INSPIRING CHANGE
PORTRAITS OF PARTNERSHIP
ON THE COVER: Protecting freshwater resources in the Great Lakes region is one example of how, with support from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, people partner with their communities to make a positive difference. Pictured here: Antuoine Hunt removes trash and debris from Euclid Beach Park on Lake Erie. Hunt is one of thousands of volunteers who participate in annual beach cleanup events in all eight Great Lakes states. The events are coordinated by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, a longtime Mott grantee.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation’s 2014 Annual Report features photography by Adam Stoltman. Unless otherwise noted, all photos are his.
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A message from William S. White, Chairman and CEO, and Ridgway H. White, President
One of Charles Stewart Mott’s most strongly held beliefs was that every person exists in a kind of informal partnership with his or her community. For nearly nine decades, this belief has guided the foundation that bears his name and shaped the work we do.

This concept of partnership has a couple of simple, yet powerful underpinnings. The first can be thought of as a virtuous cycle. When individuals succeed and give back, their community flourishes. And when a community is strong and prosperous, it cultivates opportunity for the individuals who live and work there. The success of each strengthens the other.

The second relates to the power to make positive change. When people become engaged and work in partnership with their communities, they can bridge social, cultural and economic divides, and — together — address seemingly intractable problems.

We have seen this firsthand in our hometown of Flint — from the earliest days of the Foundation, when the biggest challenges were born of the need to provide services to a rapidly expanding population, to the current day, when the reverse is true. After a decades-long decline in population, the city has fewer resources to deliver services to residents across a still-sprawling area. It is because good people and organizations continue to work together in partnership for the benefit of the community that we are confident Flint will continue to move forward through hard times to new opportunities.

Our work over the years has taught us additional truths about communities, including that they often are defined in the social sense by attributes other than geographic boundaries. A community may be made up of individuals

“IT SEEMS TO ME THAT EVERY PERSON, ALWAYS, IS IN A KIND OF INFORMAL PARTNERSHIP WITH HIS COMMUNITY.”

— CHARLES STEWART MOTT, 1875–1973
who live oceans apart, yet share a common characteristic, interest or concern. Or it may comprise various organizations and institutions working toward a joint purpose or goal.

We also have learned that the stubbornness and complexity of the issues we seek to address, whether in Flint or elsewhere around the world, mean they will not be resolved quickly or easily. It takes time and hard work for meaningful, sustainable change to take root. It requires the active collaboration of people and organizations to identify shared concerns and opportunities, explore and test potential approaches, and create solutions that meet the unique needs of their community.

And we have learned that no single institution has the knowledge, resources or agility to single-handedly address complex social issues. That power must lay in the collective hands, hearts and minds of people working together, often in new and creative ways, to make good things happen.

We’ve had a focus on strengthening partnerships between individuals and communities since our earliest days of grantmaking, and this approach is still evident in grants we made in 2014 across our four program areas: Civil Society, Education, Environment and Flint Area.

For example, in the 1930s Mr. Mott played an instrumental role in creating Flint’s “lighted schoolhouse” model of community education, which brought together multiple partners to provide area residents with academic and enrichment programs after the day’s last school bell rang and the sun went down. This model not only changed the way Flint residents engaged with their schools, it also helped to launch a national movement for community education.

Eight decades later, a community planning exercise revealed that Flint residents’ top priority was bringing a newly imagined model of community schools to the city. In 2014, we responded by providing a $330,000 grant through our Flint Area program to the Crim Fitness Foundation, which collaborated with the Flint Community Schools, other local organizations and residents to pilot a new model at a two-school elementary campus in the city. We hope this new partnership will result in a 21st century model of community education that can be expanded within our local school district, as well as insights that can inform national and international efforts. Overall, the Foundation awarded $430 million in grants between 1935 and 2014 — more than $1 billion in today’s dollars — to advance community education in our hometown of Flint and around the world.

The After-School All-Stars, one of our Education grantees, also engages
individuals, families, communities and schools to work in partnership. The organization provides comprehensive afterschool programs designed to keep kids safe and help them succeed in school and life. In 2014, its 10th year of support from Mott, the organization received two Foundation grants totaling $525,000.

In total, Mott awarded nearly $215 million in grants between 1998 and 2014 to help increase access to quality afterschool programs for all children in the United States, especially those in underserved communities. Together with other funders and advocates, we helped scale the federal government’s 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative from a small pilot project to the largest afterschool grant program in U.S. history, currently serving nearly 1.7 million children in more than 11,000 schools. We also support statewide afterschool networks in all 50 states. We believe this work is critical to providing educational opportunity because research has demonstrated that regular participation in quality afterschool programs helped to narrow the achievement gap in math between students from high-income and low-income families, improved academic and behavioral outcomes, and reduced absenteeism.

Connecting people and communities is also key to restoring and protecting freshwater resources in the Great Lakes region, which is an important aim of our Environment program. The Alliance for the Great Lakes is just one of our grantees who builds those connections. Each year, the Alliance’s Adopt-a-Beach program draws more than 10,000 volunteers to remove litter and debris from shorelines in all eight Great Lakes states. In 2014, we awarded two grants...
totaling $335,000 to the Alliance. Overall, the Foundation awarded more than $65 million in grants from 2000 to 2014 for work on Great Lakes issues.

As 2014 marked the 20th anniversary of the end of apartheid in South Africa, a number of our Civil Society grantees strengthened their resolve to ensure that every individual has a chance to participate in the nation’s young democracy. At the forefront of that effort are community advice offices (CAOs), where paralegals strive daily to help people in underserved, rural areas protect their land, access essential services, and take part in the decisions that govern their lives. Mott’s related funding has totaled nearly $26 million since 1991, including grants in 2014 totaling $400,000 to the National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices. During that year, Mott funds helped to support 200 of the country’s 312 CAOs in eight of the country’s nine provinces.

Each of the organizations mentioned above is doing critically important work. What’s equally important is how they are doing it — by helping individuals step forward, become partners with their communities, and create meaningful change.

In the Special Section of this report, you will find inspiring portraits of such individuals. A grandmother volunteering at a community school in Flint. A young woman who attended the After-School All-Stars program during junior high and is now striving to give back during her first year of college. A man whose volunteer experience turned him into a passionate protector of the Great Lakes. And a

*Seth Mnguni (left) and Julius Letlhogonolo Malekutu help to operate a community advice office in Mabopane, Pretoria. It’s one of more than 300 offices providing legal counsel and advocacy to underserved communities across South Africa.*
paralegal in South Africa who is working to ensure that the voices of people living in underserved communities are heard. Their stories demonstrate the help, hope and opportunity that can result when people are willing to partner with — and embrace — their communities.

Before we leave you to enjoy those stories, we’d be remiss if we didn’t touch on a new way in which we’re working in partnership within the Foundation. 2014 marked the start of significant transitions at Mott that have carried into 2015. Most significant is that we have a new president of the Foundation for the first time in 39 years, while the chairman and CEO remains on the job. That means we are leading the Foundation together. You’ll find more on the Board of Trustees’ appointment of Ridgway White as the Foundation’s fourth president, as well as other transitions in our leadership team and program areas, under Staff News on page 60.

What’s important to know is that we believe we have a leadership team and staff at every level who are poised to help our Foundation meet the challenges of the ever-changing environment in which we work, ensuring that our good intentions will be matched by accomplishments that contribute to a more just, equitable and sustainable world.
PORTRAITS
OF PARTNERSHIP
For some people, the notion of individual worth may spark thoughts of bank accounts and financial statements. Charles Stewart Mott viewed true personal worth as being rooted in factors beyond the balance sheet.

A genuine care and concern for the world around us. A willingness to step forward and help address tough challenges. The capacity to inspire, support and strengthen the communities we call “home.”

These are just a few of the personal assets our founder believed each of us can contribute to society.

Mr. Mott expounded on that belief in “A Foundation for Living,” the book that chronicled his perspectives and experiences as a philanthropist, and his relationship with — and affection for — his adopted hometown of Flint, Michigan:

“It seems to me that every person, always, is in a kind of informal partnership with his community. His own success is dependent to a large degree on that community, and the community, after all, is the sum total of the individuals who make it up. ... In an even larger sense, every man is in partnership with the rest of the human race in the eternal conquest which we call civilization.”

This vision of a world in which people recognize and embrace their unique roles in improving the human condition continues to guide the Mott Foundation’s grantmaking at home and around the globe.

“What I am worth is what I do for other people.”
— CHARLES STEWART MOTT, 1875–1973

In the pages that follow are four brief profiles of individuals who embody the spirit behind that vision. Their portraits reflect key areas of interest to the Foundation: a reimagined approach to community education in our hometown of Flint; the need to preserve and protect our precious natural resources; the value of high-quality afterschool opportunities; and the significance of legal lifelines for underserved people in South Africa.

We also invite you to visit our website, www.mott.org, for more stories that illustrate how each of us, by joining in partnership with our communities, can help to create the change we seek.
BRINGING THE COMMUNITY BACK INTO SCHOOL
Jeanette Edwards — grandmother, former foster parent and tireless volunteer — loves reading with the children who attend the Brownell-Holmes STEM Academy, a campus with two elementary schools that serve 800 K-6 students in Flint, Michigan.

She’s especially fond of reading to kids with behavioral problems because they remind her of her own school days.

“I was an angry little girl, and I behaved badly,” Edwards said. As a child with a reading disability and a speech impediment, she found school frustrating and embarrassing. She identifies with children who silently try to “fake” learning or who are upset and combative in the classroom. A dropout at 16, she returned to school as a young mother and earned her diploma at Flint’s Mott Adult High School, where her reading disability was diagnosed and treated.

“It took me 10 years — I only had time to take one class a semester — but at 35, I graduated from high school with honors,” she said. “I did it for my sons. How can you tell your child to stay in school if you haven’t done it yourself?”

Edwards, who’s lived around the corner from Brownell and Holmes for 32 years, does a lot for her children, seven grandsons and great-granddaughter, as well as for her church, her neighbors and the schools.

After working for 18 years as a paraprofessional with the Flint Community Schools, she found herself sidelined by a stroke in 2010. She began volunteering at Holmes during her recovery — but it was difficult, she said. Schools are busy places, and teachers and administrators often lack the time and
training to deploy volunteers effectively.

She credits a new community school model piloted in 2014 at Brownell-Holmes as the pathway to put her talents to use. A partnership between the Crim Fitness Foundation, the Flint Board of Education and 30 public- and private-sector entities, the model brings together a variety of resources for children and families, depending on the unique needs of each school and its surrounding neighborhood.

By strengthening the connection between schools and their communities, partners in the effort hope to improve students’ health, reduce absenteeism, advance academic achievement, and — ultimately — boost graduation rates and college enrollment. The Mott Foundation supported the development and implementation of the new model, now in place at five of the district’s nine elementary schools.

Jeanette Edwards, who overcame a childhood reading disability, now enjoys exploring books with Flint students.

Public school buildings in Flint, Michigan, first emerged as centers of neighborhood life and learning in the 1930s through the vision of Charles Stewart Mott and Frank J. Manley, the schools’ director of physical education and recreation. Their efforts subsequently helped to launch a national movement for community education.

Recently, the Mott Foundation has been working in our home community to create a reimagined, 21st century model of community education that meets the needs of today’s students, their families and other residents. In 2014, we made a $330,000 grant to the Crim Fitness Foundation to work with the Flint Community Schools and a variety of local organizations to pilot such an approach at the city’s Brownell-Holmes STEM Academy, a two-school campus serving 800 elementary students. We hope this new partnership will result in a model that can be expanded within the local district, as well as insights that can inform national and international efforts.

Between 1935 and 2014, the Mott Foundation awarded $430 million in grants — or more than $1 billion in today’s dollars — to support community education in our hometown of Flint and around the world.
Always the champion of children struggling with behavioral problems, Edwards works with the staff at Brownell and Holmes to ensure that “her kids” are among those who help cultivate the schools’ garden and participate in other out-of-the-classroom learning activities. She also began recruiting her retired neighbors to come to the schools and get to know the kids, thereby strengthening community ties.

The success of those efforts — and her participation with the schools’ neighborhood walking club — also inspired Edwards to create a block club.

“I wanted to have our neighborhood looking beautiful,” she said. To that end, she began working with staff at the Building Neighborhood Capacity Program, who offer training and resources to encourage community-driven change in neighborhoods that have historically faced barriers to revitalization. The program is a service of Flint’s Metro Community Development, which is a partner in the new community school model.

Reaching out to others has become a habit for Edwards. For too long, she said, her speech impairment kept her in the background. But her early troubles taught her that “you don’t always know what others are going through.”

They also taught her that a welcoming smile is sometimes all it takes for people to step forward and become true partners with their community.  

Her grandchildren are a driving force behind Edwards’ desire to strengthen Flint schools and her community.
PROTECTING
A PRECIOUS RESOURCE
A college student, Stephen Love was an altruist in search of a way to put his interest in the environment and politics into practice. He found his calling on the beaches of Lake Erie.

In 2009, Love and several friends at Baldwin Wallace University, located near Cleveland, volunteered for a beach cleanup organized by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, a longtime Mott grantee. The organization’s Adopt-a-Beach program draws more than 10,000 volunteers each year to remove trash from beaches in all eight Great Lakes states. Participants also help to monitor water quality and track the types of trash they find, which provides researchers and advocates with a better understanding of the origins of pollution that contributes to toxic algal blooms and other threats to the Great Lakes.

Love’s first experience of plucking litter and debris from the Lake Erie shoreline turned him into an avid protector of the Great Lakes.

“I was always interested in Lake Erie and the Great Lakes, but I didn’t know how to get involved in protecting them,” he said. “The Alliance provided a springboard. It’s been very rewarding.”

Love’s sense of reward springs, in part, from a personal connection to the work. As a child, he visited Euclid Beach Park on the southern shore of Lake Erie with his grandmother. His experience working with the Alliance to clean up the beach inspired him to help revitalize the
park, which had fallen into disrepair due to cuts in government funding. He began working with other community groups to remove debris from the park and organize free concerts and festivals, which attract thousands of people.

The renewed community interest was one of many factors that led the state of Ohio to transfer ownership of Euclid Beach Park and several other nearby lakefront recreational areas to Cleveland Metroparks in 2013. Since then, dilapidated buildings at Euclid Beach Park have been restored, new picnic and seating areas installed, and overgrown vegetation cleared — making Lake Erie visible once again from the hilltop park.

Love, meanwhile, continues to lead monthly cleanups at Euclid Beach — rain or shine, in sweltering heat or bone-chilling cold. He is committed to building on the park’s transformation to spark improvements in the adjacent Collinwood neighborhood, where he recently purchased a home.

Much of the Mott Foundation’s environmental grantmaking in North America focuses on the freshwater challenge — securing sustainable quantities of clean water for people and the environment. The Great Lakes figure prominently in that work. From 2000 to 2014, the Foundation awarded more than $65 million in grants for work in all eight Great Lakes states and the Canadian province of Ontario. Those grants strengthened the capacity of organizations working on Great Lakes issues — groups such as the Alliance for the Great Lakes, which in 2014 received two grants totaling $335,000. The work of the Foundation’s grantees also helped pave the way for the federal Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. That program has provided more than $1.5 billion to improve water quality, restore native fish and wildlife habitat, and combat invasive species.
“Stephen has been a great leader and a champion for Euclid Beach,” said Hyle Lowry, the Ohio outreach coordinator for the Adopt-a-Beach program. “He comes up with great ideas and initiatives to make the park more appealing and usable, and he’s a huge advocate for people getting involved and having a say in their community.”

Love said two things fuel his motivation: he wants to rid the Great Lakes of litter and debris that foul beaches and can harm wildlife and water quality; and he wants to educate Cleveland-area residents about how activities on land affect Lake Erie.

He said the beach cleanups are eye-opening for many volunteers, adding, “They arrive at the park believing they will be picking up trash that people have left on the beach. The reality is that most of the trash on this beach comes from people littering on land. Everything drains to the lake.”

ADOPT-A-BEACH 2014

CLEANUP SITES
371

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS
14,507

POUNDS OF LITTER REMOVED
51,797

“Most of the trash on this beach comes from people littering on land,” says Love. “Everything drains to the lake.”
CLIMBING MOUNTAINS
HELPING OTHERS
While climbing a mountain in Colorado with the After-School All-Stars National Youth Advisory Group, 13-year-old Jessica Lovius discovered something about herself.

“When I first saw that mountain, I thought: ‘I can’t climb that. It’s too big.’ But I climbed it anyway. And I’ve used that experience ever since,” she said.

The Colorado adventure with her afterschool program was the only “big trip” Lovius had taken outside her hometown of North Miami, Florida, until this past summer. Once again, she represented the After-School All-Stars — this time at First Lady Michelle Obama’s Beating the Odds Summit in Washington, D.C. There, she joined with 136 high school students from underserved communities to highlight the skills needed to graduate from high school and attend college.

But even the visit to the White House was eclipsed by what was, perhaps, her biggest trip of all — to Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. As a recipient of a four-year merit scholarship from the Posse Foundation, the 18-year-old chemistry major joined nine other Miami-area student leaders and scholarship winners — her posse — as they experienced two-and-a-half weeks of “immersion” on campus in preparation for their freshman year.

Like the After-School All-Stars, the Posse Foundation is dedicated to nurturing future leaders — particularly talented young people like Lovius, who might be missed by traditional academic identifiers.
“I always wanted to go to college, but I worried about how I could ever afford it,” said Lovius, one of two sisters raised by a single parent. By the fourth grade — the year her mother fought for her to attend accelerated classes — it was clear she had the brains to follow that dream. But she was, she said, “quiet and shy.”

It was the After-School All-Stars South Florida program that brought the soft-spoken and self-effacing seventh-grader out of her shell and introduced her to opportunities like the Posse Foundation.

“All my friends joined the All-Stars in sixth grade and kept pushing me to join, too,” she said. Accepted into the program in seventh grade, she quickly grew to appreciate what it had to offer.

“My mom worked after school, so it was really nice to have something to do. The All-Stars offered experiences that I would never have gotten anywhere else. And it was so important to me that it was free.”

Created in 1992 in Los Angeles, After-School All-Stars provides comprehensive out-of-school programs for more than 72,000 participants at 326 Title 1 schools in 16 communities across the country. The Mott Foundation has provided almost $2.2 million in support of the All-Stars since 2004, including funds to help the organization launch a leadership training institute for its National Youth Advisory Board in 2010.

Though she remains hesitant to describe herself as a leader, Lovius rarely backs away from a challenge. During her first year as an All-Star, she was asked to write an essay...
on what the afterschool program meant to her. She was happy to do it.

What Lovius did not know is that her essay was submitted as part of a national competition that would end with her participation on the wilderness trip to Colorado. It was the first of several leadership opportunities she would embrace as she made her way through middle and high school.

Now, halfway through her freshman year of college, Lovius is mentoring a local seventh-grader, a girl as shy and quiet as she once was.

She’s also joined SISTERS, a campus group that provides support for women of all backgrounds and ethnicities and raises money for charitable projects.

“I don’t think people can realize all they’ve done for me,” she says of her need to help others. “My dream — someday — is to open a pediatric clinic back home. I can’t wait to give back.”

THE BIG PICTURE

The Mott Foundation has long recognized that the hours after the final school bell rings are a critical time for hands-on learning that complements the regular school day. Research has demonstrated that regular participation in quality afterschool programs helped to narrow the achievement gap in math between students from high-income and low-income families, improved academic and behavioral outcomes, and reduced absenteeism. From 1998 through 2014, we awarded nearly $215 million to help increase access to quality afterschool programs for all children in the United States, especially those in underserved communities. In 2014, that support included two grants totaling $525,000 to the After-School All-Stars, a longtime Mott grantee. Together with other funders and advocates, Mott has helped to expand the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative from a pilot project to the largest afterschool grant program in the nation, currently serving nearly 1.7 million children in more than 11,000 schools. We also support statewide afterschool networks in all 50 states.
MAKING THE CASE FOR HIS COMMUNITY
Champion for justice. Great mediator. The face of a movement. These are some of the words used to describe Seth Mnguni, a community-based paralegal in Mabopane, Pretoria.

“What sets Seth apart is the amazing passion he has for the indigenous ways of resolving community conflicts,” said Nomboniso Nangu, director of the National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices (NADCAO). “He really is a champion for poor communities who believes strongly that the courts shouldn’t be the only place where people are able to go to resolve their issues.”

For decades, community-based paralegals have provided informal counsel and advocacy for those who lack access to lawyers and other forms of legal help. Such services have proved invaluable since the adoption in 1996 of South Africa’s first democratic constitution, which guarantees to all citizens the rights and access to justice that many had been denied during the apartheid era. That same year, with the idea of helping his home community take its place in the country’s fledgling democracy, Mnguni left his job at a car manufacturing company to open the Ntsu Advice Office in Mabopane.

“A passion for people and partnership fueled Seth Mnguni’s efforts to strengthen community advice offices in South Africa.”

“I felt like I needed to be a part of the change, and I could only do that in the community I lived in,” recalled Mnguni. “I’ve always believed that it is a community that makes a person who they are, and at that time it was important for me to help the people who were central to that community. It could only grow stronger if people’s lives were better.”
What he initially lacked in formal legal training, Mnguni made up for in his desire and commitment to learning all he could to help others. In the nearly 20 years since, that unwavering belief in the importance of people and community has fueled Mnguni’s efforts to help thousands of local residents resolve disputes ranging from property concerns and theft to domestic violence and harassment. He says this access to legal advice is vital to ensuring that all people in South Africa are able to fully participate in their democratic society. His office, like many of the more than 300 community advice offices across South Africa, has become an anchor institution among local residents, serving as the social glue that helps to hold their community together.

Mnguni’s own work also has evolved. Today he serves as chairman of the recently formed Association of Community Advice Offices of South Africa, which was launched in 2013 through NADCAO and with Mott.

For many people in rural South Africa, community advice offices (CAOs) represent a lifeline to legal and other important services. Since 1991, the Mott Foundation has made a total of $26 million in grants to help provide the community-based paralegals who staff these offices with the resources and recognition they need to help South Africans fully participate in the country’s democratic society. In 2014, related funding totaled $2.6 million, including grants totaling $400,000 to the National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices to support efforts to strengthen and sustain the sector nationwide. Mott funds also aided the work of 64 percent of the country’s 312 advice offices. Ultimately, these funds helped provide assistance to more than 32,000 CAO clients, with at least two-thirds of cases being successfully resolved through mediation and negotiation.

Residents line up for services at the community advice office in Mabopane, Pretoria.
Civil Society Program

Foundation support. A year later, the South African government passed a bill that finally recognized paralegals as legitimate members of the country’s legal community. The measure is crucial to paving the way toward public funding for the field, in which many advocates have worked for years without pay.

For all of his efforts and accomplishments, Mnguni says the greatest role he plays is that of mediator. Such work allows him to help others develop the skills and tools that can serve as catalysts for change, both locally and beyond.

“In working alongside those involved in a dispute, you begin to see there are underlying issues, such as lack of housing, hunger and disease, that are really causing it,” he explained. “Our approach to mediation is to take our clients with us rather than walking in front of them, leading. Then they take what they’ve learned and replicate it where they live.”

“I’ve always believed that it is a community that makes a person who they are, and at that time it was important for me to help the people who were central to that community. It could only grow stronger if people’s lives were better.”

— Seth Mnguni
Customers browse the fresh produce at the Flint Farmers’ Market.
“It seems to me that every person, always, is in a kind of informal partnership with his community. His own success is dependent to a large degree on that community, and the community, after all, is the sum total of the individuals who make it up. The institutions of a community, in turn, are the means by which those individuals express their faith, their ideals and their concern for fellow men. …

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

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

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

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

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

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

From this start, the Foundation’s major concern has been the well-being of the community, including the individual, the family, the neighborhood and the systems of government. This interest has continued to find expression in Flint and also has taken the Foundation far beyond its home city, as the content of this annual report makes clear.
OUR VALUES

Charles Stewart Mott’s central belief in the partnership of humanity was the basis upon which the Foundation was established. While this remains the guiding principle of its grantmaking, the Foundation has refined and broadened its grantmaking over time to reflect changing national and world conditions.

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

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

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

OUR CODE OF ETHICS

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

We are committed to:
• Acting honestly, truthfully and with integrity in all our transactions and dealings;
• Avoiding conflicts of interest;
• Appropriately handling actual or apparent conflicts of interest in our relationships;
• Treating our grantees fairly;
• Treating every individual with dignity and respect;
• Treating our employees with respect, fairness and good faith and providing conditions of employment that safeguard their rights and welfare;
• Being a good corporate citizen and complying with both the spirit and the letter of the law;
• Acting responsibly toward the communities in which we work and for the benefit of the communities that we serve;
• Being responsible, transparent and accountable for all of our actions; and
• Improving the accountability, transparency, ethical conduct and effectiveness of the nonprofit field.
OUR WORK

Our Vision: The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation affirms its founder’s vision of a world in which each of us is in partnership with the rest of the human race — where each individual’s quality of life is connected to the well-being of the community, both locally and globally. We pursue this vision through creative grantmaking, thoughtful communication and other activities that enhance community in its many forms. The same vision of shared learning shapes our internal culture as we strive to maintain an ethic of respect, integrity and responsibility. The Foundation seeks to strengthen, in people and their organizations, what Mr. Mott called “the capacity for accomplishment.”

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

Our Programs: We pursue our vision and mission by making grants through four program teams, as well as by supporting exploratory and special projects. You’ll find more information about the specific objectives of each program area in the Programs and Grants section of this report.

CIVIL SOCIETY
Purpose: To help strengthen the role of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies.

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

EDUCATION
Purpose: To create an environment in which all children and young people, particularly those from low- and moderate-income households, have access to quality educational experiences that help them achieve academic and economic success.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Advancing Afterschool
- College and Career Readiness
- Special Initiatives

ENVIRONMENT
Purpose: To help create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies and sustainable models of development that protect communities, as well as the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Addressing the Freshwater Challenge
- Transforming Development Finance
- Advancing Climate Change Solutions
- Special Initiatives

FLINT AREA
Purpose: To help our hometown of Flint, Michigan, develop into a well-functioning, connected community that’s capable of meeting economic, social and racial challenges.

PROGRAM AREAS:
- Revitalizing the Education Continuum
- Enriching Lives Through Arts and Culture
- Restoring Community Vitality
- Meeting Evolving Community Needs

EXPLORATORY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS
Purpose: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. Proposals are by invitation only. Unsolicited proposals are discouraged.
Classes at the Flint Institute of Arts teach kids how to make pottery.
To help strengthen the role of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in increasing civic engagement and improving communities and societies, we make grants in the following areas:

**CENTRAL/EASTERN EUROPE***

**GOAL:** Foster an environment in which the nonprofit sector strengthens democratic values and practices.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Active Civic Participation:** We strive for a society in which people and nonprofit organizations are empowered to promote and defend their democratic values.
- **Philanthropy Development:** We envision a robust culture of private giving that serves the public good.

**SOUTH AFRICA**

**GOAL:** Help underserved communities effectively address their unique needs and aspirations.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Community Advice Office Sector:** We seek a strong and sustainable field of community-based organizations that provide legal and other vital services.
- **Philanthropy Development:** We aim for a vibrant philanthropic sector that responds to the needs of underserved communities.
- **Special Opportunities:** We strive to remain alert to unique approaches to strengthening civil society.

**UNITED STATES**

**GOAL:** Help increase the responsiveness and capacity of the nation’s philanthropic and nonprofit sector.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness:** We work to foster a robust infrastructure that helps organizations and individuals engage in charitable giving.
- **Community Philanthropy:** We seek to expand local philanthropy in ways that support and promote community vitality and resiliency.

**GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR**

**GOAL:** Foster global platforms that help philanthropies and nonprofit organizations respond to the needs of local communities.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector:** We aim to help strengthen philanthropic and nonprofit support organizations through collaboration and information exchange.
- **Special Opportunities:** We strive to remain responsive to unique opportunities to strengthen civil society.

*Note: In 2014, this program area included support to organizations working in Russia, and such support is included in the grants listing on pages 34–37. However, in 2015, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation was included on a list of organizations that the upper house of the Russian parliament recommended designating as “undesirable.” We therefore concluded that the best course of action was to discontinue our support in Russia.*
## Grant Activity

The West Coast Community Foundation provides close-to-home preschool for children living in rural regions of South Africa’s Western Cape. The program illustrates Mott’s belief that local philanthropy can be a vital partner in helping to meet the unique needs of people and communities.

### Global Philanthropy & Nonprofit Sector

- **Central/Eastern Europe**
  - $10.512
  - 71 Grants
- **South Africa**
  - $3.918
  - 30 Grants
- **United States**
  - $2.838
  - 22 Grants

### 2014 Grant Activity

- **Central/Eastern Europe**
  - $10.512
  - 71 Grants
- **South Africa**
  - $3.918
  - 30 Grants
- **United States**
  - $2.838
  - 22 Grants

### Grant Dollars (in millions) and Number of Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Major Area</th>
<th>Grant Dollars</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central/Eastern Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Europe</td>
<td>$ 4.600</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>$ 3.656</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE/Russia Regional</td>
<td>$ 2.256</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advice Office Sector</td>
<td>$ 2.607</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy Development</td>
<td>$ .840</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$ .471</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>$ 1.820</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Philanthropy</td>
<td>$ .828</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$ .190</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>$ 2.558</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$ .269</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 20.095</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil Society Promotion Center
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$70,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

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

Group 484
Belgrade, Serbia
$70,000 – 24 mos.
Institutional and program development support

Heartefact Fund
Belgrade, Serbia
$140,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Institute for Public Environment Development
Sofia, Bulgaria
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

International Council for Cultural Centers
Sofia, Bulgaria
$130,000 – 24 mos.
Strengthening bread houses network in Bulgaria

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

National Association of Citizens Advice Bureaux
Bucharest, Romania
$150,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes

National Network for Children
Sofia, Bulgaria
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Developing community schools in Bulgaria

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

PACT – Partnership for Community Action and Transformation Foundation
Bucharest, Romania
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

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

Resource Center for Public Participation
Bucharest, Romania
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Romanian Federation of Community Foundations
Cluj-Nacopa, Romania
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Third Sector Foundation of Turkey
Karayok, Turkey
$45,000 – 24 mos.
Philanthropy infrastructure development in Turkey

Time Heroes Foundation
Sofia, Bulgaria
$200,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Truth, Justice and Memory Studies Association
Istanbul, Turkey
$140,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

Yayla (Gola) Culture, Arts, and Ecology Association
Istanbul, Turkey
$55,000 – 15 mos.
Cultural, ecological and economic rejuvenation of eastern Black Sea region

Youth Communication Center – Banja Luka
Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
$80,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

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

YouthBuild USA
Somerville, MA
$50,000 – 26 mos.
YouthBuild in Western Balkans

Zajecar Initiative
Zajecar, Serbia
$80,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal:
Southeast Europe
$4,600,000

Western Former Soviet Union
Arkhangelsk Centre of Social Technologies “Garant”
Arkhangelsk, Russia
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Active citizens – a resource of communities

Association for International Philanthropy Infrastructure Development
Karakoy, Turkey
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Encouraging development of non-governmental organizations in Belarus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Ukrainian Human Rights Monitors on Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Strengthening capacity of youth to protect and restore their rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Society Research</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Strengthening civic participation in Ukrainian cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities Aid Foundation</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>$600,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Community foundation development in Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Action Foundation</td>
<td>Perm, Russia</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Perm united support service for noncommercial groups and organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe Foundation</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$180,000 – 18 mos.</td>
<td>Act Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ednannia</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$250,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Community foundation school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Independent Radio Broadcasting</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>$250,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Participatory radio for community development in Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Gang Kollektiv</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Generation celebration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Center for Humanistic Technologies “AHALAR”</td>
<td>Chernihiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Territory of development: community mobilization in Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Prevention of Violence “ANNA”</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Mobilizing local communities to prevent domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openDemocracy Limited</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>$125,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>oDRussia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Initiatives Development Society</td>
<td>Perm, Russia</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Civil initiatives for public benefit support service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center</td>
<td>Novosibirsk, Russia</td>
<td>$200,000 – 32 mos.</td>
<td>Communities of, by and for the people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sluzhenye Association</td>
<td>Nizhny Novgorod, Russia</td>
<td>$125,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Community development in Volga region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step by Step Moldova</td>
<td>Chisinau, Moldova</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Community school development in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union</td>
<td>Kyiv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$100,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-Ukrainian Resource Center</td>
<td>Lviv, Ukraine</td>
<td>$150,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zing Foundation</td>
<td>Warsaw, Poland</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Promoting philanthropy in CEE/Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: $3,656,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Former Soviet Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CEE/Russia Regional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association for Community Relations</td>
<td>Cluj-Napoca, Romania</td>
<td>$295,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>INSPIRE – Initiative for Strategic Philanthropy and Intelligent Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Liberal Strategies Foundation</td>
<td>Sofia, Bulgaria</td>
<td>$80,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Lessons of protest wave in Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Foundation for Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Belfast, Ireland</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>International YouthBank support model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation Centre</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>$30,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Grantmakers East group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-Administered Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>$161,029</td>
<td>Community foundation development in CEE/Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre of Excellence for Community Schools</td>
<td>Coventry, England</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian Rural Forum</td>
<td>Riga, Latvia</td>
<td>$140,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Pre-accession partnership for rural Europe – PREPARE network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in Need</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>$550,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Center for civil society innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Association of Foundations</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>$200,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Donors and foundations networks in Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

- **Central/Eastern Europe and Russia Program Area Total:** $10,512,029
- **CEE/Russia Regional Subtotal:** $2,256,029
Project for Conflict Resolution and Development
Port Elizabeth, South Africa
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Conflict resolution training for advice offices
Rhodes University
Grahamstown, South Africa
$250,000 – 24 mos.
Rhodes University legal aid clinic: advice office project
Rural Legal Trust
Johannesburg, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
Advice office program
Southern Cape Land Committee
George, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Support to advice offices and farm communities
Steve Biko Foundation
Johannesburg, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
University of Fort Hare
Alice, South Africa
$50,000 – 18 mos.
UNESCO Oliver Tambo Chair of Human Rights: enhancing participatory development and social awareness among local women and youth
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Durban, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
Centre for Civil Society
Subtotal: $2,607,202
Community Advice Office Sector
Community Development Foundation
Western Cape
Cape Town, South Africa
$150,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Community Organisation Resource Centre
Cape Town, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Ikhala Trust
Port Elizabeth, South Africa
$150,000 – 21 mos.
General purposes
Social Change Assistance Trust
Cape Town, South Africa
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Social Justice Initiative
Johannesburg, South Africa
$50,000 – 15 mos.
General purposes
Southern Africa Trust
Midrand, South Africa
$70,000 – 16 mos.
Change4ever campaign
Subtotal: $840,000
Philanthropy Development
Special Opportunities
Foundation-Administered Project
$76,235
Learning and sharing sessions
Institute for Healing of Memories
Cape Town, South Africa
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
SGS Consulting
Johannesburg, South Africa
$175,000 – 12 mos.
Technical support and dialogue platform
South African History Online
Cape Town, South Africa
$120,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Subtotal: $471,235
Program Area Total: $3,918,437

UNITED STATES
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Alliance for Nonprofit Management
Chestnut Hill, MA
$100,000 – 12 mos.
Nonprofits Integrating Community Engagement
Center for Effective Philanthropy
Cambridge, MA
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Exponent Philanthropy
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 36 mos.
General purposes
Foundation Center
New York, NY
$500,000 – 48 mos.
Building future of philanthropy
Foundation-Administered Project
Lansing, MI
$115,262
Office of foundation liaison
Grantmakers for Effective Organizations
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 18 mos.
General purposes
GuideStar
Williamsburg, VA
$110,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Independent Sector
Washington, DC
$10,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Indiana University
Indianapolis, IN
$300,000 – 93 mos.
C. S. Mott Foundation chair on community foundations
National Center for Family Philanthropy
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 24 mos.
Community foundations and family philanthropy
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy
Special Opportunities
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS)
Dearborn, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Center for Arab American Philanthropy endowment fund
Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 18 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
Subtotal: $1,820,262
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy
Special Opportunities
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS)
Dearborn, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Center for Arab American Philanthropy endowment fund
Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 18 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
Subtotal: $1,820,262
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy
Special Opportunities
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS)
Dearborn, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Center for Arab American Philanthropy endowment fund
Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 18 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
Subtotal: $1,820,262
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy
Special Opportunities
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS)
Dearborn, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Center for Arab American Philanthropy endowment fund
Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 18 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
Subtotal: $1,820,262
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy
Special Opportunities
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS)
Dearborn, MI
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Center for Arab American Philanthropy endowment fund
Michigan Nonprofit Association
Lansing, MI
$300,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Nonprofit Quarterly
Boston, MA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement
Washington, DC
$20,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
$120,000 – 18 mos.
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
Subtotal: $1,820,262
Nonprofit Sector Responsiveness
Subtotal: $827,332
Community Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>City, Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Education Foundation</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern education leadership initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Area Total:</strong></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$2,837,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY AND NONPROFIT SECTOR**

**Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector**

**Alliance Publishing Trust**  
London, England  
$130,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation**  
Washington, DC  
$100,000 – 24 mos.  
Affinity group of national associations  
$150,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Cleveland Foundation**  
Cleveland, OH  
$20,000 – 32 mos.  
Community foundation global online atlas

**East-West Management Institute**  
New York, NY  
$90,000 – 18 mos.  
Philanthropication through privatization initiative

**European Foundation Centre**  
Brussels, Belgium  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Global Fund for Community Foundations**  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
$300,000 – 24 mos.  
Global alliance for community philanthropy secretariat  
$250,000 – 12 mos.  
Small grants and capacity-building program

**Interaction Institute for Social Change**  
Boston, MA  
$25,000 – 6 mos.  
Global community philanthropy summit planning

**Inter-American Foundation**  
Washington, DC  
$100,000 – 36 mos.  
Mexican community foundation development

**Johns Hopkins University**  
Baltimore, MD  
$80,000 – 12 mos.  
Global civil society information system  
$60,000 – 24 mos.  
International Society for Third-Sector Research

**London Community Foundation**  
London, England  
$150,000 – 36 mos.  
Developing London Community Foundation

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

**Research Foundation of the City University of New York**  
New York, NY  
$230,000 – 24 mos.  
International community foundation fellows program

**Southern Africa Trust**  
Midrand, South Africa  
$100,000 – 18 mos.  
Africa grantmakers network

**TechSoup Global**  
San Francisco, CA  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
NGOsource

**UK Community Foundations**  
London, England  
$280,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership**  
San Diego, CA  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

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

**Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support**  
São Paulo, Brazil  
$15,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**Subtotal:**  
Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector  
$2,558,000

**Special Opportunities**

**EastWest Institute**  
New York, NY  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
John Mroz executive fund

**International Academy for Innovative Pedagogy, Psychology and Economy gGmbH**  
Berlin, Germany  
$134,000 – 12 mos.  
Youth empowerment partnership program

**Madariaga College of Europe Foundation**  
Brussels, Belgium  
$35,000 – 12 mos.  
Citizens’ Europe program

**Subtotal:**  
Special Opportunities  
$269,000

**Program Area Total:**  
Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector  
$2,827,000

**Program Total:**  
Civil Society  
$20,095,060
To help create accountable and responsive institutions, sound public policies and sustainable models of development that protect communities, as well as the diversity and integrity of selected ecosystems in North America and around the world, we make grants in the following areas:

**ADDRESSING THE FRESHWATER CHALLENGE**

**GOAL:** Secure sustainable levels of clean water for people and the environment, particularly in the Great Lakes.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Strengthening the Environmental Community:** We seek a strong, effective and sustainable community of nongovernmental organizations dedicated to the long-term conservation of freshwater ecosystems.
- **Informing Sound Public Policies:** We seek to inform and advance well-designed and effectively implemented water-quality and -quantity policies that conserve freshwater resources.

**ADVANCING CLIMATE CHANGE SOLUTIONS**

**GOAL:** Increase the local adoption of clean energy technologies in our home state of Michigan and internationally.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Providing Access to Clean Energy in Developing Countries:** We seek to increase the use of renewable energy systems in rural communities throughout Africa, Asia and South America.
- **Stimulating Clean Energy Use in Michigan:** We strive for broad and deep uptake of energy-efficiency and renewable-energy technologies in our home state.

**TRANSFORMING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE**

**GOAL:** Shape international investment strategies and practices in ways that protect people and the environment.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Securing Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future:** We aim for international investments in infrastructure and energy that also foster sustainability and local economic opportunity.
- **Promoting Sustainable Regional Development and Integration:** We envision international investments that also support sustainable development at the local level. (Emphasis on South America.)

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

**GOAL:** Respond to unique opportunities to advance environmental protection in the United States and internationally.
Addressing the Freshwater Challenge

- Strengthening the Environmental Community: $1.505 million, 9 grants
- Informing Sound Public Policies: $1.731 million, 15 grants

Transforming Development Finance

- Securing Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future: $2.559 million, 20 grants
- Promoting Sustainable Regional Development and Integration: $2.557 million, 14 grants

Special Initiatives

- $1.145 million, 16 grants

**2014 Grant Activity**

- Total Grant Dollars: $9,497,497
- Total Number of Grants: 74

*PHOTO CREDIT: CARLOS MORA / ALAMY*

A proposed complex of hydroelectric dams in the Amazon’s Tapajos river basin could threaten the traditional waters, lands and way of life for the region’s indigenous communities. Mott grantees are working to improve the social and environmental accountability of those investing in large-scale infrastructure and other projects in developing countries.
2014 GRANTS ENVIRONMENT

The preceding overview of Mott’s Environment Program reflects program areas, goals and objectives that were approved by the Foundation’s Board of Trustees in September 2014. Because our grantmaking in 2014 took place under the previous program plan, the grants listed below are categorized according to that earlier framework.

ADDRESSING THE FRESHWATER CHALLENGE

**Strengthening the Environmental Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for the Great Lakes</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes water program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Fund</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Saginaw Bay watershed initiative network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint River Watershed Coalition</td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy</td>
<td>Traverse City, MI</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Conservation Leadership</td>
<td>Takoma Park, MD</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Freshwater leadership initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Environmental Partnership</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Northeast Minnesota program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Alliance of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Great Lakes program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Network</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Building citizen capacity for freshwater protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $1,505,000

**Public Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>27 mos.</td>
<td>Bretton Woods project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Accountability in practice: lessons from Compliance, Advisor, Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Information Center</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Alliance</td>
<td>Worldwide</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurodad</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Addressing changes in international development finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Peoples Programme</td>
<td>Moreton-in-Marsh, England</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Protecting the environment and securing rights of forest peoples in international development finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Greenovation hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on ADB</td>
<td>Quezon City, Philippines</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $1,731,500

**Program Area Total:** $3,236,500

TRANSFORMING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

**Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattahoochee Riverkeeper</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Georgia water policy project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoWorks</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Financing water quality improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia River Network</td>
<td>Athens, GA</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Protecting healthy river flows for Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Covington, GA</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Georgia comprehensive statewide water management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>Climate resilient communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan United Conservation Clubs</td>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Michigan land and water policy project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Environmental Advocates</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Water quantity protection and conservation project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Lake Superior water quality project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Reston, VA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Sustaining Great Lakes project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>24 mos.</td>
<td>Implementation of Great Lakes compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>42 mos.</td>
<td>Saginaw Bay initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>Improving stormwater management in Great Lakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $1,731,500

**Program Area Total:** $3,236,500

Addressing the Freshwater Challenge
Oil Change International  
**Washington, DC**  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
International program

**Oxfam America**  
**Boston, MA**  
$50,000 – 6 mos.  
Shifting the narrative: addressing Africa’s energy poverty challenge

**PLATFORM**  
**London, England**  
$150,000 – 24 mos.  
Reforming energy investment

**Re:Common**  
**Rome, Italy**  
$200,000 – 18 mos.  
Mainstreaming environmental sustainability into a changing development finance

**Sierra Club Foundation**  
**San Francisco, CA**  
$7,000 – 24 mos.  
International Financial Institution reform project

**Tufts University**  
**Medford, MA**  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
South-South investment: environmental impacts in South America

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

**Subtotal:**  
$2,559,000  
Infrastructure and Energy for a Sustainable Future

**Sustainable Regional Development and Integration**

**American University**  
**Washington, DC**  
$250,000 – 24 mos.  
China-Latin America sustainable investments initiative

**Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales**  
**Lima, Peru**  
$350,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

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

**Foundation-Administered Project**  
$32,497  
International Financial Institution convenings

**Fundacion Ambiente y Recursos Naturales**  
**Buenos Aires, Argentina**  
$250,000 – 24 mos.  
Monitoring infrastructure investments in Argentina

**iBase**  
**Rio de Janeiro, Brazil**  
$74,500 – 18 mos.  
Monitoring Brazilian Development Bank investments in energy and infrastructure

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

**Instituto Centro de Vida**  
**Cuiaba, Brazil**  
$100,000 – 12 mos.  
Energy and infrastructure development in Amazon

**Instituto de Energia e Meio Ambiente**  
**Sao Paulo, Brazil**  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Monitoring Brazilian Development Bank sustainability

**Instituto Socioambiental**  
**Sao Paulo, Brazil**  
$200,000 – 24 mos.  
Impacts of Brazilian National Development Bank investments on regional sustainability

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

**Mongabay.org**  
**Emerald Hills, CA**  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Brazilian Development Bank and the Amazon

**Socio-Environmental Fund CASA**  
**Juquitiba, Brazil**  
$225,000 – 18 mos.  
General purposes

**Uruguayan Study Center of Appropriate Technologies**  
**Montevideo, Uruguay**  
$250,000 – 24 mos.  
Impacts and alternatives to current investment and development patterns on environmental and sustainability options in Latin America

**Subtotal:**  
$2,556,997  
Sustainable Regional Development and Integration

**Program Area Total:**  
$5,115,997  
Transforming Development Finance

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

**Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan**

**Disability Advocates of Kent County**  
**Grand Rapids, MI**  
$40,000 – 15 mos.  
Model transportation project

**Ecology Center**  
**Ann Arbor, MI**  
$60,000 – 12 mos.  
Model transit project

**MI*Voice**  
**Detroit, MI**  
$50,000 – 12 mos.  
Constituency building and outreach on land use and equitable development

**Michigan Environmental Council**  
**Lansing, MI**  
$85,000 – 12 mos.  
Michigan transportation reform partnership

**Smart Growth America**  
**Washington, DC**  
$85,000 – 12 mos.  
Multi-modal development and delivery

**Subtotal:**  
$320,000  
Growth Management and Urban Revitalization in Michigan

**Special Opportunities**

**Council of Great Lakes Governors**  
**Chicago, IL**  
$25,000 – 12 mos.  
Great Lakes summit

**EcoAdapt**  
**Bainbridge Island, WA**  
$20,000 – 27 mos.  
Climate adaptation survey

**Environmental Grantmakers Association**  
**New York, NY**  
$80,000 – 24 mos.  
General purposes

**Fresh Energy**  
**Saint Paul, MN**  
$50,000 – 14 mos.  
Midwest energy news in Michigan

**Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities**  
**Coral Gables, FL**  
$40,000 – 12 mos.  
General purposes

**Grand Valley State University**  
**Allendale, MI**  
$25,000 – 19 mos.  
Growing Michigan’s blue economy

**Institute for Energy Innovation**  
**Lansing, MI**  
$75,000 – 12 mos.  
Barriers to advanced energy in Michigan

**Michigan Land Use Institute**  
**Traverse City, MI**  
$450,000 – 36 mos.  
General purposes

**Michigan Save**  
**Lansing, MI**  
$60,000 – 12 mos.  
Michigan clean energy report

**Subtotal:**  
$825,000  
Special Opportunities

**Program Area Total:**  
$1,145,000  
Special Initiatives

**Program Total:**  
$9,497,497  
Environment
To help our hometown of Flint, Michigan, develop into a well-functioning, connected community that’s capable of meeting economic, social and racial challenges, we make grants in the following program areas:

REVITALIZING THE EDUCATION CONTINUUM

**GOAL:** Increase educational opportunities and outcomes for area children, youth and adults.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Flint K-12 Education:** We strive for a strong K-12 system that provides local families with educational choices.
- **Community Schools:** We seek the district-wide adoption of a re-envisioned approach to community schools.
- **College, Careers and Connections:** We aim for broad access among residents to multiple educational and career pathways.

ENRICHING LIVES THROUGH ARTS AND CULTURE

**GOAL:** Support arts and cultural organizations as critical forces for positive change in Flint.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Flint Cultural Center Campus:** We envision a strong, sustainable Flint Cultural Center campus that engages all residents, especially youth.
- **Smaller Arts Organizations:** We seek diverse initiatives and organizations that offer an array of arts and cultural opportunities.

RESTORING COMMUNITY VITALITY

**GOAL:** Stimulate local job growth and revitalize downtown and residential districts.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Regional Economy:** We envision a vibrant and diverse economy that builds on the area’s economic strengths and assets.
- **Downtown Revitalization:** We strive for a downtown area that attracts public and private investment.
- **Community Development:** We seek affordable housing opportunities and livable neighborhoods in and around the city.
- **Entrepreneurship:** We aim for a vibrant and connected community of local entrepreneurs and small businesses.

MEETING EVOLVING COMMUNITY NEEDS

**GOAL:** Support programs that provide opportunities for children and families, improve lives of area residents, and sustain a vibrant nonprofit sector.

**OBJECTIVES:**
- **Nonprofit/Philanthropic Sector:** We envision a strong nonprofit and philanthropic sector that contributes to quality of life.
- **Special Opportunities:** We strive to help the community respond to key opportunities and issues.
On June 21, 2014, the 106-year-old Flint Farmers’ Market opened for business in its new location in downtown Flint, Michigan. The expanded market is the centerpiece of an emerging health and wellness district, one of several projects that, with support from Mott, help to foster positive economic, social and health outcomes in the Foundation’s home community.

### 2014 Grant Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grant Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revitalizing the Education Continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint K-12 Education</td>
<td>$4.061</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools</td>
<td>$3.958</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, Careers and Connections</td>
<td>$6.441</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enriching Lives Through Arts and Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Cultural Center Campus</td>
<td>$10.702</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Arts Organizations</td>
<td>$.460</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoring Community Vitality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economy</td>
<td>$4.600</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Revitalization</td>
<td>$1.464</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$3.379</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>$.448</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Evolving Community Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit/Philanthropic Sector</td>
<td>$4.546</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opportunities</td>
<td>$.862</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$40.921</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2014 GRANTS FLINT AREA

The preceding overview of Mott's Flint Area Program reflects program areas, goals and objectives that were approved by the Foundation's Board of Trustees in June 2015. Because 2014 grants were awarded under an earlier framework, the grants listed below are categorized according to that framework.

ARTS, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Education

Cranbrook Educational Community
Bloomfield Hills, MI
$500,000 – 12 mos.
Flint Community Schools young scientists

Crim Fitness Foundation
Flint, MI
$330,000 – 12 mos.
Community schools initiative

Flint Community Schools
Flint, MI
$800,000 – 17 mos.
Business office reconfiguration

$500,000 – 12 mos.
Educational plan implementation

$950,000 – 7 mos.
Outsourced chief financial officer and accounting technical assistance

$178,325 – 12 mos.
Science, technology, engineering and math support

$167,689 – 3 mos.
Summer Tot Lot program

$700,000 – 17 mos.
Superintendent technical assistance

Foundation-Administered Project
$760,000
Technical assistance for Flint Community Schools

Genesee Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$2,800,000 – 12 mos.
YouthQuest afterschool initiative

Genesee Intermediate School District
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 10 mos.
Genese Early College

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$4,056,000 – 36 mos.
Transformational initiatives

Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$30,500 – 9 mos.
Flint and Genese literacy and basic skills network capacity building

$150,000 – 36 mos.
GAPS: transition program

$700,000 – 36 mos.
Mott Middle/Early College replication

$150,000 – 12 mos.
Smart Teachers as Role Models (STAR) initiative

NEA Foundation
Washington, DC
$173,000 – 9 mos.
Flint Community Schools education plan support

Subtotal: $13,095,514

Arts and Culture

Bikes on the Bricks
Flint, MI
$10,000 – 7 mos.
Bikes on the Bricks marketing

City of Flint
Flint, MI
$130,000 – 5 mos.
Downtown Flint summer event planning and implementation

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

Flint Cultural Center Corporation
Flint, MI
$1,500,000 – 10 mos.
Longway Planetarium theater renovation

$1,700,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

Flint Institute of Arts
Flint, MI
$200,000 – 10 mos.
Art school endowment

$3,362,856 – 32 mos.
Art school endowment II

$2,225,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

Flint Institute of Music
Flint, MI
$45,000 – 6 mos.
Music in the Parks

$1,100,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

$50,000 – 6 mos.
Tapology Tap Dance Festival for Youth

Greater Flint Arts Council
Flint, MI
$150,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

$120,000 – 12 mos.
Parade of Festivals

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

Subtotal: $10,742,856

Program Area Total: $23,838,370

ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION

Economic Development

Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
$500,000 – 24 mos.
Metropolitan policy program

Foundation for the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation
Flint, MI
$222,073 – 12 mos.
Downtown security

$175,000 – 12 mos.
Flint Food Works commercial kitchen

$900,000 – 12 mos.
Hurley Children's Hospital pediatric center

$150,000 – 12 mos.
Operating support

$72,000 – 12 mos.
Real-estate development support services

Foundation-Administered Project
$120,000
Technical assistance for downtown Flint revitalization

Genese Area Focus Fund
Flint, MI
$3,750,000 – 12 mos.
Education and economic development initiatives

Kettering University
Flint, MI
$1,750,000 – 12 mos.
Atwood Stadium improvements

Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$140,046 – 12 mos.
FABLAB for the community

United Way of Genese County
Flint, MI
$350,000 – 12 mos.
Flint Area Reinvestment Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Michigan-Flint</th>
<th>$65,000 – 12 mos.</th>
<th>Innovation incubator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Flint Health Coalition</td>
<td>$175,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Flint Healthcare Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott Community College</td>
<td>$68,000 – 7 mos.</td>
<td>Teen Creating Economic Opportunity initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Employment Services Inc.</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Flint STRIVE replication program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Public Library</td>
<td>$300,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Operating support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>$20,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Flint Diaper Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Network of Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>$2,500,000 – 24 mos.</td>
<td>Hunger Solution Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee Area Focus Fund</td>
<td>$825,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Summer Youth Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Genesee</td>
<td>$60,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>One Stop Genesee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army of Genesee County</td>
<td>$150,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Rent and utility assistance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter of Flint Inc.</td>
<td>$50,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Comprehensive emergency assistance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Employment Services Inc.</td>
<td>$85,000 – 12 mos.</td>
<td>Flint STRIVE Academy youth empowerment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee County Parks &amp; Recreation Commission</td>
<td>$490,519 – 4 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Elmwood Foundation</td>
<td>$74,980 – 11 mos.</td>
<td>Glenwood Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>$150,000 – 17 mos.</td>
<td>Flint 21st century community policing technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Information Center</td>
<td>$79,000 – 36 mos.</td>
<td>General purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Initiatives</td>
<td>$940,981</td>
<td>Special Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Total:</td>
<td>$940,981</td>
<td>Special Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Total:</td>
<td><strong>$40,921,020</strong></td>
<td>Flint Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To create an environment in which all children and young people, particularly those from low- and moderate-income households, have access to quality educational experiences that help them achieve academic and economic success, we make grants in the following areas:

**ADVANCING AFTERSCHOOL**

**GOAL:** Increase access to quality afterschool educational opportunities.

**OBJECTIVES:**

- **Policy and Partnerships:** We seek informed policies and strong partnerships that increase the availability and quality of afterschool programs capable of meeting the needs of children and families.
- **Quality and Innovation:** We aim for research-based and data-driven practices that engage young people in learning, prepare them for college and careers, and connect them with their communities.

**COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS**

**GOAL:** Increase the percentage of students, especially those from underserved communities, who graduate high school with the knowledge, experience and skills they need to succeed in college and career pathways.

**OBJECTIVES:**

- **Assets:** We will expand the use of children’s savings accounts as a means of increasing students’ and families’ aspirations, expectations and financial resources for training beyond high school.
- **Access:** We seek to inform well-designed and implemented financial aid systems that engage families early, provide better information, and encourage college and career planning.

**SPECIAL INITIATIVES**

**GOAL:** Maintain the Foundation’s flexibility for responding to new strategies, unique opportunities, and changing social, economic and political contexts.
High-quality afterschool programs — like those offered by the East Tenth United Methodist Children and Youth Center in Indianapolis — help students acquire critical academic and life skills. Mott is working to ensure that all of the country’s children, especially those in underserved communities, have access to such programs.
The preceding overview of Mott’s Education Program reflects program areas, goals and objectives that were approved by the Foundation’s Board of Trustees in September 2014. Because our grantmaking in 2014 took place under the previous program plan, the grants listed below are categorized according to that earlier framework.

### ADVANCING AFTERSCHOOL

**Policy and Partnerships**

- **Afterschool Alliance**
  - Washington, DC
  - $300,000 – 12 mos.
  - General purposes
  - $125,000 – 12 mos.
  - VISTA project

- **After-School All-Stars**
  - Los Angeles, CA
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Nevada statewide afterschool network

- **Arkansas State University**
  - State University, AR
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Arkansas statewide afterschool network

- **BoardSource**
  - Washington, DC
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - Statewide afterschool network support

- **Children’s Services Council of Florida**
  - Tallahassee, FL
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Florida statewide afterschool network

- **Civic Canopy**
  - Denver, CO
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Colorado statewide afterschool network

- **Collaborative Communications Group**
  - Washington, DC
  - $300,000 – 12 mos.
  - Afterschool communications project
  - $300,000 – 24 mos.
  - Supporting national network of statewide afterschool networks

- **Foundation-Administered Project**
  - $15,000 – 12 mos.
  - After-School All-Stars

- **FowlerHoffman**
  - Richmond, CA
  - $200,000 – 12 mos.
  - Policy and messaging strategies for afterschool networks

- **Grantmakers for Education**
  - Portland, OR
  - $66,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Greater Gallatin United Way**
  - Bozeman, MT
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Montana statewide afterschool network

- **Institute for Educational Leadership**
  - Washington, DC
  - $200,000 – 24 mos.
  - Coalition for community schools
  - $15,000 – 12 mos.
  - Leadership across boundaries fund

- **Jannus Inc.**
  - Boise, ID
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Idaho statewide afterschool network

- **LA’s BEST**
  - Los Angeles, CA
  - $25,000 – 24 mos.
  - General purposes

- **Marshfield Clinic Research Foundation**
  - Marshfield, WI
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Wisconsin statewide afterschool network

- **National Conference of State Legislatures**
  - Denver, CO
  - $487,500 – 24 mos.
  - Informing state legislatures: statewide afterschool policy

- **National Governors Association Center for Best Practices**
  - Washington, DC
  - $300,000 – 24 mos.
  - Gubernatorial leadership to transform the learning day and year

- **National League of Cities Institute**
  - Baltimore, MD
  - $300,000 – 24 mos.
  - Building support for summer learning

- **National Summer Learning Association**
  - Washington, DC
  - $450,000 – 24 mos.
  - City leaders engaged in afterschool reform and a New Day for Learning

- **Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children**
  - Gladstone, OR
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Oregon statewide afterschool network

- **Public Profit**
  - Oakland, CA
  - $160,000 – 24 mos.
  - Statewide afterschool networks evaluation

- **Public School Forum of North Carolina**
  - Raleigh, NC
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - North Carolina statewide afterschool network

- **Public School Forum of North Carolina**
  - Columbia, SC
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - South Carolina statewide afterschool network

- **Southeastern Regional Education Service Center Inc.**
  - Bedford, NH
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - New Hampshire statewide afterschool network

- **United Way of Rhode Island**
  - Providence, RI
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Rhode Island statewide afterschool network

- **United Ways of Tennessee**
  - Franklin, TN
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Tennessee statewide afterschool network

- **United Ways of Texas**
  - Austin, TX
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Texas statewide afterschool network

- **University of California – Davis**
  - Davis, CA
  - $225,000 – 9 mos.
  - California statewide afterschool network

- **University of Delaware**
  - Newark, DE
  - $15,000 – 12 mos.
  - Delaware statewide afterschool partnership

- **University of Hawaii**
  - Honolulu, HI
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Hawaii statewide afterschool network

- **University of Kansas Center for Research Inc.**
  - Lawrence, KS
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Kansas statewide afterschool network

- **University of Missouri – Columbia**
  - Columbia, MO
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Missouri statewide afterschool network

- **University of Southern Maine**
  - Portland, ME
  - $225,000 – 36 mos.
  - Maine statewide afterschool network

- **Voices for Illinois Children**
  - Chicago, IL
  - $112,500 – 18 mos.
  - Illinois statewide afterschool network

**Subtotal:** $8,050,996

**Policy and Partnerships**

### Quality and Innovation

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

- **American Institutes for Research**
  - Washington, DC
  - $250,000 – 24 mos.
  - Identifying promising practices
ASIA SOCIETY
New York, NY
$300,000 – 24 mos.
International approaches and 21st-century competencies

FOUNDATIONS INC.
Mt. Laurel, NJ
$100,000 – 12 mos.
21st Century Community Learning Centers Institute

FOWLER-HOFFMAN
Richmond, CA
$15,000 – 4 mos.
Exploring intersection of afterschool and community schools movements

MOZILLA FOUNDATION
Mountain View, CA
$350,000 – 18 mos.
Digital badges initiative

Subtotal: $1,315,000
Quality and Innovation
Program Area Total: $9,365,996

SUCCESS BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

Assets
Community Economic Development Association of Michigan
Lansing, MI
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Michigan communities for financial empowerment network

University of Kansas Center for Research Inc.
Lawrence, KS
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Assets and education initiative

Subtotal: $400,000
Assets

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

National Youth Employment Coalition
Washington, DC
$300,000 – 24 mos.
Building capacity and informing policy to better serve disconnected youth

New America Foundation
Washington, DC
$110,000 – 9 mos.
Building a case for postsecondary access and success

Subtotal: $610,000
Access

Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
Washington, DC
$80,000 – 24 mos.
Youth Transition Funders Group

Editorial Projects in Education
Bethesda, MD
$200,000 – 24 mos.
Diplomas Count: the graduation project

Genesee/Shiawassee Michigan Works!
Flint, MI
$30,000 – 12 mos.
Jobs for America’s graduates

Lansing Community College
Lansing, MI
$150,000 – 21 mos.
High school diploma-completion initiative

Mott Community College
Flint, MI
$49,050 – 12 mos.
Increasing literacy levels for at-risk youth in college-connected programs

Resource Genesee
Flint, MI
$75,000 – 12 mos.
Genesee County out-of-school youth initiative

Rutgers University Foundation
New Brunswick, NJ
$200,000 – 30 mos.
Developing and sustaining college-access programming

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

University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$415,700 – 12 mos.
Committed to excellence and opportunity program

Youth Connection Charter School
Chicago, IL
$275,000 – 24 mos.
Career pathways program

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

Subtotal: $1,899,750
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Program Area Total: $2,909,750
Success Beyond High School

EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Income Security

Arise Citizens’ Policy Project
Montgomery, AL
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

California Budget Project
Sacramento, CA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative – D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute

Colorado Fiscal Institute
Denver, CO
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Fiscal Policy Institute
Latham, NY
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Foundation-Administered Project

Joint Tax Policy Center

Subtotal: $1,259,926

Rutgers University Foundation
New Brunswick, NJ
$200,000 – 30 mos.
Developing and sustaining college-access programming

School & Main Institute
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Subtotal: $1,899,750
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Program Area Total: $2,909,750
Success Beyond High School
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Assets
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Michigan’s Children
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Washington, DC
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New America Foundation
Washington, DC
$110,000 – 9 mos.
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Subtotal: $610,000
Access

Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
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$80,000 – 24 mos.
Youth Transition Funders Group
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Diplomas Count: the graduation project
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Increasing literacy levels for at-risk youth in college-connected programs

Resource Genesee
Flint, MI
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Genesee County out-of-school youth initiative

Rutgers University Foundation
New Brunswick, NJ
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School & Main Institute
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University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$415,700 – 12 mos.
Committed to excellence and opportunity program

Youth Connection Charter School
Chicago, IL
$275,000 – 24 mos.
Career pathways program

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

Subtotal: $1,899,750
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Program Area Total: $2,909,750
Success Beyond High School

EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Income Security

Arise Citizens’ Policy Project
Montgomery, AL
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

California Budget Project
Sacramento, CA
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Washington, DC
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative – D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute

Colorado Fiscal Institute
Denver, CO
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Fiscal Policy Institute
Latham, NY
$100,000 – 24 mos.
State fiscal analysis initiative

Foundation-Administered Project

Joint Tax Policy Center

Subtotal: $1,259,926

Rutgers University Foundation
New Brunswick, NJ
$200,000 – 30 mos.
Developing and sustaining college-access programming

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

University of Michigan-Flint
Flint, MI
$415,700 – 12 mos.
Committed to excellence and opportunity program

Youth Connection Charter School
Chicago, IL
$275,000 – 24 mos.
Career pathways program

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

Subtotal: $1,899,750
Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth

Program Area Total: $2,909,750
Success Beyond High School
Reducing Barriers to Employment

Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan Inc.
Flint, MI
$125,000 – 12 mos.
Mid-Michigan GoodTemp alternative staffing organization

Heartland Alliance for Human Needs & Human Rights
Chicago, IL
$90,000 – 12 mos.
National transitional jobs network

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

Subtotal: $415,000
Reducing Barriers to Employment

Retention and Wage Progression

Aspen Institute
Washington, DC
$125,000 – 12 mos.
Low wage work: what can we do to improve job quality

$250,000 – 12 mos.
Sector Skills Academy

Corporation for a Skilled Workforce
Ann Arbor, MI
$200,000 – 12 mos.
Building capacity of Michigan’s workforce system

Economic Mobility Corporation
New York, NY
$75,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

$300,000 – 31 mos.
Project QUEST evaluation

Subtotal: $1,450,000
Retention and Wage Progression

Program Area Total: $3,124,926

SPECIAL INITIATIVES

Microenterprise

Aspen Institute
Washington, DC
$250,000 – 18 mos.
Demonstrating scale in domestic microenterprise

$200,000 – 12 mos.
MicroTest

Association for Enterprise Opportunity
Washington, DC
$200,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Center for Rural Affairs
Lyons, NE
$50,000 – 12 mos.
Rural microenterprise development

Subtotal: $700,000
Microenterprise

Special Opportunities

Church of the Messiah
Detroit, MI
$25,000 – 6 mos.
Mt. Elliott Makerspace

City Year Inc.
Boston, MA
$80,000 – 10 mos.
National service programs on federal policy convening

Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan
Detroit, MI
$400,000 – 126 mos.
New economy initiative for southeast Michigan

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

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

National Youth Leadership Council
St. Paul, MN
$150,000 – 12 mos.
Youth-serving organizations on service learning and K-12 education convening

Prima Civitas Foundation
East Lansing, MI
$500,000 – 12 mos.
General purposes

Subtotal: $2,105,000
Special Opportunities

Program Area Total: $2,805,000
Special Initiatives

Program Total: $18,205,672
Education
2014 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Exploratory and Special Projects

Purpose: To support unusual or unique opportunities addressing significant national and international problems. Proposals are by invitation only. Unsolicited proposals are discouraged.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation
New York, NY
$20,000 – 12 mos.
Clinton Global Initiative

Faith & Politics Institute
Washington, DC
$50,000 – 24 mos.
General purposes

Foundation for Detroit’s Future
Detroit, MI
$10,000,000 – 240 mos.
Detroit Institute of Arts’ settlement

Institute for Behavior and Health Inc.
Rockville, MD
$125,000 – 24 mos.
Youth substance abuse-reduction program

Subtotal: $10,195,000
Special Projects

Program Total: $10,195,000
Exploratory and Special Projects

Employee and Trustee Grants

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

Employee/Trustee Matching Grants

Program Area Total: $1,431,093
Employee/Trustee Matching

Trustee-Initiated Grants

Program Area Total: $1,020,000
Trustee-Initiated

Program Total: $2,451,093
Employee/Trustee Matching and Trustee-Initiated

TOTAL: All Mott Grantmaking in 2014 $101,365,342
Cyclists pedal the Flint River bike path near Stepping Stone Falls, part of the Genesee County Parks system.
FINANCE
In 2014, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation ended the year with nearly $2.8 billion in assets, an increase from more than $2.6 billion in assets at the close of 2013.

### Total Assets at Market Value & 2014 Dollars (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Assets – Fair Value</th>
<th>Total Assets – 2014 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$2,477.3</td>
<td>$2,955.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$2,626.1</td>
<td>$3,055.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,711.5</td>
<td>$3,031.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,929.9</td>
<td>$2,155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2,079.9</td>
<td>$2,261.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2,227.4</td>
<td>$2,386.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,159.9</td>
<td>$2,247.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2,301.1</td>
<td>$2,353.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,584.0</td>
<td>$2,603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2,794.6</td>
<td>$2,794.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12-Month Rolling Average Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Assets – 2014 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$2,955.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$3,055.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$3,031.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$2,155.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2,261.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2,386.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,247.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2,353.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2,794.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Investment Income (Loss) (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Grants Awarded (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>101.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditures (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Financial Ratio

- **Total Growth Assets**: $1,550.7 / 55.5%
- **Total Inflation Protection Assets**: $512.1 / 18.3%
- **Total Risk Reduction Assets**: $711.7 / 25.5%

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

*Total expenditures include grant payments, foundation-administered projects, administrative expenses, excise and income taxes, and investment expenses.*
Profile: 2014 Grantmaking

Grantmaking Activities 2014

- **Civil Society**: 149 grants, 37.3%
- **Environment**: 74 grants, 18.5%
- **Exploratory & Special Projects**: 4 grants, 1.0%
- **Education**: 93 grants, 23.2%
- **Flint Area**: 80 grants, 20.0%

**Total Grants**: 400

Does not include Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants

2005–2014 Grants Awarded by Program (in millions)

- **Civil Society**: $20.1 / 19.8%
- **Environment**: $9.5 / 9.4%
- **Flint Area**: $40.9 / 40.4%
- **Education**: $18.2 / 17.9%
- **Exploratory & Special Projects**: $10.2 / 10.1%
- **Employee/Trustee Matching & Trustee-Initiated Grants**: $2.5 / 2.4%

**Total**: $101,365,342

Employee/Trustee Matching
Exploratory
Education
Flint Area
Environment
Civil Society
Grant Thornton

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (the Foundation), which comprise the statements of financial position as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements.

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

Auditor's responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the Foundation's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Foundation’s internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

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

Opinion
In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Charles Stewart Mott Foundation as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, and the results of its activities and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Southfield, Michigan
July 1, 2015
## STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION

### Years Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investments, at fair value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$118,070,163</td>
<td>$30,677,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>573,887,679</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>123,709,493</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,422,467,866</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>535,023,077</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>1,358,858</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,774,517,136</td>
<td>2,563,419,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>8,197,218</td>
<td>4,261,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>657,768</td>
<td>679,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and improvements, net</td>
<td>3,671,758</td>
<td>3,520,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>7,525,933</td>
<td>12,110,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,794,569,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,583,992,015</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades payable</td>
<td>$645,826</td>
<td>$4,781,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>27,576,190</td>
<td>9,262,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and other liabilities</td>
<td>31,213,762</td>
<td>25,068,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax</td>
<td>14,210,361</td>
<td>12,095,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,646,139</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,207,645</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>2,720,923,674</td>
<td>2,532,784,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Unrestricted Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,794,569,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,583,992,015</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Years Ended December 31,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>$30,632,398</td>
<td>$21,571,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnership income (loss)</td>
<td>144,388,039</td>
<td>67,279,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>35,425,262</td>
<td>62,130,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>103,192,673</td>
<td>250,187,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (expense)</td>
<td>(993,069)</td>
<td>1,247,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income:</strong></td>
<td>312,645,303</td>
<td>402,417,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct investment expenses</td>
<td>5,561,757</td>
<td>5,462,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for excise tax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2,824,152</td>
<td>1,502,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred expense (income)</td>
<td>2,115,078</td>
<td>5,152,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated business income tax</td>
<td>55,633</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>10,556,620</td>
<td>12,117,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Investment Income:</strong></td>
<td>302,088,683</td>
<td>390,299,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, net of refunds</td>
<td>89,075,828</td>
<td>97,671,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-administered projects</td>
<td>1,687,277</td>
<td>1,548,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses</td>
<td>14,520,342</td>
<td>15,650,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants and Operating Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>105,283,447</td>
<td>114,871,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income (loss):</strong></td>
<td>196,805,236</td>
<td>275,428,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Changes in Unrestricted Net Assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension-related changes other than net periodic benefit cost</td>
<td>(5,143,449)</td>
<td>10,267,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postretirement health-care related changes other than net periodic benefit cost</td>
<td>(3,522,483)</td>
<td>2,175,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>188,139,304</td>
<td>287,871,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Net Assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year</td>
<td>2,532,784,370</td>
<td>2,244,912,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year</td>
<td>$2,720,923,674</td>
<td>$2,532,784,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Years Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash flows from operating activities:</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$188,139,304</td>
<td>$287,871,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Net realized (gain) loss on investments: (35,425,262) (62,130,811)
- (Income) loss on limited partnerships: (144,388,039) (67,279,527)
- Net unrealized (gain) loss on investments: (103,192,673) (250,187,887)
- Excess value of donated securities included with grants: 3,325,148 –
- Depreciation expense: 289,260 283,503
- (Increase) decrease in accrued interest and dividends: 22,170 1,017,893
- (Increase) decrease in other assets: 4,584,885 (10,100,365)
- Increase (decrease) in grants payable: 18,313,470 (11,994,636)
- Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and other liabilities: 6,145,274 (2,850,270)
- Increase (decrease) in deferred excise tax liability: 2,115,078 5,152,504

**Total adjustments:** (248,210,689) (398,089,596)

**Net cash used by operating activities:** (60,071,385) (110,217,756)

### Cash flows from investing activities:

- Proceeds from sales or redemptions of investments: 465,819,721 559,640,735
- Purchases of investments: (401,371,850) (449,010,863)
- Acquisition of building improvements: (440,291) (212,643)

**Net cash provided by investing activities:** 64,007,580 110,417,229

### Net increase (decrease) in cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash, beginning of year</td>
<td>$4,261,023</td>
<td>$4,061,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, end of year</td>
<td>$8,197,218</td>
<td>$4,261,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental disclosure of noncash investing activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment trades receivable (payable) at year end, net</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$713,032</td>
<td>$1,930,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

The Foundation has received a favorable determination letter from the Internal Revenue Service stating that it is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in Sections 501(c) (3). However, unrelated business income is subject to taxation. The Foundation’s liability for unrelated business income taxes was $52,193 for 2013 and is expected to be immaterial for 2014.

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

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

OTHER ASSETS
Included in other assets are prepaid pension expense and land and buildings that were purchased by the Foundation for charitable purposes and are recorded at cost.
LAND, BUILDING AND IMPROVEMENTS

Land, building and improvements are recorded at cost. Upon sale or retirement of land, building and improvements, the cost and related accumulated depreciation are eliminated, and the resulting gain or loss is included in current income. Depreciation of building and improvements is provided over the estimated useful lives of the respective assets on a straight-line basis, ranging from six to 50 years. Depreciation expense for the year December 31, 2014 and 2013, was $289,260 and $283,503, respectively.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
<td>$397,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and improvements</td>
<td>9,680,978</td>
<td>9,357,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(6,407,072)</td>
<td>(6,234,283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,671,758</td>
<td>$3,520,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATES

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

INVESTMENTS

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

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

The Foundation’s 18.0 percent investment in United States Sugar Corporation (USSC), a non publicly traded security with no readily determinable fair value, is priced based on an independent valuation of the USSC stock on a nonmarketable minority interest basis.

The Foundation is party to certain limited partnership agreements, whereby the Foundation is committed to invest future funds into these partnerships. As of December 31, 2014, the Foundation has $327.4 million in outstanding limited partnership commitments, including both domestic and international partnerships.

Temporary investments in partnerships that are publicly traded and where the Foundation has no committed capital are included with equity securities and not limited partnerships for financial statement presentation.

FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES

The costs of operating the Foundation have been allocated among program-related, communications and operations (all of which are included with administration expenses on the Statement of Activities). Program-related expenses pertain principally to the direct programmatic grant-making functions of the Foundation, such as reviewing proposals and awarding, monitoring and evaluating grants, whereas Communications expenses include activities directly related to the Foundation’s external communications efforts. Administrative expenses include all other nonprogram and noncommunications related operating expenses of the Foundation.
INVESTMENT TRADES RECEIVABLE AND PAYABLE

Investment trades receivable represent investments that have been sold with a trade date in the current year but for which the funds have not been received until the subsequent year. The pending cash equivalent to be received from such trades is classified as an investment for balance sheet purposes. Investment trades payable represent investments that have been purchased with a trade date in the current year but for which the funds have not been sent until the subsequent year. This commitment to settle the trade is classified as a liability for balance sheet purposes.

RECLASSIFICATIONS

Certain amounts in the 2013 statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2014 presentation.

NEW ACCOUNTING UPDATES

On May 1, 2015, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) No. 2015-07, which amends guidance related to fair value measurement and the disclosures for investments in certain entities that calculate net asset value (NAV) per share (or its equivalent). The updated guidance applies to entities that elect to measure the fair value of certain investments using the NAV per share (or its equivalent) of the investment as a practical expedient. Currently, investments valued using the practical expedient are categorized within the fair value hierarchy on the basis of when the investment is redeemable with the investee at NAV. The amendments remove the requirement to categorize within the fair value hierarchy all investments for which fair value is measured using the NAV per share practical expedient. The amendments also remove the requirement to make certain disclosures for all investments that are eligible to be measured at fair value using the NAV per share practical expedient. Rather, those disclosures are limited to investments for which the entity has elected to measure the fair value using that practical expedient. ASU No. 2015-07 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and shall apply retrospectively to all periods presented. Earlier application is permitted. The Foundation is currently evaluating the impact the updated guidance will have on the Foundation’s financial statement disclosures.

C. Investment Securities

The following is a summary of fair values and cost basis of the investment securities held at December 31, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Cost Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 118,070,163</td>
<td>$ 118,080,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>573,887,679</td>
<td>485,811,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>123,709,493</td>
<td>118,893,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,422,467,866</td>
<td>956,875,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>535,023,077</td>
<td>369,960,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>1,358,858</td>
<td>1,358,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,774,517,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,050,980,593</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a summary of fair values and cost basis of the investment securities held at December 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Cost Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
<td>$ 30,676,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
<td>465,857,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
<td>117,574,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – limited partnerships</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>966,397,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives – nonpartnerships</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
<td>355,857,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,563,419,509</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,943,075,639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments valued at Net Asset Value (NAV) as of December 31, 2014, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$ 447,537,218</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,422,467,866</td>
<td>327,400,000</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments at NAV</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,870,005,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 327,400,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments valued at Net Asset Value (NAV) as of December 31, 2013, consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Unfunded Commitments</th>
<th>Redemption Frequency</th>
<th>Redemption Notice Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities (a)</td>
<td>$ 416,774,438</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships (b)</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>348,700,000</td>
<td>Quarterly to Annual if applicable</td>
<td>5 days to 4 months if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments at NAV</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,737,526,362</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 348,700,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

The Foundation has significant amounts of investment instruments. Investment securities, in general, are exposed to various risks, such as interest rate, credit and overall market volatility. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities, it is reasonably possible that changes in the values of investment securities will occur in the near term and that such changes could materially affect the amounts reported in the financial statements.

D. Fair Value Measurements

Fair Value is defined as the exchange price that would be received for an asset or paid to transfer a liability (an exit price) in the principal or most advantageous market for the asset or liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. In accordance with the authoritative guidance on fair value measurements and disclosures under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), the Foundation adopted a framework for measuring fair value under GAAP that establishes a fair value hierarchy which requires an entity to maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs when measuring fair value. The standard describes three levels of inputs that may be used to measure fair value:

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

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

**Level 3** — Unobservable inputs that are supported by little or no market activity and that are significant to the fair value of the assets or liabilities. Level 3 assets and liabilities include financial instruments for which fair value is determined using pricing models, discounted cash flow methodologies or similar techniques, as well as instruments for which the determination of fair value requires significant management judgment or estimation. This category generally includes certain private debt and equity instruments and alternative investments. Also included in Level 3 are investments measured using NAV per share, or its equivalent, that can seldom be redeemed at the NAV or for which redemption at NAV is uncertain due to lock-up periods or other investment restrictions.

Generally, assets held at the Foundation’s custodian, Comerica Bank, include cash equivalents, U.S. government obligations, corporate bonds and equity securities which are publicly traded in active markets and are considered Level 1 assets. Equity securities purchased and held directly by the Foundation include private equities, hedge funds, real estate funds and energy funds.

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

The valuation of nonpublic or alternative investments requires significant judgment by the General Partner or Fund Manager due to the absence of quoted market values, inherent lack of liquidity and the long-term nature of such assets. Private equity investments are valued initially based upon transaction price excluding expenses. Year-end valuations are as provided by the General Partner or Fund Manager, which are tied to capital statements and/or audited financial statements when available and are carried at NAV or its equivalent. These valuations include estimates, appraisals, assumptions and methods that are reviewed by the Foundations’ independent investment advisors and management.
The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 118,070,163</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 118,070,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>573,887,679</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>573,887,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>123,709,493</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>123,709,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>1,422,467,866</td>
<td>1,422,467,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>535,023,077</td>
<td>535,023,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>1,358,858</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>1,358,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 817,026,193</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 1,957,490,943</td>
<td>$ 2,774,517,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2013</strong></td>
<td>1,823,181,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>208,329,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(345,071,355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains/Partnership income</td>
<td>141,323,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>129,728,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2014</strong></td>
<td>1,957,490,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the investments carried on the statement of financial position by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 30,677,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public equities</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>575,097,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income securities</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>127,751,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
<td>1,320,751,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartnerships</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
<td>502,429,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment trades receivable</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>6,711,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 740,238,448</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 1,823,181,061</td>
<td>$ 2,563,419,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of Level 3 activity for the year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance, December 31, 2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>$1,561,876,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(194,416,789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains/Partnership income</td>
<td>(234,874,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>77,413,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, December 31, 2013</strong></td>
<td>$1,823,181,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfers in and out of level 3 assets are as denoted by “Purchases” and “Sales” in the summary of Level 3 activity schedules above, whereas the funds used to make purchases of Level 3 assets are generally made from liquid (Level 1) funds and, likewise, sales or maturities of Level 3 assets are generally received as cash (Level 1) and deposited into liquid fund assets. Purchases of Level 3 assets are made in accordance with the Foundation’s investment policy to maintain targeted levels of such assets, which are balanced against the liquidity needs of the Foundation for purposes of making grants and covering operating expenses and to achieve an overall growth in investments sufficient to meet various required distribution calculations. Sales and maturities represent a combination of pre-designated capital distributions from partnerships whose specific timing is generally determined by the partnership but that, overall, is an expected and integral part of the partnership agreement. Other sales of Level 3 assets, whereby such is not pre-designated, are based on the Foundation’s liquidity needs, maintaining targeted levels of various assets as proscribed by the investment policy, and, in certain instances, where the Foundation and its investment committee decides to take funds out of a given investee due to poor performance or otherwise better opportunities deemed available with other investees.

E. Excise Tax and Distribution Requirements

The Foundation is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), but is subject to a 2 percent (1 percent if certain criteria are met) federal excise tax on net investment income, including realized gains, as defined in the IRC. The current excise tax is provided at 2 percent for 2014 and 1 percent for 2013. The deferred excise tax provision is calculated assuming a 2 percent rate and is based on the projected gains/losses that assume complete liquidation of all assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excise tax payable (receivable)</td>
<td>$446,834</td>
<td>$142,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred excise tax liability</td>
<td>14,210,361</td>
<td>12,095,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$14,657,195</td>
<td>$12,237,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excise tax payments of $2,520,000 and $1,960,000 were paid in 2014 and 2013, respectively.

IRC Section 4942 requires that a private foundation make annual minimum distributions based on the value of its noncharitable use assets or pay an excise tax for the failure to meet the minimum distribution requirements. For the year ended December 31, 2014, the Foundation made qualifying distributions less than the required minimum distribution of approximately $41.2 million. The Foundation has $86.5 million in prior year excess distributions, resulting in a net accumulated over-distribution of $45.3 million to be carried forward to 2015.
F. Grants Payable

Grants payable at December 31, 2014, are expected to be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>$8,956,747</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$11,003,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4,052,957</td>
<td>427,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,479,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Area</td>
<td>3,820,940</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,379,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Opportunity</td>
<td>5,315,806</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8,015,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>22,176,450</td>
<td>5,708,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>27,934,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Unamortized discount</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>353,686</td>
<td>4,574</td>
<td>358,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22,176,450</td>
<td>$5,354,314</td>
<td>$45,426</td>
<td>$27,576,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Foundation has also approved grants that require certain conditions to be met by the grantee. Conditional grants excluded from the Foundation’s financial statements totaled $11,084,165 and $1,173,000 as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.

Grant activity for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undiscounted grants payable, January 1</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,379,528</td>
<td>$21,510,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants approved</td>
<td>91,454,177</td>
<td>102,311,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,833,705</td>
<td>123,821,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less grants paid by program:

| Civil Society | 13,940,793 | 24,954,406 |
| Environment   | 6,301,075  | 11,513,419 |
| Flint Area    | 37,003,117 | 41,598,500 |
| Pathways to Opportunity | 12,503,177 | 33,464,290 |
| Other*        | 3,151,093  | 2,911,674  |
|              | 72,899,255 | 114,442,289 |

Undiscounted grants payable, December 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$27,934,450</td>
<td>$9,379,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Basic information is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in ($000)</th>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th></th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit obligation at December 31</td>
<td>$ (58,050)</td>
<td>$ (51,727)</td>
<td>$ (19,670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value of plan assets at December 31</td>
<td>57,327</td>
<td>55,445</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded status at December 31</td>
<td>$ (723)</td>
<td>$ 3,718</td>
<td>$ (19,670)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts recognized in the statements of financial position:

| Prepaid benefit included with other assets | $ 6,126 | $ 9,716 | – | – |
| Accrued benefit liability included with accounts payable and other liabilities | (6,849) | (5,998) | (19,670) | (15,144) |
| Net amount recognized | $ (723) | $ 3,718 | $ (19,670) | $ (15,144) |

Employer contributions | $ 625 | $ 2,748 | $ 402 | $ 367 |
Benefit payments | $ (1,795) | $ (1,879) | $ (402) | $ (367) |

Components of net periodic benefit cost:

| Service cost | $ 1,378 | $ 1,538 | $ 583 | $ 600 |
| Interest cost | 2,364 | 2,051 | 758 | 664 |
| Expected return on assets | (4,193) | (3,502) | – | – |
| Amortization of net loss | 319 | 1,502 | 36 | 235 |
| Amortization of prior service cost | 55 | 55 | 29 | 128 |
| Net periodic benefit cost | $ (77) | $ 1,644 | $ 1,406 | $ 1,627 |

**BENEFIT OBLIGATIONS**

The accumulated benefit obligation of the nonqualified pension plan was $6,004,764 and $5,997,639 as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation of the qualified plan was $46,144,303 and $41,570,058 as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.
The assumptions used in the measurement of the Foundation’s benefit obligations and net periodic benefit costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pension Benefits</th>
<th>Postretirement Health-Care Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected return on plan assets</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (benefit obligation)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation increase (net periodic cost)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For measurement purposes, an initial annual rate of 7 percent for Pre-65 and 6 percent for Post-65 in the per capita cost of health care was used. These rates were assumed to decrease gradually each year to an ultimate rate of 4.5 percent by year 2022.

**ASSET HOLDINGS**

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

A summary of asset holdings in the pension plan at year end is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic stock</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International stock</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-alternative</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the pension assets by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 34,430,239</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14,564,714</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,950,114</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,781,487</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-alternative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,600,198</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 57,326,752</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table presents the pension assets by level within the valuation hierarchy as of December 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity securities</td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$ 33,327,869</td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt securities</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16,585,293</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,758,411</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real asset</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,773,725</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td><strong>$ 55,445,298</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

The Foundation expects to contribute $1,183,440 to its pension plans and $620,000 to its postretirement medical plan in 2015. For the unfunded plans, contributions are deemed equal to expected benefit payments.

EXPECTED BENEFIT PAYMENTS

The Foundation expects to pay the following amounts for pension benefits, which reflect future service as appropriate, and expected postretirement benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pension Plans</th>
<th>Postretirement Health Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 3,093,440</td>
<td>$ 620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,063,440</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,113,440</td>
<td>690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,103,440</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,183,440</td>
<td>730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>16,607,200</td>
<td>4,390,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEFINED CONTRIBUTION 401(K) PLAN

In addition to the above, the Foundation maintains a 401(k) defined contribution retirement plan for all eligible employees. The Foundation matches employee contributions up to $3,000 per year. For the years ending December 31, 2014 and 2013, the Foundation contributed $211,736 and $207,723, respectively.
H. Subsequent Events

The Foundation evaluated its December 31, 2014, financial statements for subsequent events through July 1, 2015, the date the financial statements were available to be issued. The Foundation is not aware of any subsequent events that would require recognition or disclosure in the financial statements.

Administration and Investment Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Investment Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$8,020,567</td>
<td>$7,733,299</td>
<td>$1,925,869</td>
<td>$2,164,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personnel costs</td>
<td>3,037,085</td>
<td>4,547,527</td>
<td>533,190</td>
<td>794,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,711,979</td>
<td>1,401,486</td>
<td>337,947</td>
<td>313,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>809,261</td>
<td>930,814</td>
<td>2,673,530</td>
<td>2,103,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and business expenses</td>
<td>769,878</td>
<td>893,818</td>
<td>91,221</td>
<td>86,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and contract services</td>
<td>171,572</td>
<td>143,590</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,520,342</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,650,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,561,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,462,522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students at Brownell-Holmes STEM Academy in Flint, Michigan, celebrate their graduation from pre-kindergarten.
TRUSTEES & STAFF
Ridgway H. White was appointed the fourth president of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation by its Board of Trustees, effective January 1, 2015. In that position, he succeeds his father, William S. (Bill) White, who remains Mott’s chairman and CEO.

“It’s the right time and the right approach for the evolution of the organization,” said Bill White, who had been president of the Foundation since 1976, and who has been CEO since 1979 and chairman of the Board of Trustees since 1988. “The Foundation is in excellent shape. Our people, our programs and our assets are all strong, and we’re poised to continue our work to promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.”

Ridgway White joined the Foundation in 2004 as a program assistant on the Flint Area grantmaking team. He was promoted to associate program officer in 2006 and program officer in 2009. In the latter capacity, he also served as a loaned executive to the Uptown Reinvestment Corporation, a nonprofit focused on revitalizing downtown Flint. In 2011, he was named vice president for special projects at Mott and chair of the Foundation’s management working group.

Ridgway brings to his new role an entrepreneurial spirit gleaned from 10 years of experience in guiding revitalization efforts in Flint. He has been a driving force behind public-private partnerships that have resulted in the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized buildings and properties, creating an environment that has helped to attract new business to Flint. He also played a key role in bringing the city’s new Health and Wellness district to fruition.
In his first year as president, Ridgway was instrumental in helping the city of Flint return to the Detroit system for its drinking water after it was determined that water from the Flint River was leaching lead from pipes and solder. This was a critical first step to bringing safe drinking water back to the city’s homes and businesses.

On the state and regional levels, he has focused on helping the Foundation and our grantees advance clean-energy solutions in Michigan and protect the Great Lakes. Nationally, he is working to help increase access to high-quality afterschool programs for all children, and he recently led efforts to support a new U.S. Department of Education initiative to reduce chronic absenteeism and keep kids in school. He also is committed to the Foundation’s goals of advancing community education and local philanthropy, both locally and globally.

“I’m honored to have the opportunity to continue the Foundation’s legacy of service to the people and communities we support,” Ridgway said when his appointment as president was announced in December 2014. “And the strength of our team at Mott gives me great confidence in our ability to make a difference — in our home community of Flint, throughout our nation and around the world.”

“It’s more than just a logical progression,” said Bill Piper, who has served on the Foundation’s Board of Trustees since 1985. “It’s also the perfect fit. Ridgway brings the kind of passion and dedication to Flint that his great-grandfather Charles Stewart Mott demonstrated. And that will always be an important part of the Foundation’s work.”

**Foundation marks other promotions, transitions and fond farewells**

In April 2015, Mary A. Gailbreath was promoted to vice president – Administration and secretary/treasurer of the Foundation. She succeeded Phillip H. (Phil) Peters, who retired after 15 years with the Foundation. Mary joined the Mott staff in 2002 as grants manager and became director of Grants Administration and assistant treasurer in 2010. We’re glad to have such strong leadership and solid continuity in our administrative and financial areas.

To that end, Fred Kump has been named interim director of Grants Administration and assistant secretary/assistant treasurer. He joined the Foundation in 2000 as a program/grants administration specialist, was promoted to program officer in 2006 and assumed additional duties as a grants financial analyst in 2010.

Benita Melton has been promoted to director of the Foundation’s newly named Education program. She joined Mott in 1995 as an associate program officer and became a program officer in 2000, working primarily on the Foundation’s national anti-poverty grantmaking plan. She played a key role in helping to refocus that plan on education-related strategies and, as program director, will oversee its implementation.

Benita succeeds Kyle Caldwell, who left Mott in July 2015 to take over as executive director of the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan. We’re glad Kyle will train future leaders in philanthropy and wish him the best in his new post.

In addition to Phil Peters, three other staff members retired from the Foundation in 2015. Teri Chambry, who began working for the Mott Foundation’s Communications Department in 1977, left the Foundation in April after 38 years of service as an administrative secretary. Cris A.W. Doby, who joined the Foundation in 2000 and led our grantmaking in the area of community organizing, retired from the Foundation in August. And Maggie Jaruzel-Potter, a communications officer working primarily with our Civil Society grantmaking team, retired in June after 15 years of service. We wish them all the best.
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Vice President – Administration and Secretary/Treasurer

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
Gregory S. Hopton
Accounting Manager
Rebecca Burns
Administrative Accountant
Collette Pries
Accountant
Debra L. Cormier
Payroll Administrator
Annette M. Chamberlain
Administrative Secretary
Kim R. McDonald
Jill A. Powell
Word Processors
Teresa A. Littlejohn
Receptionist
Debra E. Bullen
Building Manager
Lynne Mortellaro
Building Administrative/Accounting Assistant
Billy M. Powell
Building Operations Supervisor
Gilbert Medrano
Patrick J. Turowicz
Building Operations Assistants

GRANTS ADMINISTRATION
Frederick L. Kump
Interim Director of Grants
Administration and Assistant Secretary/Assistant Treasurer
Michael S. Birchmeier
Grants Manager
Cindy S. Compeau
S. Renee Jackson
Grants Accountants
Kaitlyn C. Adler
Data and Research Assistant
Mary Beth Smith
Administrative Secretary/Program Review Committee
Jean M. Bamberg
Administrative Assistant/Central Files
Deborah K. Reid
Secretary

HUMAN RESOURCES
Julie M. Flynn
Human Resources Manager
Ona Kay Goza
Administrative Secretary

INFORMATION SERVICES
Gavin T. Clabaugh
Vice President – Information Services
Michael L. Wright
Information Services Manager
Linda L. Davidson
Senior IT Support Analyst
Glen A. Birdsall
Librarian
Ellen Chien
IT Support Analyst
Joumana M. Klanseck
Database Administrator
Asia B. McHaney
Library Administrative Assistant
**Communications**
Kathryn A. Thomas  
Vice President – Communications  
Ann F. Richards  
Senior Communications Officer  
Jeff Alexander  
Duane M. Elling  
Jessica M. Martin  
Communications Officers  
Macie Schriner  
Communications Officer – Online Strategies  
Cristina G. Wright  
Web Administrator  
Craig Kelley Jr.  
Communications Assistant  
Jon’Tise S. Lewis  
Administrative Assistant

**Investments**
Jay C. Flaherty  
Vice President – Investments and Chief Investment Officer  
Kenneth C. Austin  
Cheryl Garneau  
Stephen W. Vessells  
Investment Managers  
Laura R. Bechard  
Investment Operations Manager  
Alicia T. Aguilar  
Assistant Investment Administrator  
Laura D. Franco  
Kelly Swoszowski  
Administrative Assistants

**Programs**
Neal R. Hegarty  
Vice President – Programs  
Ruth M. Woodruff  
Administrative Secretary

**CIVIL SOCIETY**
Shannon L. Lawder  
Program Director

**Central/Eastern Europe**
J. Walter Veirs  
Regional Director – CEE  
Vera Dakova  
Ross MacIver  
Program Officers  
Michele H. Neumann  
Secretary

**South Africa**
Vuyiswa Sidzumo  
Director – South Africa  
Mamotshidisi Mohapi  
Associate Program Officer  
Lydia Molapo  
Office Administrator

**United States and Global Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector**
Nicholas S. Deychakiwsky  
Program Officer  
Diane M. Gildner  
Secretary

**EDUCATION**
Benita Melton  
Program Director  
Gwynn Hughes  
Senior Program Officer  
Kari M. Pardoe  
Associate Program Officer  
Wynette L. Adamson  
Crystal L. Bright  
Delia Cappel  
Secretaries

**ENVIRONMENT**
Sam Passmore  
Program Director  
Traci Romine  
Sandra N. Smithey  
Jumana Z. Vasi  
Program Officers  
Sarah Murray  
Dondré D. Young  
Program Assistants  
Sandra J. Smith  
Judy Wallace  
Secretaries

**FLINT AREA**
Kimberly S. Roberson  
Program Director  
Alicia E.M. Kitsuse  
Joseph Martin  
Program Officers  
Jennifer M. Acree  
Christopher J. Stallworth  
Associate Program Officers  
Christine L. Anderson  
Secretary

**Loaned Staff**
Karen B. Aldridge-Eason  
Foundation Liaison  
Office of Gov. Rick Snyder, State of Michigan

**Contract Employees/Consultants**
Shaun Samuels  
Civil Society program (South Africa)  
Amy C. Shannon  
Environment program  
Svitlana Suprun  
Civil Society program (Moldova, Ukraine)

Staff list is current as of October 31, 2015.

For a current staff list, please visit our website at [www.mott.org](http://www.mott.org).
CREDITS

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Writers: Jeff Alexander, Duane Elling, Jessica Martin, Ann Richards
Editor: Kathryn Thomas
Project Support: Craig Kelley Jr., Jon'Tise Lewis, Macie Schriner, Cristina Wright

Photography
The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation’s 2014 Annual Report features photography by
Adam Stoltman. Unless otherwise noted, all photos are his.

Graphic Design & Production
Olmsted Associates Inc., Flint, Michigan

Production Assistance
Sheila Beachum Bilby

Printing
The Riegle Press, Davison, Michigan

The global benchmark for responsible forest management.
The FSC Logo identifies products which contain wood from
well managed forests certified by Bureau Veritas Certification
in accordance with the rules of the Forest Stewardship Council.
Cert. no. SW-COC-1530
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council, A.C.

ON THE BACK COVER: Antuoine Hunt helps pick up litter at Euclid Beach Park in Cleveland. Each year, the Alliance for the Great Lakes brings together thousands of volunteers like Hunt to clean up beaches in all eight Great Lakes states.