and family planning programs in Syria</i>	600,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
MARIE STOPES INTERNATIONAL London, England <i>For family planning programs in Afghanistan and Yemen and for general support</i>	1,000,000
PARTNERS OF THE AMERICAS Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i>	250,000
PATHFINDER INTERNATIONAL Watertown, Massachusetts <i>For general support</i>	1,000,000
PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA New York, New York <i>For Family Planning International Assistance</i>	750,000
POPULATION ACTION INTERNATIONAL Washington, D.C. <i>For the Reproductive Health Supply Initiative</i>	1,000,000
PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL San Diego, California <i>For development of sustainable models to support family planning and reproductive health interventions worldwide</i>	100,000
WORLD NEIGHBORS Oklahoma City, Oklahoma <i>For general support</i>	300,000

Domestic Family Planning Activities

ABORTION ACCESS PROJECT Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For general support</i>	160,000
ASSOCIATION OF REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH PROFESSIONALS Washington, D.C. <i>For the Emergency Contraception Hotline and Web site</i>	225,000
PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, AFFILIATE SERVICES CENTER/ SAN FRANCISCO San Francisco, California <i>For the Innovations Group</i>	750,000

Population Research and Training

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR POPULATION RESEARCH Los Angeles, California <i>For the Training in International Population Studies program</i>	250,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN FRANCISCO, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS, GYNECOLOGY, AND REPRODUCTIVE SCIENCES San Francisco, California <i>For the Gender, Power, Culture, and Reproductive Health in Mexico project</i>	115,750

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN FRANCISCO, INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH POLICY STUDIES San Francisco, California <i>For the Institute for Health Policy Studies and for the International and Family Planning Research, Training, and Technical Assistance project</i>	350,000
CENTER FOR GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT Washington, D.C. <i>For population-related activities</i>	600,000
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, MAILMAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH New York, New York <i>For the Heilbrunn Center for Population and Family Health</i>	600,000
CORNELL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY Ithaca, New York <i>For the Population and Development Program</i>	300,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Center for Population and Development Studies</i>	250,000
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, WEST COAST REGIONAL OFFICE San Francisco, California <i>For the Census of Human Capacity in Population program</i>	250,000
MAHIDOL UNIVERSITY Nakhon Pathom, Thailand <i>For the Institute for Population and Social Research</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY College Park, Maryland <i>For the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality</i>	250,000
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH Ann Arbor, Michigan <i>For the Population Studies Center</i>	225,000
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, POPULATION FELLOWS PROGRAMS Ann Arbor, Michigan <i>For the Population Fellows program</i>	150,000
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, COMMITTEE ON POPULATION Washington, D.C. <i>For policy-relevant research on international population topics</i>	300,000
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, POPULATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE University Park, Pennsylvania <i>For the Training and Research in International Demography program</i>	385,000
POPULATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA Silver Spring, Maryland <i>For general support</i>	100,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
POPULATION COUNCIL	
New York, New York	
<i>For general support</i>	3,800,000
<i>For the Middle East Awards</i>	300,000
POPULATION REFERENCE BUREAU	
Washington, D.C.	
<i>For general support</i>	500,000
POPULATION RESOURCE CENTER	
Washington, D.C.	
<i>For the Comparative Study of Contraception and Abortion project</i>	60,000
SAVE THE CHILDREN	
Westport, Connecticut	
<i>For evaluation of a community-based adolescent health program in Ethiopia</i>	265,000
STIFTUNG BERLIN-INSTITUT FÜR WELTBEVÖLKERUNG UND GLÖBALE ENTWICKLUNG	
Berlin, Germany	
<i>For general support</i>	600,000
UNIVERSIDAD DE COSTA RICA	
San Jose, Costa Rica	
<i>For the Central American Population Center</i>	200,000

Contraceptive Development

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>	1,750,000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH AND RESEARCH	
Geneva, Switzerland	
<i>For the Special Programme of Research, Development, and Research Training in Human Reproduction</i>	300,000

Migration Studies

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	
Davis, California	
<i>For the Rural Economies of the Americas and Pacific Rim Center (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	50,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO	
La Jolla, California	
<i>For the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies (Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	35,000

Population: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
CENTER FOR IMMIGRATION STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	300,000
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, POPULATION STUDIES CENTER Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For the Mexican Migration project</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	200,000
REGIONAL CENTER FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH Cuernavaca, MOR, Mexico <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	75,000
UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE ZACATECAS Zacatecas, Zacatecas, Mexico <i>For a research and training program on migration</i> <i>(Collaboration with U.S.–Latin American Relations)</i>	50,000

Environment

PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN DEVELOPMENT, ENVIRONMENT, AND SECURITY Oakland, California <i>For general support</i> <i>(Collaboration with Environment and Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000
--	---------

Population Social Science Research and Training

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Notre Dame, Indiana <i>For the Latino National Survey</i> <i>(Collaboration with Special Projects and Conflict Resolution)</i>	75,000
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For research on teen births among immigrants and natives in California</i> <i>(Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	14,250

Special Projects

Although most grantmaking takes place in the programs, the Hewlett 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. In addition, Special Projects houses three initiatives, described below.

Americans in the World

In the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Foundation launched the Americans in the World initiative with the goal of better informing Americans—ordinary citizens as well as policymakers—about international issues and encouraging them to become engaged in thoughtful ways with the world beyond our borders. Grants were focused on current-affairs programming on television and radio, and on stimulating public dialogue about America’s engagement with the global community. The Foundation supported programming from a foreign perspective so that audiences could learn how people in other countries understood and reacted to global events. To this end, the Americans in the World initiative supported the launch of two new public television series—Wide Angle and Frontline/World—and the expansion of WorldLink TV, a satellite channel offering a global perspective on world issues and culture. Public Radio International received funds to expand the coverage of global topics and perspectives on public radio at the local and national levels. The Foundation also supported MacNeil/Lehrer Productions’ *By the People*, which seeks to engage a broad range of citizens in foreign-affairs discussions. *By the People* was launched with a national deliberative poll on foreign policy that brought together a representative group of citizens over a weekend in Philadelphia.

Neighborhood Improvement

In response to the accelerating deterioration of many low-income urban communities in Northern California, the Hewlett Foundation launched the Neighborhood Improvement Initiative (NII) in 1996. A large-scale, multiyear comprehensive community revitalization

Program Description

effort, the NII seeks to improve the physical, economic, and social conditions in three areas in the San Francisco Bay Area: Mayfair in east San Jose; the 7th Street McClymonds Corridor in west Oakland; and central East Palo Alto. The underlying premise of the NII emphasizes that simultaneous and focused attention on several interconnected issues (e.g., limited supply of affordable housing, unemployment, deteriorating physical infrastructure) through a community-led process is the most effective method of promoting and sustaining neighborhood revitalization. The NII has six outcome goals:

- Coordinated and effective programs and services that improve the quality of life of residents;
- Improved operational and financial capacity of community-based organizations to carry out neighborhood projects;
- Improved capacity of Bay Area community foundations to support neighborhood revitalization;
- Increased resident involvement in neighborhood planning and improvement efforts;
- Increased public and private sector investment in the neighborhoods; and
- Improved neighborhood-level outcomes, including but not limited to financial self-sufficiency, educational attainment, physical blight, and crime and safety.

Proposals are considered on an invitation-only basis.

Nonprofit Capital Markets

The Foundation is committed to sustaining and improving institutions that make positive contributions to society. The Foundation believes that private philanthropy is of great value to society, and it seeks to encourage and develop philanthropy generally.

Thus, in addition to modeling effective philanthropic practices in its core program areas, the Foundation works to strengthen the infrastructure of the nonprofit sector. Specifically, the Nonprofit Capital Markets Initiative within the Special Projects budget attempts to improve the capital markets that link funders and non-

profits and to improve philanthropic practices more generally. The initiative's ultimate goal is to increase the flow of capital to high-performing nonprofit organizations.

This goal is pursued through two complementary strategies: by increasing knowledge about nonprofit capital markets and effective philanthropic practices; and by improving the marketplace in which institutional and individual donors identify and invest in nonprofit organizations. This includes increasing the transparency, accountability, and performance of nonprofit organizations, including foundations themselves, with the aim of facilitating donor investment in effective organizations. The majority of the Foundation's grants to improve nonprofit capital markets have been made in collaboration with other funders.

Philanthropy

THE BRIDGESPAN GROUP

Boston, Massachusetts

For general support

\$2,000,000

CALVERT SOCIAL INVESTMENT FOUNDATION

Bethesda, Maryland

For the DevelopmentSpace Project

200,000

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR RESPONSIVE PHILANTHROPY

Washington, D.C.

For general support

25,000

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GRANTMAKERS

San Francisco, California

For programs to promote strategic philanthropy

50,000

PHILANTHROPIX PARTNERS

San Francisco, California

For general support

250,000

THE ROBERTS FOUNDATION

San Francisco, California

For OASIS, the Ongoing Assessment of Social ImpactS system

50,000

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Stanford, California

For the Center for Social Innovation

1,500,000

SYNERGOS INSTITUTE, GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND FOUNDATION BUILDING DEPARTMENT

New York, New York

*For the U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy initiative
(Collaboration with U.S.-Latin American Relations)*

150,000

WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

San Francisco, California

*For the Global Philanthropy Forum Conference: Giving Without Borders
For creation of an ongoing global philanthropy forum*

13,395
360,000

Americans in the World

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

New York, New York

*For the planning of an exchange program for Islamic scholars to serve in residence
at U.S. colleges and universities to enhance understanding between the United States
and the Muslim world*

38,030

ASIA SOCIETY

San Francisco, California

*For lectures and programming in the Bay Area on international affairs topics with the
purpose of allowing more speakers from Asia to participate*

40,000

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
ASSOCIATED PRESS MANAGING EDITORS New York, New York <i>For the launch of the International Coverage Project</i>	105,000
BROOKINGS INSTITUTION Washington, D.C. <i>For the United States Foreign Policy in an Age of Globalization project</i>	272,000
CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE Washington, D.C. <i>For distributing Foreign Policy, a magazine focusing on international trends and global issues, to journalists at regional news outlets</i>	100,000
COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT Washington, D.C. <i>For launching a public education and engagement initiative around “Reducing Global Poverty” with business leaders in Detroit, Michigan; Nashville, Tennessee; and Raleigh, North Carolina</i>	310,066
COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For lectures and programming in the Bay Area on global affairs and international topics, featuring speakers from other countries</i>	40,000
DEMOCRACY PROJECT New York, New York <i>For the development of online tools to engage the readers of smaller and mid-market newspapers—affiliated with e-the People—in discussion and activities about America’s role in the world</i>	50,000
EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION New York, New York <i>For Wide Angle, a PBS documentary series on international topics</i>	500,000
GREATER WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, MACNEIL/LEHRER PRODUCTIONS Arlington, Virginia <i>For the launch of By the People, an eighteen-month project consisting of national deliberative poll public broadcast programs and civic engagement activities around the country on global affairs and America’s role in the world</i> <i>For continuation of the By the People project</i>	1,000,000 200,000
LINK MEDIA San Rafael, California <i>For general support of World Link TV, a satellite channel bringing international programming and perspectives on current affairs to American audiences, and for production of its Mosaic program, a daily digest of news from foreign broadcasters</i>	500,000
PUBLIC RADIO INTERNATIONAL Minneapolis, Minnesota <i>For the At Home in the World project, a programming partnership between The World radio program and several metropolitan public radio stations</i>	329,136

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
RELIEF INTERNATIONAL Los Angeles, California <i>For a pilot project to connect middle schoolers in the United States with their counterparts in developing countries</i>	300,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS Stanford, California <i>For the first phase of a project with the University of Texas to develop an infrastructure to pilot and test the feasibility of conducting online deliberative polls</i> <i>For the second phase of the online deliberative polling project to compare the results of online deliberative polls with face-to-face deliberative polling</i>	135,007 316,444
TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project, a survey of 44,000 people in forty-three countries</i>	315,000
WGBH Boston, Massachusetts <i>For Frontline World, a public television series on global affairs</i>	500,000

Children and Youth

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE Brooklyn, New York <i>For the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN)</i>	71,680
CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For developing and producing a report identifying and framing a set of issues affecting at-risk youth</i>	150,000
NATIONAL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COALITION Washington, D.C. <i>For a program to educate federal policymakers about the implications of proposed cuts to federal youth employment and training programs</i>	50,000
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY University Park, Pennsylvania <i>For publication and dissemination of a book entitled On Your Own Without a Net: The Transition to Adulthood for Vulnerable Populations</i>	50,000
QUEST SCHOLARS PROGRAM Stanford, California <i>For strategic planning to expand the program</i>	50,000
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY Albany, New York <i>For the production and dissemination of a census-based report on the demographic, educational, economic, housing, and health circumstances of immigrant families and their children in select counties in California</i>	200,000
TIDES CENTER San Francisco, California <i>For the Youth Transition Funders Group</i>	25,000

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
URBAN INSTITUTE Washington, D.C. <i>For a special meeting of the Reentry Roundtable to focus on the challenges faced by young people who have been incarcerated</i>	128,000
<i>Neighborhood Improvement Initiative</i>	
ASPEN INSTITUTE New York, New York <i>For the Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives program</i>	350,000
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE East Palo Alto, California <i>For the National Community Development Institute's development and implementation of a cross-site technical assistance and training program for the Neighborhood Improvement Initiative</i>	500,000
<i>For the One East Palo Alto Neighborhood Improvement Initiative</i>	188,000
COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SILICON VALLEY San Jose, California <i>For the Mayfair Improvement Initiative</i>	1,396,600
JUSTICE MATTERS INSTITUTE San Francisco, California <i>For the design and management of an indicator data collection and tracking system for the Neighborhood Improvement Initiative</i>	177,000
SAN FRANCISCO FOUNDATION San Francisco, California <i>For the Seventh Street / McClymonds Corridor Improvement Initiative</i>	1,346,600
<i>Other</i>	
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Humanities Indicators project (Collaboration with Education)</i>	375,000
AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH Washington, D.C. <i>For a project entitled The Continuity of Congress</i>	50,000
ASIAN UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN FOUNDATION New York, New York <i>For a planning conference</i>	49,500
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Boise, Idaho <i>For the Engineering Schools of the West Initiative</i>	1,050,000
CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES Stanford, California <i>For long-term planning and development</i>	48,000

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY Washington, D.C. <i>For the hiring of staff to promote policies for disconnected youth</i>	65,000
CLASSICS FOR KIDS FOUNDATION Bozeman, Montana <i>For travel expenses of evaluation site visits</i>	5,000
CORPORATION FOR ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT Washington, D.C. <i>For the Forum on Social Innovations conference</i>	10,000
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY Washington, D.C. <i>For the Constitution Project</i>	50,000
GREAT VALLEY CENTER Modesto, California <i>For the Building Toward Sustainability program</i>	3,696,000
INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP Washington, D.C. <i>For efforts to build sustainable international defenses against terrorism (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000
JSTOR New York, New York <i>For an archive of music literature (Collaboration with Education)</i>	250,000
KCET, COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA Los Angeles, California <i>For California Connected, a collaborative public television series produced by KCET, KPBS, KQED, and KVIE on the changes that are transforming California</i>	2,000,000
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Globalization, Development, and Standards project</i>	400,000
MENLO SCHOOL Atherton, California <i>For the Music@Menlo festival (Collaboration with Performing Arts)</i>	75,000
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Bozeman, Montana <i>For the Engineering Schools of the West Initiative</i>	734,580
NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE New York, New York <i>For general support</i>	1,500,000
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Las Cruces, New Mexico <i>For the Engineering Schools of the West Initiative</i>	1,098,910

Special Projects: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Notre Dame, Indiana <i>For the Latino National Survey (Collaboration with Population and Conflict Resolution)</i>	25,000
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING Corvallis, Oregon <i>For the Engineering Schools of the West Initiative</i>	1,100,000
PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY Los Angeles, California <i>For the appointment of a Vice President and for the studies program (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	50,000
PHILANTHROPY INCUBATOR Palo Alto, California <i>For general support</i>	600,000
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco, California <i>For research on teen births among immigrants and natives in California (Collaboration with Population)</i>	14,250
SILICON VALLEY MANUFACTURING GROUP San Jose, California <i>For an engineering and environmental study for the Dumbarton Rail Corridor project</i>	200,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON THE CONTEXT OF TEACHING Stanford, California <i>For the John Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities</i>	750,000
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK Stony Brook, New York <i>For the Emerson String Quartet</i>	200,000
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Salt Lake City, Utah <i>For the Engineering Schools of the West Initiative</i>	1,103,000
<hr/> <hr/>	
TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS (EXCLUDING GIFTS) FOR 2002	\$176,090,635

U.S.–Latin American Relations

The 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.

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 Hewlett Foundation’s Web site (www.hewlett.org).

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

Program Description

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 to:

- 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.

Economic Policy Research

CENTRO BRASILEIRO DE ANÁLISE E PLANEJAMENTO São Paulo, Brazil <i>For economic and social policy research programs</i>	\$150,000
LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION, CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS MONETARIOS Y FINANCIEROS Madrid, Spain <i>For the Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association's 2002 conference</i>	50,000
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STUDIES Champaign, Illinois <i>For collaborative research and exchange with Brazilian economic researchers</i>	400,000
PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO DE JANEIRO Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <i>For the Department of Economics</i>	300,000
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, SOCIAL SCIENCE HISTORY INSTITUTE Stanford, California <i>For the Social Science History Institute</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDAD TORCUATO DI TELLA Buenos Aires, Argentina <i>For the Department of Economics</i>	100,000

Environmental Policy

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, RICHARD AND RHODA GOLDMAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY Berkeley, California <i>For a program to train local environmental authorities in Mexico</i>	75,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO La Jolla, California <i>For the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	300,000
CENTRO DE DERECHOS HUMANOS Y MEDIO AMBIENTE Córdoba, Argentina <i>For general support</i>	200,000
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES Gainesville, Florida <i>For the Tropical Conservation and Development program</i>	300,000
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES Miami, Florida <i>For collaborative training and research with Mexican institutions</i>	300,000
FUNDAÇÃO VITÓRIA AMAZÔNICA Manaus / AM, Brazil <i>For general support</i>	300,000

U.S.–Latin American Relations: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY FOUNDATION San Diego, California <i>For the Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
NORTH AMERICAN INSTITUTE Santa Fe, New Mexico <i>For environmental policy programs</i>	100,000
PRONATURA NORESTE Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	150,000
PROYECTO FRONTERIZO DE EDUCACIÓN AMBIENTAL San Ysidro, California <i>For the fourth annual conference on the U.S.-Mexican border environment For general support</i>	75,000 125,000
WOODS HOLE RESEARCH CENTER Woods Hole, Massachusetts <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment and Conflict Resolution)</i>	0
 <i>Freshwater Management</i>	
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE New York, New York <i>For work on the Rio Grande basin</i>	300,000
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE, U.S.-MEXICAN BORDER REGION El Paso, Texas <i>For the Paso del Norte Water project (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	250,000
FUNDAÇÃO DE EMPREENDIMENTOS CIENTIFICOS E TECNOLÓGICOS Asa Norte, Brasilia, Brazil <i>For the Marca d'Água project</i>	300,000
FUNDACIÓN MÉXICO-ESTADOS UNIDOS PARA LA CIENCIA Mexico City, México <i>For work on border-water issues</i>	300,000
HOUSTON ADVANCED RESEARCH CENTER, CENTER FOR GLOBAL STUDIES The Woodlands, Texas <i>For the Paso del Norte Water project (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	400,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO Y DE ESTUDIOS SUPERIORES DE MONTERREY, CENTRO DE CALIDAD AMBIENTAL Monterrey, Nuevo León, México <i>For the Rio Grande / Río Bravo basin hydrological assessment (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000

U.S.–Latin American Relations: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, ZANVYL KRIEGER SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES Baltimore, Maryland <i>For the Marca d'Agua project</i>	50,000
NATURAL HERITAGE INSTITUTE Berkeley, California <i>For the Rio Grande / Río Bravo Basin hydrological assessment (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	100,000
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN AND BORDER STUDIES Las Cruces, New Mexico <i>For a water-policy program in collaboration with Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez and Houston Advanced Research Center</i>	200,000
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE Las Cruces, New Mexico <i>For development of a strategic plan and bylaws for the Paso del Norte Water Task Force</i>	100,000
PRO ESTEROS LAGUNAS Y MARISMAS DE LAS CALIFORNIAS Ensenada, Baja California, México <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE Washington, D.C. <i>For a project on water policy in Chile and Argentina</i>	100,000
RIO GRANDE/RÍO BRAVO BASIN COALITION El Paso, Texas <i>For general support (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	0
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY San Diego, California <i>For the Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias (Collaboration with Environment)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE CIUDAD JUÁREZ, PROGRAMA DE CONSTRUCCIÓN REGIONAL Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, México <i>For a water policy program in collaboration with New Mexico State University and Houston Advanced Research Center</i>	200,000

Judicial Reform

INSTITUTO DIREITO E SOCIEDADE Rio de Janeiro, Brazil <i>For a conference on legal education innovation in Latin America</i>	50,000
JUSTICE STUDIES CENTER OF THE AMERICAS Santiago, Chile <i>For general support (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000

U.S.–Latin American Relations: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES San Diego, California <i>For work on judicial reform in Chile</i>	270,000
UNIVERSIDAD DIEGO PORTALES, ESCUELA DE DERECHO Santiago, Chile <i>For work on judicial reform</i>	200,000
<i>For work on judicial reform and legal education (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDAD RAFAEL LANDÍVAR, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS POLITICAS Y SOCIALES Guatemala City, Guatemala <i>For INTRAPAZ, the Institute for Transforming Conflicts and Building Peace in Guatemala</i> <i>(Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	50,000

Migration and Immigration Policy

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS Davis, California <i>For the Rural Economies of the Americas and Pacific Rim Center (Collaboration with Population)</i>	250,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO La Jolla, California <i>For the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies (Collaboration with Population)</i>	40,000
CENTER FOR IMMIGRATION STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For general support (Collaboration with Population)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, POPULATION STUDIES CENTER Philadelphia, Pennsylvania <i>For the Mexican Migration project (Collaboration with Population)</i>	100,000
REGIONAL CENTER FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH Cuernavaca, MOR, Mexico <i>For general support (Collaboration with Population)</i>	75,000
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, L.B.J. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS Austin, Texas <i>For the Center for Inter-American Policy Studies</i>	100,000
UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE ZACATECAS Zacatecas, Zacatecas, Mexico <i>For a research and training program on migration (Collaboration with Population)</i>	100,000
UNIVERSIDAD DE GUADALAJARA, DEPARTAMENTO DE ESTUDIOS REGIONALES Zapopan, Jalisco, México <i>For general support</i>	125,000

Public Security

FACULTAD LATINOAMERICANA DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, CHILE Santiago, Chile <i>For a hemispheric conference on economic development and public security in Latin America</i>	50,000
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the Mexico Project (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	200,000
MANHATTAN INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH New York, New York <i>For work on public security in Latin American cities</i>	150,000
VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE New York, New York <i>For the Global Alliance for Justice (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	150,000

U.S.-Mexican Futures Forum

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES Berkeley, California <i>For general support and for the U.S.-Mexican Futures Forum</i>	400,000
<i>For the U.S.-Mexican Futures Forum</i>	100,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO AUTÓNOMO DE MÉXICO, INTERNATIONAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT Mexico City, Mexico <i>For the U.S.-Mexican Futures Forum</i>	100,000

Other

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES Tucson, Arizona <i>For the Oaxacan Summer Institute and for activities of the Latin American Area Center</i>	100,000
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, RICHARD AND RHODA GOLDMAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY Berkeley, California <i>For a program to train local environmental authorities in Mexico</i>	75,000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT LOS ANGELES, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY Los Angeles, California <i>For the Social Responses to Globalization in Latin America project</i>	100,000
CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Washington, D.C. <i>For the Mexico Project</i>	175,000

U.S.–Latin American Relations: Organizations (by Category)	Grants Authorized 2002
FACULTAD LATINOAMERICANA DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, CHILE Santiago, Chile <i>For general support</i>	300,000
FOUNDATION FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN CENTRAL AMERICA Round Rock, Texas <i>For La Coordinadora del Bajo Lempa in El Salvador (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	35,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies</i>	300,000
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, WEATHERHEAD CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Cambridge, Massachusetts <i>For the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival (Collaboration with Conflict Resolution)</i>	50,000
INSTITUTO TECNOLÓGICO AUTÓNOMO DE MÉXICO Mexico City, Mexico <i>For the North American Public Policy Studies program</i>	350,000
LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania <i>For the March 2003 congress</i>	75,000
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDIES London, England <i>For work with Oxford University on public security in Mexico</i>	350,000
SYNERGOS INSTITUTE, GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND FOUNDATION BUILDING DEPARTMENT New York, New York <i>For the U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy initiative (Collaboration with Special Projects)</i>	150,000
UNIVERSIDAD DE SAN ANDRÉS, DEPARTAMENTO DE HUMANIDADES Buenos Aires, Argentina <i>For the Latin American Studies program</i>	100,000

Advice to Applicants

The most efficient means of initiating contact with the Hewlett Foundation is through a letter of inquiry addressed to the Grants Administration Department. Letters must contain the following information to be considered:

1. Contact person name and title
2. Organization name and address
3. Phone number
4. Fax number
5. E-mail address
6. Brief statement outlining the organization's need for support

Letters will not be considered unless all of the above information is provided.

The letter should provide a straightforward statement of the organization's needs and aspirations for support, taking into account other possible sources of funding. The Foundation prefers to receive letters of inquiry as documents in Microsoft Word format, attached to electronic mail messages. Please send them to loi@hewlett.org.

The Foundation supports nonprofit organizations that comply with section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code; it does not provide funds to individuals. Normally the Foundation will not consider grants for basic research, capital construction funds, endowment, general fundraising drives, or fundraising events. It does not make grants intended directly or indirectly to support candidates for political office or to influence legislation. Programs often require time to demonstrate their value, and the Foundation is therefore willing to consider proposals covering several years of support.

All inquiries are reviewed first by the relevant program director, who may decline a request that seems unlikely to result in a proposal the Foundation can support, or request further information, or invite the submission of a formal proposal. Letters of inquiry will be acknowledged upon receipt, with an individual response following in due course. Grants must be approved by the Board of Directors, which meets quarterly.

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, 2002 and 2001, 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, 2003

Statements of Financial Position
(Dollars in Thousands)

	December 31	
	2002	2001
ASSETS		
Investments, at fair value		
Hewlett-Packard and Agilent common stock	\$ 593,323	\$ 985,973
Other public domestic equities	1,383,270	1,241,666
Public international equities	742,359	483,121
Private equities	585,032	567,437
Fixed income	1,050,260	707,971
Cash equivalents	198,037	160,511
Investment of collateral received for securities on loan	120,287	90,437
Receivables for interest and dividends	13,003	9,081
Net due to brokers	(268,380)	(243,100)
Total investments	<u>4,417,191</u>	<u>4,003,097</u>
Cash	193	939
Federal excise tax refundable	2,690	1,705
Program-related investment	2,000	-0-
Prepaid expenses and other assets	583	597
Distribution receivable from Hewlett Trust <i>(Note 4)</i>	548,268	1,913,143
Fixed assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization	<u>39,272</u>	<u>26,325</u>
	<u>\$ 5,010,197</u>	<u>\$ 5,945,806</u>
LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS		
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	\$ 4,884	\$ 5,413
Grants payable	152,555	143,916
Gift payable, net of discount <i>(Note 7)</i>	<u>331,248</u>	<u>336,928</u>
Total liabilities	488,687	486,257
Commitments <i>(Note 3)</i>	3,973,242	3,546,406
Unrestricted net assets	<u>548,268</u>	<u>1,913,143</u>
Temporarily restricted net assets <i>(Note 4)</i>	<u>4,521,510</u>	<u>5,459,549</u>
	<u>\$ 5,010,197</u>	<u>\$ 5,945,806</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 76–82.

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

	Year Ended December 31	
	2002	2001
UNRESTRICTED NET ASSETS		
Net investment revenues and losses:		
Interest, dividends and other	\$ 94,202	\$ 76,442
Loss on investment portfolio	(448,032)	(768,338)
Investment management expense	(11,563)	(8,879)
Net investment loss	(365,393)	(700,775)
Net federal excise tax (expense) benefit on net investment income (loss) (Note 8)	(953)	7,328
Net investment revenues and losses	(366,346)	(693,447)
Expenses:		
Grants authorized, net of cancellations	(176,853)	(209,356)
Gift authorized, net of discount (Note 7)	(15,572)	(336,928)
Administrative expenses	(14,366)	(12,213)
Deficit of income over expenses before contribution and net assets released from time restriction	(573,137)	(1,251,944)
Contribution	-0-	1,179,711
Net assets released from time restriction (Note 4)	999,973	-0-
Change in unrestricted net assets	426,836	(72,233)
TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED NET ASSETS		
Temporarily restricted revenues:		
Contributions (Note 4)	(364,902)	1,913,143
Net assets released from time restriction	(999,973)	-0-
Change in temporarily restricted net assets	(1,364,875)	1,913,143
Change in total net assets	(938,039)	1,840,910
Net assets at beginning of year	5,459,549	3,618,639
Net assets at end of year	\$ 4,521,510	\$ 5,459,549

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 76–82.

Statements of Cash Flows
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Year Ended December 31	
	2002	2001
Cash flows used in operating activities:		
Interest and dividends received	\$ 92,386	\$ 76,808
Cash (paid) received for federal excise tax, net of refund	(1,938)	5,655
Cash paid to suppliers and employees	(25,362)	(21,446)
Cash contributions received	25,000	-0-
Grants paid	(168,214)	(119,923)
Net cash used in operating activities	<u>(78,128)</u>	<u>(58,906)</u>
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Purchases of equipment	(2,400)	(642)
Building and land improvements	(13,734)	(11,896)
Program-related investment	(2,000)	-0-
Cash received from partnership distributions	49,039	30,085
Proceeds from sale of investments	6,809,265	4,621,883
Purchase of investments	(6,762,788)	(4,579,611)
Net cash from investing activities	<u>77,382</u>	<u>59,819</u>
Net (decrease) increase in cash	(746)	913
Cash at beginning of year	939	26
Cash at end of year	<u>\$ 193</u>	<u>\$ 939</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 76–82.

Statements of Cash Flows
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Year Ended December 31	
	2002	2001
Reconciliation of change in net assets to net cash used in operating activities:		
Change in total net assets	\$ (938,039)	\$ 1,840,910
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash used in operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization	1,429	372
Stock contributions received from Hewlett Trust	-0-	(1,179,711)
Increase in interest and dividends receivable	(3,922)	(896)
(Increase) decrease in federal excise tax refundable	(985)	6,550
Decrease (increase) in prepaid expenses and other assets	14	(408)
Decrease (increase) in distribution receivable from Hewlett Trust	389,902	(1,913,143)
Increase in accounts payable and accrued liabilities	1,230	944
Increase in grants payable	8,639	89,433
Increase in gift payable, net of discount	15,572	336,928
Decrease in deferred federal excise tax	-0-	(8,223)
Net unrealized and realized losses on investments	448,032	768,338
Net cash used in operating activities	<u>\$ (78,128)</u>	<u>\$ (58,906)</u>
Supplemental data for non-cash activities:		
Stock contributions received from Hewlett Trust	<u>\$ 974,973</u>	<u>\$ 1,179,711</u>
Stock contributions to grantee	<u>\$ (21,252)</u>	<u>\$ -0-</u>
Fixed assets additions, not yet paid, included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities	<u>\$ 22</u>	<u>\$ 1,781</u>

See accompanying notes to the financial statements on pp. 76–82.

Notes to Financial Statements
December 31, 2002 and 2001
(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 six program areas of conflict resolution, education, environment, 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. Cash consists of a commercial demand deposit account.

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. Index swaps, which gain exposure to domestic equities in a leveraged form, are traded with a counterparty and are valued at the payment to be made or received at each month end. 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, buyout firms, and real estate. Accordingly, their values are based upon guidelines established by the general partners. 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 cash flows that occurred during the quarter ended December 31. Management believes this method provides a reasonable estimate of fair 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 at market value on the date of the 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.

Cash equivalents consist of money market mutual funds held for investment purposes.

Fixed assets. Fixed assets are recorded at cost and depreciated using the straight-line basis over their estimated useful lives. The headquarters building and associated fixtures are generally depreciated using the straight-line basis over ten to fifty years. Furniture and computer and office equipment are depreciated over estimated useful lives of three to ten years.

Grants. Grants are accrued when awarded by the Foundation.

Use of estimates. The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles 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 reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Reclassifications. Certain reclassifications have been made to the 2001 balances to conform with the 2002 presentation. These reclassifications had no effect on the change in net assets in 2001 or total net assets at December 31, 2001.

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 13 percent and 14 percent of the Foundation's investment assets at December 31, 2002 and 2001, 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. As of December 31, 2002, the Foundation is committed to invest approximately \$642,300 in additional capital in future years to various partnerships.

The loss on the investment portfolio consists of the following:

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
Net realized gain (loss)	\$ (88,382)	\$ (30,373)
Net unrealized gain (loss)	(359,650)	(737,965)
	<u>\$ (448,032)</u>	<u>\$ 768,338</u>

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, swaps, 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 and swap 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, 2002 and 2001, was \$317,901 and \$607,863, respectively.

One of the Foundation's international equity managers sells currency securities forward. At December 31, 2002, the liability for these forward sales (stated at market value) was \$932, and the proceeds received with respect to these at December 31, 2002, were \$877.

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.

Fair values of the Foundation's derivative financial instruments at December 31, 2002, are summarized in the following table. This table excludes exposures relating to derivatives held indirectly through commingled funds.

<i>DERIVATIVE FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS</i>	<u>2002</u> Fair Value (in thousands)
<i>Equity contracts to manage desired asset mix:</i>	
Swap contracts	
Liabilities	\$ (8,753)
Forward sales	
Liabilities	\$ (932)
Call options	
Liabilities	\$ (39,025)
<i>Fixed income contracts to manage portfolio duration and asset allocation:</i>	
Put and call options	
Liabilities	\$ (278)
<i>Foreign currency contracts:</i>	
Forward contracts	
Unrealized gain on currency contracts	\$ 2,573
Unrealized loss on currency contracts	\$ (1,440)

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; these investments include A1-rated commercial paper, repurchase agreements, asset backed securities and floating rate notes. Income 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, 2002 and 2001, was \$120,461 and \$89,838, respectively. The value of the collateral received at December 31, 2002 and 2001, aggregated \$123,196 and \$92,645, respectively, of which \$120,287 and \$90,437, respectively, was received in cash and was invested in accordance with the investment guide-

lines. The remainder of the collateral, \$2,909 at December 31, 2002, and \$2,208 at December 31, 2001, was received in the form of securities and letters of credit.

At December 31, 2002, net due to brokers includes a receivable from brokers of \$17,283 and a payable to brokers of \$285,663. At December 31, 2001, net due to brokers included a receivable from brokers of \$26,490 and a payable to brokers of \$269,590. The payable to brokers includes a liability for collateral received on securities loaned at December 31, 2002 and 2001, of \$120,287 and \$90,437, respectively, and includes a liability for a swap contract of \$8,753 at December 31, 2002. The payable to brokers includes a liability for options written at December 31, 2002 and 2001, in the amounts of \$39,303 and \$42,533, respectively. Premiums received with respect to open options contracts at December 31, 2002 and 2001, are \$14,377 and \$38,506, respectively.

The Foundation held 29.0 million shares of Hewlett-Packard Company ("Hewlett-Packard") stock (approximately .95% of that Company's total outstanding shares) with a market price of \$17.36 per share at December 31, 2002. At December 31, 2001, the Foundation held 36.5 million shares with a market price of \$20.54 per share. During 2002, the Foundation received 58.0 million shares of Hewlett-Packard stock and reduced its Hewlett-Packard stock holdings by 65.5 million shares by sale or transfer. The Foundation held 5.0 million shares of Agilent Company ("Agilent") stock with a market price of \$17.96 per share at December 31, 2002. At December 31, 2001, the Foundation held 8.3 million shares with a market price of \$28.51. During 2002, the Foundation did not receive any shares of Agilent stock and reduced its Agilent stock holdings by 3.3 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.

The receivable from the Trust, which was \$1,913,143 at December 31, 2001, is adjusted for contributions during 2002 and also for changes in market value. The change in market value was approximately \$365,000. During 2002 the Foundation received Hewlett-Packard stock and other assets valued at \$999,973 from the Trust. At December 31, 2002, the estimated fair market value of the remaining assets to be distributed to the Foundation by the Trust was \$548,268. 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, 2002 and 2001:

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
Furniture, fixtures, and leasehold improvement	\$ 4,569	\$ 1,564
Computer and office equipment	1,727	1,303
Building, land lease, and land improvements	34,552	-0-
New headquarters building project	-0-	25,050
	<u>40,848</u>	<u>27,917</u>
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization	<u>(1,576)</u>	<u>(1,592)</u>
	<u>\$ 39,272</u>	<u>\$ 26,325</u>

The construction of a new headquarters building for the Foundation was completed in the spring of 2002. The Foundation entered into a land lease at the time that construction began on the new building, in early 2001. Effective in May 2002, the Foundation began amortizing this land lease, valued at approximately \$10,600, using the straight-line method over fifty years.

NOTE 6
Grants Payable

Grant requests are recorded as grants payable when they are awarded. Some of the grants are payable in installments, generally over a three-year period. Grants authorized but unpaid at December 31, 2002, are payable as follows:

<u>Year Payable</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2003	\$ 131,009
2004	17,838
2005 and thereafter	3,708
	<u>\$ 152,555</u>

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, 2002, using risk-free rates ranging from 3.6% to 4.9%. During 2002, the first installment was made with stock contributions valued at \$21,252.

Gift payable, net of discount, at December 31, 2002 and 2001, is as follows:

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
Gift payable	\$ 378,748	\$ 400,000
Less unamortized discount	<u>(47,500)</u>	<u>(63,072)</u>
Gift payable, net of discount	<u>\$ 331,248</u>	<u>\$ 336,928</u>

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 2002 and 2001. Each year, current federal excise tax is levied on interest and dividend income of the Foundation; excise tax is not reduced by net investment losses. Deferred federal excise tax is usually provided at 1.33%, which is the average effective rate expected to be paid on unrealized gains on investments. At December 31, 2002 and 2001, there was no liability recorded for deferred federal excise taxes, due to the overall unrealized loss on the Foundation's investment portfolio.

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

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
Current	\$ 953	\$ 895
Deferred	<u>-0-</u>	<u>(8,223)</u>
	<u>\$ 953</u>	<u>\$ (7,328)</u>

A

Abortion Access Project, 49
 Advancement Project, 16
 Alaska Conservation Foundation, 23
 American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 14, 67
 American Association for Higher Education, 15
 American Bach Soloists, 37
 American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Reproductive Freedom Project, 46
 American Composers Forum, 37
 American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 67
 American Institute for Social Justice, 66
 American University of Beirut, 15, 64
 AmericaSpeaks, 7
 Arizona, University of, Center for Latin American Studies, 59
 Arts Council Silicon Valley, 42
 Asian Neighborhood Design, 31
 Asian University for Women Foundation, 67
 Asia Society, 64
 Aspen Institute, 67; Program on Education in a Changing Society, 17
 Aspen Music Festival and School, 37
 Associated Press Managing Editors, 65
 Association for Conflict Resolution, 7
 Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, 16
 Association of Reproductive Health Professionals, 49
 A Traveling Jewish Theatre, 39
 Australian Reproductive Health Foundation, 46

B

Bank Street College of Education, 18, 23
 Bay Area Industry Education Council, 31

Bay Area School Reform Collaborative, 15
 Berkeley City Ballet, 40
 Berkeley Repertory Theatre, 39
 Berkeley Society for the Preservation of Traditional Music, 37
 Berkeley Symphony Orchestra, 37
 Better World Fund, United Nations Foundation, 9
 Boise State University, College of Engineering, 67
 Boston College, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, 18
 Bread and Roses, 42
 Breakthrough Technologies Institute / Fuel Cell 2000, 27
 Bridgespan Group, 64
 Broadway By the Bay, 40
 Brookings Institution, 65
 Bush Foundation, 15
 Business Arts Council, 42

C

California Budget Project, 31
 California Center for Regional Leadership, 5
 California Climate Action Registry, 27
 California Dispute Resolution Institute, 7
 California Foundation on the Environment and the Economy, 27
 California State University at Los Angeles, Department of History, 59
 California Summer Music, 37
 California, University of, at Berkeley, 14; Cal Performances, 42; Center for Latin American Studies, 59; Graduate School of Journalism, 23; Richard and Rhoda Goldman School of Public Policy, 55, 59; University Extension, 40
 California, University of, at Davis, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 51, 58
 California, University of, at Irvine, Distance Learning Center, 14
 California, University of, at Los Angeles: California Center for Population Research, 49; Institute for Democracy, Education and Access, 16; Program in Public Interest Law and Policy, 16; School of Law, 16
 California, University of, at San Diego, 23, 51, 55, 58
 California, University of, at San Francisco: Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, 49, 51; Institute for Health Policy Studies, 50
 California, University of, at Santa Cruz: Division of the Arts, 39; Santa Cruz Foundation, 18
 Calvert Social Investment Foundation, 23, 33, 64
 CARE, 46
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 65
 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 15
 Carnegie Mellon University, 14
 Carter Center, 9
 Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County, 31
 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 67
 Center for Applied Linguistics, 19
 Center for Community Service Fund: Washington Technology in Education Trust, 18
 Center for Global Development, 50
 Center for Health and Social Policy, 46
 Center for Immigration Studies, 52, 58
 Center for Law and Social Policy, 66, 68
 Center for Resource Economics, 23
 Center for Science in Public Participation, 25
 Center for Strategic and International Studies, 9, 59
 Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 17

- Center for Watershed and Community Health, 23
- Center for Women Policy Studies, 46
- Central European University, 11
- Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento, 55
- Centro de Derechos Humanos y Medio Ambiente, 55
- Century Foundation, 17
- Chamber Music America, 37
- Chicago, University of, 17
- Christian Community, 46
- Chronicle Season of Sharing Fund, 33
- Cine Qua Non, 46
- Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, 17
- Classics for Kids Foundation, 68
- Collins Center for Public Policy, 26, 33
- Colorado, University of, at Boulder, 23; Conflict Research Consortium, 7
- Columbia University, Mailman School of Public Health, 50
- Committee for Economic Development, 65
- Commonwealth Club of California, 65
- Community Action Marin, 31
- Community Building Institute, 32
- Community Development Institute, 67
- Community Foundation Silicon Valley, 5, 33, 67
- Community Music Center, 37
- Community Partners, 5
- Community School of Music and Arts, 37
- Conciliation Resources, 9
- Conflict Management Group, 9
- Conflict Resolution Network Canada, 7
- Conflict Resolution, Research, and Resource Institute, 9
- Consensus Building Institute, 5
- Consensus Council, 7
- Consensus Organizing Institute, 7
- Cornell University, Department of Rural Sociology, 50
- Corporation for Enterprise Development, 68
- Corporation for Supportive Housing, 31
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 14
- Cultural Council of Santa Cruz County, 42
- D**
- Dancers' Group, 40
- Dance Through Time, 40
- Dance USA, 41
- David Suzuki Foundation, 25
- Davis Street Community Center, 31
- DC Agenda Support Corporation, 5
- Democracy Project, 65
- Dimensions Dance Theater, 41
- Distributed Learning Workshop, 18
- Djerassi Resident Artists Program, 42
- DKT International, 48
- E**
- East Bay Center for the Performing Arts, 37
- East Bay Community Foundation, 17
- Ecotrust, 25
- Educational Broadcasting Corporation, 65
- Education Commission of the States, 17
- Education Writers Association, 17
- Eighty Langton Street / New Langton Arts, 42
- Energy Foundation, 27
- EngenderHealth, 48
- Engineering Schools of the West Initiative, 15
- Environmental Defense, 56; U.S.-Mexican Border Region, 26, 56
- Environmental Leadership Program, 29
- Equal Access, 19
- European Centre for Population and Development, 46
- F**
- Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Chile, 59, 60
- Family Care International, 48
- Family Stress Center, 32
- Federación de Planificación Familiar de España, 46
- Federación Mexicana de Asociaciones Privadas de Salud y Desarrollo Comunitario, 48
- Film Arts Foundation, 41
- Florida, University of, Center for Latin American Studies, 55
- Florida International University, Department of Environmental Studies, 55
- Forest Community Research, 24
- Foundation for International Security, 9
- Foundation for Self-Sufficiency in Central America, 9, 60
- Frameline, 41
- Freedom House, 11
- Fundação de Empreendimentos Científicos e Tecnológicos, 56
- Fundação Vitória Amazônica, 55
- Fundación México-Estados Unidos para la Ciencia, 56
- Fund for Folk Culture, 43
- Fund for Peace, 10
- Fund for the City of New York, 5
- G**
- Gender and Rights, 46
- Georgetown University, 68; Center for Latin American Studies, 10, 59
- Goodwill Industries of the Greater East Bay, 31
- Grand Canyon Trust, 25
- Grantmakers for Education, 17
- Greater Washington Educational Telecommunications Association, MacNeil / Lehrer Productions, 65
- Greater Yellowstone Coalition, 25
- GreatSchools, 18
- Great Valley Center, 68
- H**
- Harvard University, 50, 60; Graduate School of Education, 18, 19; John F. Kennedy School of Government, 5, 10, 15;

- Science Technology and Public Policy Program, 27; University Library, 14; Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 10, 60
- Hawaii, University of: International Pacific Research Center, 27; Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 8
- Headlands Center for the Arts, 42
- Health Effects Institute, 27
- Henry L. Stimson Center, 10
- Higher Education Policy Institute, 14
- Holy Names College, 37
- Houston Advanced Research Center, Center for Global Studies, 27, 56
- Hypercar, 28
- I
- Ibis Reproductive Health, 48
- Idris Ackamoor and Cultural Odyssey, 39
- Illinois, University of, at Urbana-Champaign, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 55
- Indian Dispute Resolution Services, 8
- Indian Law Resource Center, 25
- Information Renaissance, 5, 17
- Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia, 10, 29
- Institute for America's Future, 24
- Institute for Eastwest Studies, 10
- Institute for Resource and Security Studies, 10
- Institute for the Advanced Study of Black Family Life and Culture, 32
- Institute of International Education, West Coast Regional Office, 50
- Institute of World Affairs, 10
- Institutes for Journalism and Natural Resources, 23
- Instituto Direito e Sociedade, 57
- Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, 60; International Studies Department, 59
- Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Centro de Calidad Ambiental, 27, 56
- International Center for Transitional Justice, 11
- International Community Foundation, 24, 56
- International Crisis Group, 10, 68
- International Family Health, 48
- International Foundation for Population and Development, 46
- International Planned Parenthood Federation, 48
- International Rescue Committee, 46
- International Women's Health Coalition, 48
- Italian Association for Women in Development, 47
- Ives String Quartet, 37
- J
- Japanese Organization for International Cooperation in Family Planning, 47
- Jewish Family and Children's Services, 32
- Johns Hopkins University, Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, 57
- Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 5
- JSTOR, 14, 68
- Julia Morgan Center for the Arts, 16, 43
- Justice Matters Institute, 67
- Justice Studies Center of the Americas, 11, 57
- KL
- Ka'ala Farm, 25
- KCET, Community Television of Southern California, 68
- Kettering Foundation, 10
- Key Bridge Foundation for Education and Research, 8
- Kuumbwa Jazz Society, 37
- Land and Water Fund of the Rockies, 28
- La Peña Cultural Center, 42
- Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association, Centro de Estudios Monetarios y Financieros, 55
- Latin American Studies Association, 60
- Lawrence Pech Dance Company, 41
- Learning Matters, 17
- LINE5 Contemporary Ballet, 41
- Link Media, 65
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation, 33
- London, University of, School of Advanced Studies, 60
- M
- Mahidol University, 50
- Malpai Borderlands Group, 5, 25
- Management Sciences for Health, 48
- Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, 59
- Marie Stopes International, 49
- Marin Community Foundation, 32
- Marin Theatre Company, 39
- Marsh, The, 40
- Maryland, University of: Civil Society / Community Building Initiative, 5, 15; Department of Sociology, 50
- Maryland Association of Community Mediation Centers, 8
- Massachusetts, University of, at Amherst, Department of Legal Studies, 8
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Economics, 68
- Mediation Center for Dispute Resolution, 8
- Menlo School, 38, 68
- Michigan, University of: Institute of Social Research, 50; Population Fellows Programs, 50; School of Natural Resources and Environment, 5; Study of Instructional Improvement, 18
- Michigan State University, Education Policy Center, 18

- Midsummer Mozart, 38
Mills College, 32
Mission Hiring Hall, 31
Missouri, University of, at
 Columbia, Center for the Study
 of Dispute Resolution, 8
Missouri Botanical Garden, 24
Montana State University, College
 of Engineering, 68
Morris K. Udall Foundation, 6
Music at Kohl Mansion, 38
- N**
Napa Valley Symphony Association,
 38
National Academy of Sciences:
 Committee on Population, 50;
 Division of Behavioral and
 Social Sciences and Education,
 19
National Asian American
 Telecommunications
 Association, 41
National Association for
 Community Mediation, 8
National Campaign to Prevent Teen
 Pregnancy, 47
National Coalition of Community
 Foundations for Youth, 33
National Commission on Energy
 Policy, 28
National Committee for
 Responsive Philanthropy, 64
National Conference on
 Peacemaking and Conflict
 Resolution, 8
National Economic Development
 and Law Center, 32
National Latina Health
 Organization, 47
National Latina Institute for
 Reproductive Health, 47
National League of Cities Institute,
 6
National Tropical Botanical
 Garden, 25
National Urban League, 68
National Women's Law Center, 33,
 47
National Youth Employment
 Coalition, 66
- Natural Heritage Institute, 27, 57
Natural Resources Defense
 Council, 28; Climate Center, 28
Nature Conservancy, California
 Regional Office, 24
New Mexico State University:
 Center for Latin American and
 Border Studies, 57; College of
 Engineering, 68; Water
 Resources Research Institute, 57
New Schools Venture Fund, 19
New York, State University of, at
 Albany, Department of
 Sociology, 66
New York, State University of, at
 Stony Brook, 69
New Zealand Family Planning
 Association, 47
Noontime Concerts, 38
North American Institute, 56
Northeast States Clean Air
 Foundation, 28
Northern California Grantmakers,
 33, 43, 64
Northern Virginia Mediation
 Service, The Institute for
 Conflict Analysis and
 Resolution, 6
Northwest Energy Coalition, 28
Northwestern University, J. L.
 Kellogg Graduate School of
 Management, 8
Notre Dame, University of, 6, 52, 69
- O**
Oakland East Bay Symphony, 38
Oakland Unified School District,
 Office of the Superintendent, 16
Oberlin Dance Collective, 41
Oceans Blue Foundation, 26
Ohio Commission on Dispute
 Resolution and Conflict
 Management, 6
Old First Center for the Arts / Old
 First Concerts, 38
One Thousand Friends of New
 Mexico, 26
One Thousand Friends of Oregon,
 26
Opera America, 38
Oregon Shakespeare Festival, 40
- Oregon State University, Industrial
 and Manufacturing
 Engineering, 69
Österreichische Stiftung für
 Weltbevölkerung und
 Internationale
 Zusammenarbeit, 47
Other Minds, 38
- P**
Pace University, Land Use Law
 Center, 6
Pacific Chamber Symphony, 38
Pacific Council on International
 Policy, 10, 69
Pacific Environment and Resources
 Center, 29
Pacific Institute for Studies in
 Development, Environment,
 and Security, 6, 24, 52
Pajaro Valley Performing Arts
 Association, 42
Partners for Democratic Change,
 11
Partners in School Innovation, 16
Partners of the Americas, 49
Pathfinder International, 49
Peninsula Community Foundation,
 33
Pennsylvania, University of,
 Population Studies Center, 52,
 58
Pennsylvania State University:
 Department of Sociology, 66;
 Population Research Institute,
 50
Performing Arts Workshop, 43
Philanthropix Partners, 64
Philanthropy Incubator, 69
Philharmonia Baroque Orchestra,
 38
Piedmont Choirs, 38
Planned Parenthood Federation of
 America, 49; Affiliate Services
 Center / San Francisco, 49
Planned Parenthood Federation of
 Korea, 47
PolicyLink, 6, 34
Pomona College, 14
Pontificia Universidade Católica do
 Rio de Janeiro, 55

- Population Action International, 47, 49
- Population Association of America, 50
- Population Communications International, 47
- Population Council, 51
- Population Reference Bureau, 51
- Population Resource Center, 51
- Portland State University, College of Urban and Public Affairs, 8
- Pro Esteros Lagunas y Marismas de las Californias, 24, 57
- Project Concern International, 49
- Pronatura Noreste, 24, 56
- Proyecto Fronterizo de Educación Ambiental, 56
- Public Agenda Foundation, 18
- Public Policy Institute of California, 52, 69
- Public Radio International, 65
- QR**
- Quest Scholars Program, 66
- RAND Corporation, 18, 28, 47
- Regional Center for Multidisciplinary Research, 52, 58
- Relief International, 66
- Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, 47
- Renewable Northwest Project, 28
- Reproductive Health Technologies Project, 48
- RESOLVE, 6
- Resources for the Future, 57
- Rice University, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, 14
- Río Grande / Río Bravo Basin Coalition, 27, 57
- Roberts Foundation, 64
- Rockman et cetera, 16
- Rova:Arts, 38
- Rubicon Programs, 32
- S**
- Salvation Army, National Headquarters, 33
- San Diego Foundation, San Diego Dialogue, 6, 17
- San Diego State University, 24, 57; Center for Latin American Studies, 58
- San Francisco, University of, School of Education, 16
- San Francisco Ballet Association, 41
- San Francisco Bar Association, 33
- San Francisco Chanticleer, 38
- San Francisco Conservatory of Music, 39
- San Francisco Foundation, 67; Community Initiative Funds, 16, 39
- San Francisco Friends of Chamber Music, 39
- San Francisco Jazz Organization, 39
- San Francisco Jewish Film Festival, 42
- San Francisco Live Arts, 39
- San Francisco Performing Arts Library and Museum, 42
- San Jose Cleveland Ballet, 41
- San Jose Mercury News Wish Book Fund, 34
- San Jose Museum of Art, 43
- Santa Fe Institute, 15
- Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition, 28
- Save the Children, 51
- Schola Cantorum, 39
- Search for Common Ground, 6
- Second Start, 31
- Shakespeare San Francisco, 40
- Sierra Business Council, 6, 25
- Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group, 69
- Smart Growth British Columbia, 26
- Society of Environmental Journalists, 23
- Sonoran Institute, 24
- Sonos Handbell Ensemble, 39
- Southern California, University of, School of Policy, Planning, and Development, 7
- South Florida, University of, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, 8
- Stanford University, 9; Center for Innovations in Learning, 19; Center for Research on the Context of Teaching, 69;
- Department of Communications, 66; Graduate School of Business, 64; Institute for International Studies, 11; School of Education, 15, 17; Social Science History Institute, 55
- Stern Grove Festival Association, 43
- Stiftung Berlin-Institut für Weltbevölkerung und Globale Entwicklung, 51
- Sundance Institute, 42
- Swedish Association for Sex Education, 48
- Synergos Institute, Global Philanthropy and Foundation Building Department, 60, 64
- Syracuse University, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, 9
- T**
- Teatro Visión, 40
- Technical Education Research Centers, 19
- Texas, University of, at Austin, 19; L.B.J. School of Public Affairs, 58
- Theatre of Yugen, 40
- Tides Canada Foundation, 26
- Tides Center, 7, 26, 33, 66
- Tides Foundation, 26
- Trout Unlimited, 24
- Trust for Public Land, 23, 26
- 2050, 46
- U**
- Union of Concerned Scientists, 28
- United Nations Foundation, 48
- United States Institute of Peace, 11
- United Way of the Bay Area, 31
- Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, Programa de Construcción Regional, 57
- Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, 52, 58
- Universidad de Costa Rica, 51
- Universidad de Guadalajara, Departamento de Estudios Regionales, 58

-
- Universidad de San Andrés,
 Departamento de Humanidades,
 60
 - Universidad Diego Portales, Escuela
 de Derecho, 11, 58
 - Universidad Rafael Landívar,
 Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y
 Sociales, 11, 58
 - Universidad Torcuato di Tella, 55
 - Urban Institute, 32, 67
 - Utah, University of, College of
 Engineering, 69
 - Young Audiences of San Jose and
 Silicon Valley, 43
 - Young Audiences of the Bay Area,
 43
 - Zohar Dance Company, 41
 - Z Space Studio, 40

VW

- Vera Institute of Justice, 11, 59
- Victim Offender Mediation
 Association, 9
- Volunteer Center of San Mateo
 County, 32
- Wallace Alexander Gerbode
 Foundation, 43
- Wayne State University, College of
 Urban, Labor and Metropolitan
 Affairs, 9
- Western Consensus Council, 7, 24
- Western Interstate Commission for
 Higher Education, 14, 19
- WGBH, 66; Educational
 Foundation, 48
- Wilderness Society, 25
- Wisconsin, University of, at
 Madison, Wisconsin Center for
 Education Research, 19
- Women's Initiative for Self-
 Employment, 31
- Woods Hole Research Center, 7, 25,
 56
- Working Partnerships USA, 32
- World Affairs Council of Northern
 California, 64
- World Arts West, 41
- World Health Organization,
 Department of Reproductive
 Health and Research, 51
- World Media Foundation, 23
- World Neighbors, 49
- Wyoming, University of, 26

YZ

- Yale University, School of Forestry
 and Environmental Studies, 28