

**PRIVATE FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN CALIFORNIA**

**A REPORT PREPARED FOR
THE CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

SANDRA A. GLASS, PH.D.

MARCH 13, 1998

**ABOUT THE CCST CALIFORNIA REPORT ON THE ENVIRONMENT FOR
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

CCST's California Report on the Environment for Science and Technology (CREST) has analyzed the state's science and technology infrastructure to determine if California has the people, capital investment and necessary state governmental policies to maintain California's leadership in the face of increasing worldwide competition. Through eight individual research projects, CREST analyzes the state's ability to create and use new technology. By facilitating a dialog with policy makers, industry leaders, and academic communities, CCST hopes to enhance economic growth and quality of life for Californians.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The California Council on Science and Technology gratefully acknowledges support from the W. M. Keck Foundation of Los Angeles, CCST's Sustaining Members, and the State of California.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright 1999 by the California Council on Science and Technology. Library of Congress Cataloging Number in Publications Data Main Entry Under Title:

Private Foundation Support for Science and Technology in California

ISBN 1-930117-05-1

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means -- graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping or information storage and retrieval systems -- without the express written permission of the California Council on Science and Technology.

Note: The California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) has made every reasonable effort to assure the accuracy of the information in this publication. However, the contents of this publication are subject to changes, omissions, and errors, and CCST accepts no liability for inaccuracies that may occur.

The California Council on Science and Technology is a nonprofit organization established in 1988 at the request of the California State Government and sponsored by the major post secondary institutions of California, in conjunction with leading private-sector firms. CCST's mission is to improve science and technology policy and application in California by proposing programs, conducting analyses, and helping government implement policies and initiatives for a better economy and quality of life.

The writers of this publication can be reached for questions or comments on content at the

California Council on Science and Technology
1130 K Street, Suite 280
Sacramento, California 95814

by voice at
(916) 492-0996

by fax at
(916) 492-0999

or e-mail at
ccst@ccst.ucr.edu

To order additional copies of this report or other CCST publications
contact 909.787.2913 or email ccst@ccst.ucr.edu.

Table of Contents

1.	Study's Goals	1
2.	Background and Perspectives	1
	2.1 <i>Total Foundation Giving</i>	1
	2.2 <i>Grants for Science and Technology</i>	1
3.	California Support	1
	3.1 <i>California Foundations' Grantmaking:</i>	1
	3.2 <i>California Grant Recipients:</i>	2
4.	Future Trends	2
5.	Preliminary Recommendations	3
6.	Major References Cited	3

List of Tables

Table 1.	Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology	4
Table 2.	Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology (Constant 1987 Dollars)	5
Table 3.	Interests of California Foundations	6
Table 4.	To Recipients Located in California – Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology Programs	7
Table 5.	To Recipients Located in California – Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology Programs (Constant 1987 Dollars)	8
Table 6.	Interests of Foundations Located Outside California	9

1. Study's Goals

This study's goals are the analysis and presentation of data on private foundation support for science and technology, especially in California. The following questions frame the study and are addressed in subsequent sections. Does the information reveal any trends or new directions for support, e.g. how does private foundation support relate to what federal and state data reveal? Are any specific foundations of particular importance to California? What recommendations can be made to enhance the role of private support for S&T in California?

2. Background and Perspectives

2.1 Total Foundation Giving

In 1995, for the first time, the number of private foundations in the United States exceeded 40,000, nearly doubling since 1980. These foundations' total assets were \$227 billion, and their total grants were \$12.26 billion. Early figures indicate a granting increase of about 11 to 12 percent in 1996 (*Foundation Giving*, 1997). The recent boom in investment markets has greatly increased endowments of many foundations. A new survey by the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* indicates that the endowments of 121 big private foundations were worth a total of \$126.5 billion in 1997, compared with \$103.3 billion in 1996 (*Chronicle of Philanthropy*, February 26, 1998).

Foundations, however, form but a small percentage of overall U.S. philanthropy, i.e. about 7.8 percent in 1996. The largest percentage of donations, by far, comes from individual gifts (*Giving USA*, 1997). Foundation contributions are, nevertheless, very significant because of their size and visibility and because their boards are often composed of regional and national leaders.

The large U.S. foundations also have the major impact on the grantmaking field. The 1000 larger foundations sampled annually by the Foundation Center form less than 3 percent of the total number of U.S. foundations, but their giving accounts for more than 50 percent of total foundation annual grant dollars.

2.2 Grants for Science and Technology

[Note: In the following sections of the report, "Science and Technology" or "S&T" grants are general terms embracing selected classifications from the Foundation Center's Grants Classification System using "The National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities." Statistics include grants made to any agencies (especially universities, colleges, and scientific research institutes) for science and technology research and services; grants for medical research; and grants for research in agriculture and nutrition (Foundation Center 1997).]

In 1995, science received 4.8 percent of grant dollars, up 4 percent over the previous year, and the highest level reported since 1991 (*Foundation Giving*, 1997). It is relevant to note that science and technology funding tends to fluctuate, often because just a few very large grants made in a given year can alter the percentages. For example, the recent pledge of \$100 million to USC and proposed \$100 million to UCLA by Alfred E. Mann for research institutes in biomedical engineering will have a major impact when 1998 funding figures are reported.

Why do foundations give to science and technology? While there are as many specific reasons as there are foundations, some general observations emerge:

- ◆ the founder or major contributors to the foundation made their money in scientific, medical, or technological fields;
- ◆ science and technology are interests of current foundation directors, trustees, and officers;
- ◆ foundation staff members have expertise in these fields;
- ◆ foundations are reacting to current community, regional, state, or national needs and pressures.

3. California Support

3.1 California Foundations' Grantmaking

Most of the major California philanthropic foundations have made some grants for science and technology, even if they specialize in awards for social services or cultural programs. Table 1 lists the larger California foundations' grants of \$10,000 and over for science, technology, medical research, and agriculture in the sample years of 1989, 1992, and 1996 (source = Foundation Center Data Bases). Table 2 provides the same information in constant 1987 dollars. Summary:

1989: 33 foundations made 261 grants totaling \$113.8 million (\$104.9M in constant 1987 dollars).

1992: 74 foundations made 373 grants totaling \$71.9 million (\$59.5M in constant 1987 dollars).

1996: 76 foundations made 468 grants totaling \$117.9 million (\$88.3M in constant 1987 dollars).

Data on the larger California foundations' grant of \$10,000 and over for science, technology, medical research, and agriculture show twice as many foundations awarding 79% more grants with real dollar decrease, in constant 1987 dollars, of 16% between 1989 and 1996 (on average, there are now more foundations awarding smaller grant amounts to more recipients).

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation has emerged as a major supporter of S&T programs. In all three years, also, significant S&T support (over \$1 million) has come from Packard, W. M. Keck Foundation, Arnold and Mabel Beckman Foundation.

Other emerging and consistent supporters of some aspects of S&T include the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation and the Ralph M. Parsons Foundation. Table 3 describes the priority interests of the major California donors within the broader areas of science and technology.

3.2 California Grant Recipients

Table 4 itemizes grants of \$10,000 and over made by foundations throughout the U.S. to recipients located in California. Table 5 provides the same information in constant 1987 dollars. Summary:

1989: 85 foundations made 447 grants totaling \$97.6 million (\$90M in constant 1987 dollars).

1992: 165 foundations made 546 grants totaling \$94.1 million (\$77.8M in constant 1987 dollars).

1996: 174 foundations made 654 grants totaling \$112.6 million (\$84.3M in constant 1987 dollars).

Data itemizing grants of \$10,000 and over made by foundations throughout the U.S. to recipients in California show a 6.3% real dollar decrease, in constant 1987 dollars, from 1989 to 1996.

A number of these major national foundations are located in California, e.g. Packard, Keck, Beckman, Milken, Fletcher Jones, Ahmanson, Doheny, Irvine, Weingart, Hewlett, Parsons. Other national foundations also provide significant S&T support to California institutions, e.g. Whitaker (VA), Sloan (NY), Burroughs Wellcome (NC), McDonnell (MO), Mathers (NY), Exxon (TX). Most of the grants have gone to California universities and colleges and to medical research institutes. Both public and private institutions have received support.

The types of support vary greatly from most sophisticated scientific and medical research to education programs in science and engineering to capital equipment and building projects (see Table 6 describing grantmaking priorities of major foundations located outside California). Often their grants respond to specific priorities of California institutions that may have long-term relationships with the foundations. If, for example, a foundation's published guidelines indicate an interest in providing support for science projects, a university may in one year submit a request for support for biochemistry research, in another year a proposal to construct a physics building, and in a third year an application for geoscience graduate fellowships. Often foundation guidelines are intentionally broad in order to respond to significant and emerging needs.

4. Future Trends

While data is not available, discussions with program directors at sample foundations reveal that those currently supporting S&T generally plan to continue to do so. A number are assessing or reassessing the types and amounts of funding, and there may be a trend emerging to make multi-year major commitments to projects with significant impacts. Foundations do not, however, wish to make commitments about the amounts of support they might give in the next decade. Private foundations say that they want to be flexible in order to respond to new trends and needs. Following are some reasons given by foundations for their support of S&T especially at universities and colleges:

- ◆ support for premier research with short-term or long-term benefits to society.
- ◆ keeping equipment and laboratories up to date.
- ◆ constructing or renovating science facilities.
- ◆ assisting schools to attract and retain more science and engineering majors, particularly women and underrepresented minority students
- ◆ career enhancement for young faculty members
- ◆ support for retraining in new scientific fields
- ◆ incorporating new technologies into instruction
- ◆ support for faculty-student research collaboration
- ◆ assistance with technology transfer
- ◆ providing non-science majors with improved understanding of science and its role in society.

In response to the questions about whether foundations take into consideration amounts or changes in federal or state support for S&T the answers have been consistent: While many staff and board members of private foundations around the country are somewhat knowledgeable about what is going on in funding agencies, e.g. NSF, NIH, NASA, most foundations do not make grant policies or decisions on the basis of what is being planned or committed in Washington or Sacramento. One California exception and certainly one major foundation to watch is the Packard Foundation. With rapidly increasing assets, Packard is conducting careful planning about how best to support S&T and medical research.

Over the last decade, private foundations have become more interested in sharing costs of major projects with other donors. As the prices of supporting research endeavors, building construction, and endowments have risen, foundations have come to realize that it is difficult for any one donor to fund a large S&T endeavor. A large university project, such as an institute or research center, often receives funding from federal, state, corporate, foundation, and individual donors, as well as a commitment from the institution itself. Some foundations like to provide up-front funding as a

challenge to the recipient to raise additional monies from other donors. Other foundations respond to challenges by federal or private agencies by supplying funds to complete a project. Generally foundations would like some type of recognition for their contributions, though the terms of desired recognition vary greatly.

5. Preliminary Recommendations

1. Share the results of the CCST study with major California foundations and with select national foundations that are supporting S&T. Have members of the CCST Board and Council present the report personally to key foundations.
2. CCST Board and/or Council could host a meeting for leaders of select California foundations to talk about science needs. Alternatively, key members of foundations' boards and staff could be invited to attend CCST meeting and programs.
3. Identify CCST Fellows who serve on foundation boards or serve as science advisors to foundations. Other fellows may know foundation trustees and staff members. The fellows can help place science and technology programs, or even specific projects, on priority lists for foundations. The fellows can also begin discussions about how foundations might react to projects in which private funding for S&T projects might be matched by funds from the State.

4. Identify ways to keep California foundations well informed about developments in S&T, e.g. develop an e-mail list of 25 foundation staff members who will receive special CCST bulletins on important science and technology happenings.
5. Encourage foundations who are interested in S&T to share information among themselves, electronically or through group meetings. This might lead to joint sponsorship of major programs in California that are too large for any one foundation.

6. Major References Cited

Foundation Center Databases. Electronic searches conducted by Research Assistant Crystal Mandler. Foundation Center, New York, 1998.

Foundation Giving, Yearbook of Facts and Figures of Private, Corporate, and Community Foundations. Foundation Center, New York, 1996 and 1997 editions.

The Foundation 1000. 1997/1998 edition, ed. Francine Jones. Foundation Center, New York, 1998.

Giving USA. 1997 edition, ed. Anne E. Kaplan. AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, New York.

California Nonprofit Organizations 1995. University of San Francisco Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management, 1996.

Table 1. Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology

California Foundations	1989 \$ (1)	Ranking	1992 \$ (2)	Ranking	1996 \$ (3)	Ranking
Arnold & Mabel Beckman Fdn.	\$46,917,298	1	\$4,310,000	3	\$7,630,222	3
W. M. Keck Fdn.	\$27,781,500	2	\$11,545,000	2	\$33,070,000	2
Henry J. Kaiser Family Fdn.	\$13,270,000	3				
David & Lucile Packard Fdn.	\$10,691,905	4	\$31,359,263	1	\$41,150,597	1
James Irvine Fdn.	\$3,100,000	5	\$1,150,000	9	\$900,000	14
Joan B. Kroc Fdn.	\$2,198,002	6				
Ahmanson Fdn.	\$2,053,000	7	\$2,013,000	6	\$2,164,180	8
Nora Eccles Treadwell Fdn.	\$2,049,874	8	\$2,405,000	4	\$2,430,000	7
William & Flora Hewlett Fdn.	\$988,000	9	\$520,000	18	\$1,985,000	9
Weingart Fdn.	\$965,000	10	\$1,055,000	10	\$125,000	39
Marin Community Fdn.	\$954,680	11				
ARCO Fdn.	\$725,000	12				
John Stauffer Charitable Trust	\$535,067	13			\$850,000	16
Fletcher Jones Fdn.	\$275,000	14	\$615,000	16	\$3,357,100	6
San Francisco Fdn.	\$238,500	15	\$355,000	22	\$1,546,870	11
Jules & Doris Stein Fdn.			\$1,042,175	11	\$105,000	41
Carrie Estelle Doheny Fdn.			\$1,039,000	12	\$1,619,050	10
Ralph M. Parsons Fdn.			\$2,237,422	5	\$864,918	15
Wayne & Gladys Valley Fdn.			\$260,000	28	\$3,880,037	5
L. K. Whittier Fdn.			\$1,370,444	7		
Milken Family Fdn.			\$10,000	73	\$4,686,751	4
Jennifer Jones Simon Fdn.					\$1,414,145	12
Confidence Fdn.			\$65,000	46	\$1,050,000	13
H.N. & Frances C. Berger Fdn.			\$945,500	13	\$620,000	19

Source: Databases of the Foundation Center, New York. Survey of approximately 1,000 of the country's larger foundations, recording grants of \$10,000 and over.

- (1) In 1989, 33 foundations made 261 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$113.8 million.
- (2) In 1992, 74 foundations made 373 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$71.9 million.
- (3) In 1996, 76 foundations made 468 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$117.9 million.

Table 2. Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology (Constant 1987 Dollars)

California Foundations	1989 \$ (1)	Ranking	1992 \$ (2)	Ranking	1996 \$ (3)	Ranking
Arnold & Mabel Beckman Fdn.	\$43,241,749	1	\$3,564,930	3	\$5,715,522	3
W. M. Keck Fdn.	\$25,605,069	2	\$9,549,214	2	\$24,771,536	2
Henry J. Kaiser Family Fdn.	\$12,230,415	3				
David & Lucile Packard Fdn.	\$9,854,290	4	\$25,938,183	1	\$30,824,417	1
James Irvine Fdn.	\$2,857,143	5	\$951,199	9	\$674,157	14
Joan B. Kroc Fdn.	\$2,025,808	6				
Ahmanson Fdn.	\$1,892,166	7	\$1,665,012	6	\$1,621,109	8
Nora Eccles Treadwell Fdn.	\$1,889,285	8	\$1,989,247	4	\$1,820,225	7
William & Flora Hewlett Fdn.	\$910,599	9	\$430,108	18	\$1,486,891	9
Weingart Fdn.	\$889,401	10	\$872,622	10	\$93,633	39
Marin Community Fdn.	\$879,889	11				
ARCO Fdn.	\$668,203	12				
John Stauffer Charitable Trust	\$493,149	13			\$636,704	16
Fletcher Jones Fdn.	\$253,456	14	\$508,685	16	\$2,514,682	6
San Francisco Fdn.	\$219,816	15	\$293,631	22	\$1,158,704	11
Jules & Doris Stein Fdn.			\$862,014	11	\$78,652	41
Carrie Estelle Doheny Fdn.			\$859,388	12	\$1,212,772	10
Ralph M. Parsons Fdn.			\$1,850,639	5	\$647,879	15
Wayne & Gladys Valley Fdn.			\$215,054	28	\$2,906,395	5
L. K. Whittier Fdn.			\$1,133,535	7		
Milken Family Fdn.			\$8,271	73	\$3,510,675	4
Jennifer Jones Simon Fdn.					\$1,059,285	12
Confidence Fdn.			\$53,763	46	\$786,517	13
H.N. & Frances C. Berger Fdn.			\$782,051	13	\$464,419	19

Source: Databases of the Foundation Center, New York. Survey of approximately 1,000 of the country's larger foundations, recording grants of \$10,000 and over.

- (1) In 1989, 33 foundations made 261 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$104.9 million.
- (2) In 1992, 74 foundations made 373 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$59.5 million.
- (3) In 1996, 76 foundations made 468 grants of \$10,000 and over totaling \$88.3 million.

Table 3. Interests of California Foundations

Ahmanson Foundation	Science research, education, capital projects
Arnold & Mabel Beckman Foundation	Science, engineering research
H.N. & Frances Berger Foundation	Science education
Confidence Foundation	Medical research
Carrie Estelle Doheny Foundation	Medical research, education
William & Flora Hewlett Foundation	Education, medicine
James Irvine Foundation	Science education (private institutions within California)
Fletcher Jones Foundation	Science education
W. M. Keck Foundation	Science, engineering, medical research & education
Milken Family Foundation	Medical research
David & Lucile Packard Foundation	Science, engineering
Ralph M. Parsons Foundation	Science, engineering education, research
San Francisco Foundation	Regional needs
Jennifer Jones Simon Foundation	Medical research
John Stauffer Charitable Trust	Science education
Jules & Doris Stein Foundation	Medical research
Nora Eccles Treadwell Foundation	Medical research
Wayne & Gladys Valley Foundation	Science research & education (Bay Area)
Weingart Foundation	Science education

Source: *The Foundation 1000, 1997/98*, ed. Francine Jones. The Foundation Center, New York, 1998.

Table 4. To Recipients Located in California – Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology Programs

Foundations		1989 (1)	Ranking	1992 (2)	Ranking	1996 (3)	Ranking
Arnold & Mabel Beckman Fdn.	CA	\$34,309,517	1	\$23,050,000	5	\$4,855,222	3
W. M. Keck Fdn.	CA	\$13,889,000	2	\$650,000	29	\$9,325,000	2
Lucille P. Markey Charitable Trust	FL	\$9,789,669	3	\$15,860,000	2		
David & Lucile Packard Fdn.	CA	\$3,292,713	4	\$21,821,960	1	\$27,537,667	1
James Irvine Fdn.	CA	\$3,100,000	5	\$1,150,000	15	\$900,000	25
W. K. Kellogg Fdn.	MI	\$2,707,823	6	\$27,688	122	\$45,900	113
Carnegie Corporation	NY	\$2,421,100	7				
Kresge Fdn.	MI	\$2,100,000	8	\$1,000,000	20		
Henry Luce Fdn.	NY	\$1,841,984	9	\$686,857	28		
Ahmanson Fdn.	CA	\$1,817,500	10	\$2,003,000	7	\$2,154,180	12
Whitaker Fdn.	VA	\$1,813,415	11	\$1,420,479	10	\$4,380,439	5
Pew Charitable Trusts	PA	\$1,610,000	12	\$3,503,600	4	\$185,000	60
John & Mary R. Markle Fdn.	NY	\$1,149,295	13				
Burroughs Welcome Fund	NC			\$460,000	36	\$4,849,114	4
Milken Family Fdn.	CA			\$973,714	21	\$4,286,751	
Annenberg Fund	PA	\$932,233	16	\$1,005,253	18	\$40,000	6
Shell Oil Company Fdn.	TX	\$899,383	17	\$413,407	41		
Weingart Fdn.	CA	\$865,000	18	\$1,055,000	16	\$125,000	78
Alfred P. Sloan Fdn.	NY	\$611,343	22	\$4,577,466	3	\$3,968,297	7
G. Harold & Leila Y. Mathers Fdn.	NY			\$2,329,822	6	\$2,469,766	11
Fletcher Jones Fdn.	CA	\$275,000	36	\$595,000	30	\$3,257,100	
AT & T Fdn.	NY	\$501,702	29	\$1,467,217	9	\$985,757	9
Sherman Fairchild Fdn.	CT	\$450,000	30	\$1,350,000	11		
James S. McDonnell Fdn.	MO	\$37,500	64	\$432,762	39	\$1,859,444	13
Rockefeller Fdn.	NY	\$175,400	45	\$1,258,258	14	\$584,461	34

Source: Databases of the Foundation Center, New York. Survey of 1,000 of US's larger foundations.

- (1) In 1989, 85 foundations made 447 grants totaling \$97.6 million.
- (2) In 1992, 165 foundations made 546 grants totaling \$94.1 million.
- (3) In 1996, 174 foundations made 654 grants totaling \$112.6 million.

Table 5. To Recipients Located in California – Grants of Over \$10,000 to Science and Technology Programs (Constant 1987 Dollars)

Foundations		1989 (1)	Ranking	1992 (2)	Ranking	1996 (3)	Ranking
Arnold & Mabel Beckman Fdn.	CA	\$31,621,675	1	\$2,522,746	5	\$3,636,870	3
W. M. Keck Fdn.	CA	\$12,800,922	2	\$537,634	29	\$6,985,019	2
Lucille P. Markey Charitable Trust	FL	\$9,022,736	3	\$13,118,280	2		
David & Lucile Packard Fdn.	CA	\$3,034,759	4	\$18,049,595	1	\$20,627,466	1
James Irvine Fdn.	CA	\$2,857,143	5	\$951,199	15	\$674,157	25
W. K. Kellogg Fdn.	MI	\$2,495,689	6	\$22,902	122	\$34,382	113
Carnegie Corporation	NY	\$2,231,429	7				
Kresge Fdn.	MI	\$1,935,484	8	\$827,130	20		
Henry Luce Fdn.	NY	\$1,697,681	9	\$568,120	28		
Ahmanson Fdn.	CA	\$1,675,115	10	\$1,656,741	7	\$1,613,618	12
Whitaker Fdn.	VA	\$1,671,350	11	\$1,174,921	10	\$3,281,228	5
Pew Charitable Trusts	PA	\$1,483,871	12	\$2,897,932	4	\$138,577	60
John & Mary R. Markle Fdn.	NY	\$1,059,258	13				
Burroughs Welcome Fund	NC			\$380,480	36	\$3,632,295	4
Milken Family Fdn.	CA			\$805,388	21	\$3,211,049	
Annenberg Fund	PA	\$859,201	16	\$831,475	18	\$29,963	6
Shell Oil Company Fdn.	TX	\$828,924	17	\$341,941	41		
Weingart Fdn.	CA	\$797,235	18	\$872,622	16	\$93,633	78
Alfred P. Sloan Fdn.	NY	\$563,450	22	\$3,786,159	3	\$2,972,507	7
G. Harold & Leila Y. Mathers Fdn.	NY			\$1,927,065	6	\$1,850,012	11
Fletcher Jones Fdn.	CA	\$253,456	36	\$492,142	30	\$2,439,775	
AT & T Fdn.	NY	\$462,398	29	\$1,213,579	9	\$738,395	9
Sherman Fairchild Fdn.	CT	\$414,747	30	\$1,116,625	11		
James S. McDonnell Fdn.	MO	\$34,562	64	\$357,950	39	\$1,392,842	13
Rockefeller Fdn.	NY	\$161,659	45	\$1,040,743	14	\$437,799	34

Source: Databases of the Foundation Center, New York. Survey of 1,000 of US's larger foundations.

- (1) In 1989, 85 foundations made 447 grants totaling \$90 million.
- (2) In 1992, 165 foundations made 546 grants totaling \$77.8 million.
- (3) In 1996, 174 foundations made 654 grants totaling \$84.3 million.

Table 6. Interests of Foundations Located Outside California

Annenberg Fund	Education
A T & T Foundation	Science education
Burroughs Welcome Fund	Medical research
Carnegie Corporation	Education
Exxon Education Foundation	Education
Sherman Fairchild Foundation	Science research, education
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	Health
W. K. Kellogg Foundation	Education, environment
Kresge Foundation	Capital construction, renovation, equipment
Henry Luce Foundation	Education, professorships
John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	Medical research, foundation initiatives
Lucille P. Markey Charitable Trust	Medical research
John & Mary R. Markle Foundation	Medical research
A. Harold & Leila Y. Mathers Foundation	Science research
James S. McDonnell Foundation	Science, medical research
Pew Charitable Trusts	Education
Rockefeller Foundation	Education, research
Shell Oil Company Foundation	Education
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	Science, engineering research
Whitaker Foundation	Biomedical engineering

Source: *The Foundation 1000, 1997/98*, ed. Francine Jones. *The Foundation Center*, New York, 1998.